

**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
IOWA**



**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 EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 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
<p>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</p>		
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: Iowa Department of Education		
Address: 400 East 14th Street Des Moines, IA 50319.0146		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Del Hoover		
Telephone: 515-281-8402		
Fax: 515-281-7700		
e-mail: del.hoover@iowa.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jason Glass		
Wednesday, March 16, 2011, 4:20:09 PM		
Signature		Date

**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.

No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned.

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.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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)	30.0
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	70.0
Comments:	

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)	Yes
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)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
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	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
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	Yes
Other	No
Comments:	

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	244,618		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,254		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,150		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	12,593		>97
Hispanic	19,276		>97
White, non-Hispanic	201,772		>97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,697		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,204		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	93,208		>97
Migratory students	762		>97
Male	125,501		>97
Female	119,106		>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	4,346	13.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27,170	81.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,934	5.8
Total	33,450	
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	244,684		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,252		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,149		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	12,598		>97
Hispanic	19,275		>97
White, non-Hispanic	201,834		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	33,739		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,194		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	93,260		>97
Migratory students	761		>97
Male	125,560		>97
Female	119,115		>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	4,337	13.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27,197	81.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,940	5.8
Total	33,474	
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	243,990		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,252		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,139		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	12,574		>97
Hispanic	19,236		>97
White, non-Hispanic	201,223		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	33,405	31,853	95.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,207	9,814	96.1
Economically disadvantaged students	92,963		>97
Migratory students	758	718	94.7
Male	125,126		>97
Female	118,854		>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	4,295	13.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,733	84.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	794	2.5
Total	31,822	
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	34,673	26,420	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	175	103	58.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	747	578	77.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,901	910	47.9
Hispanic	3,048	1,847	60.6
White, non-Hispanic	28,059	22,459	80.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,280	2,106	49.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,090	1,134	54.3
Economically disadvantaged students	14,581	9,456	64.9
Migratory students	129	74	57.4
Male	17,718	13,618	76.9
Female	16,955	12,802	75.5
Comments:			

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	34,721	26,222	75.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	174	109	62.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	740	563	76.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,907	968	50.8
Hispanic	3,048	1,787	58.6
White, non-Hispanic	28,107	22,241	79.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,283	1,665	38.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,081	1,012	48.6
Economically disadvantaged students	14,612	9,297	63.6
Migratory students	129	59	45.7
Male	17,732	12,933	72.9
Female	16,989	13,289	78.2
Comments:			

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	32,318	25,948	80.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	103	64.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	687	539	78.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,813	993	54.8
Hispanic	2,816	1,892	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	26,131	21,888	83.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,741	2,356	63.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,968	1,220	62.0
Economically disadvantaged students	13,623	9,643	70.8
Migratory students	118	79	66.9
Male	16,452	13,269	80.7
Female	15,866	12,679	79.9
Comments:			

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	34,944	27,660	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	167	118	70.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	820	668	81.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,888	918	48.6
Hispanic	3,127	1,996	63.8
White, non-Hispanic	28,249	23,451	83.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,710	2,338	49.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,004	1,086	54.2
Economically disadvantaged students	14,508	9,812	67.6
Migratory students	125	66	52.8
Male	17,960	14,433	80.4
Female	16,984	13,227	77.9
Comments:			

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	34,972	27,140	77.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	166	104	62.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	818	636	77.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,895	982	51.8
Hispanic	3,133	1,886	60.2
White, non-Hispanic	28,267	23,006	81.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,713	1,917	40.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,005	979	48.8
Economically disadvantaged students	14,524	9,540	65.7
Migratory students	125	64	51.2
Male	17,975	13,606	75.7
Female	16,997	13,534	79.6
Comments:			

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	33,802	28,320	83.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	164	123	75.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	795	645	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,846	1,052	57.0
Hispanic	2,966	2,103	70.9
White, non-Hispanic	27,360	23,880	87.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,291	2,730	63.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,921	1,182	61.5
Economically disadvantaged students	13,908	10,345	74.4
Migratory students	113	69	61.1
Male	17,339	14,492	83.6
Female	16,463	13,828	84.0
Comments:			

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	34,647	27,594	79.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	171	105	61.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	709	595	83.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,848	1,013	54.8
Hispanic	2,862	1,877	65.6
White, non-Hispanic	28,404	23,547	82.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,972	2,388	48.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,675	945	56.4
Economically disadvantaged students	14,038	9,645	68.7
Migratory students	113	69	61.1
Male	17,781	14,269	80.2
Female	16,866	13,325	79.0
Comments:			

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	34,667	26,884	77.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	170	111	65.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	708	554	78.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,851	961	51.9
Hispanic	2,860	1,824	63.8
White, non-Hispanic	28,426	22,974	80.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,990	2,015	40.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,666	827	49.6
Economically disadvantaged students	14,051	9,267	66.0
Migratory students	113	56	49.6
Male	17,797	13,488	75.8
Female	16,870	13,396	79.4
Comments:			

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	34,557	28,640	82.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	171	124	72.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	707	565	79.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,845	1,055	57.2
Hispanic	2,848	1,975	69.3
White, non-Hispanic	28,335	24,431	86.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,960	2,949	59.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,660	953	57.4
Economically disadvantaged students	14,000	10,156	72.5
Migratory students	112	67	59.8
Male	17,730	14,676	82.8
Female	16,827	13,964	83.0
Comments:			

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	34,657	26,402	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	123	68.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	736	593	80.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,827	844	46.2
Hispanic	2,758	1,652	59.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,463	22,716	79.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,919	1,831	37.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,314	559	42.5
Economically disadvantaged students	13,648	8,566	62.8
Migratory students	117	57	48.7
Male	17,728	13,640	76.9
Female	16,929	12,762	75.4
Comments:			

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	34,665	24,057	69.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	95	52.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	733	538	73.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,826	757	41.5
Hispanic	2,755	1,489	54.0
White, non-Hispanic	28,477	20,738	72.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,921	1,359	27.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,304	413	31.7
Economically disadvantaged students	13,652	7,517	55.1
Migratory students	117	42	35.9
Male	17,731	11,976	67.5
Female	16,934	12,081	71.3
Comments:			

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	34,343	27,736	80.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	177	127	71.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	725	589	81.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,805	911	50.5
Hispanic	2,731	1,784	65.3
White, non-Hispanic	28,215	23,813	84.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,633	2,389	51.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,284	605	47.1
Economically disadvantaged students	13,486	9,267	68.7
Migratory students	117	63	53.8
Male	17,527	14,121	80.6
Female	16,816	13,615	81.0
Comments:			

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	34,814	26,585	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	179	115	64.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	751	612	81.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,856	849	45.7
Hispanic	2,738	1,654	60.4
White, non-Hispanic	28,668	22,912	79.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,017	1,700	33.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,256	539	42.9
Economically disadvantaged students	13,161	8,211	62.4
Migratory students	99	55	55.6
Male	17,921	13,712	76.5
Female	16,893	12,873	76.2
Comments:			

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	34,860	24,921	71.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	107	59.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	746	557	74.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,863	847	45.5
Hispanic	2,738	1,555	56.8
White, non-Hispanic	28,709	21,437	74.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,037	1,346	26.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,249	430	34.4
Economically disadvantaged students	13,182	7,456	56.6
Migratory students	98	44	44.9
Male	17,948	12,401	69.1
Female	16,912	12,520	74.0
Comments:			

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	34,533	27,901	80.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	180	129	71.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	746	596	79.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,834	989	53.9
Hispanic	2,706	1,789	66.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,446	23,929	84.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,743	2,367	49.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,236	568	46.0
Economically disadvantaged students	13,008	9,014	69.3
Migratory students	98	54	55.1
Male	17,741	14,203	80.1
Female	16,792	13,698	81.6
Comments:			

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	34,780	26,165	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	192	112	58.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	698	550	78.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,650	725	43.9
Hispanic	2,579	1,505	58.4
White, non-Hispanic	29,006	22,828	78.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,942	1,525	30.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,082	433	40.0
Economically disadvantaged students	12,496	7,573	60.6
Migratory students	95	42	44.2
Male	17,897	13,472	75.3
Female	16,883	12,693	75.2
Comments:			

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	34,814	25,266	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	119	61.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	697	525	75.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,651	733	44.4
Hispanic	2,580	1,460	56.6
White, non-Hispanic	29,037	21,993	75.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,949	1,406	28.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,076	355	33.0
Economically disadvantaged students	12,522	7,244	57.9
Migratory students	95	29	30.5
Male	17,921	12,658	70.6
Female	16,893	12,608	74.6
Comments:			

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	34,774	27,950	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	135	69.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	694	581	83.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,648	921	55.9
Hispanic	2,580	1,716	66.5
White, non-Hispanic	29,003	24,106	83.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,934	2,265	45.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,079	506	46.9
Economically disadvantaged students	12,500	8,610	68.9
Migratory students	94	38	40.4
Male	17,896	14,128	78.9
Female	16,878	13,822	81.9
Comments:			

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	35,219	27,028	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	179	128	71.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	655	524	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1,480	589	39.8
Hispanic	2,046	1,160	56.7
White, non-Hispanic	30,371	24,302	80.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,576	1,435	31.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	673	230	34.2
Economically disadvantaged students	10,186	6,102	59.9
Migratory students	66	30	45.5
Male	18,030	13,910	77.1
Female	17,189	13,118	76.3
Comments:			

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	35,189	27,256	77.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	177	122	68.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	653	522	79.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,480	697	47.1
Hispanic	2,039	1,220	59.8
White, non-Hispanic	30,350	24,337	80.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,548	1,568	34.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	670	219	32.7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,175	6,286	61.8
Migratory students	65	22	33.8
Male	18,012	13,439	74.6
Female	17,177	13,817	80.4
Comments:			

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	35,070	28,129	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	176	123	69.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	653	535	81.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,464	734	50.1
Hispanic	2,026	1,283	63.3
White, non-Hispanic	30,264	25,094	82.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,520	1,913	42.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	666	258	38.7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,106	6,684	66.1
Migratory students	66	29	43.9
Male	17,944	13,963	77.8
Female	17,126	14,166	82.7
Comments:			

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	1,423	910	63.9
Districts	361	323	89.5
Comments:			

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	675	452	67.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	164	66	40.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	511	386	75.5
Comments:			

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
361	322	89.2
Comments: Iowa had 361 districts that received Title I funds in SY 2009-2010.		

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	5
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	1
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)	1
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	
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.

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 Iowa State Support Team continued to provide assistance to all 24 districts that were identified for improvement and/or corrective action during the 2009-2010 school year. The assistance included the implementation of approved action plans or corrective action plans.

There are five phases in the Iowa Support System assistance for corrective action plans, they are:

- Audit Phase
- Diagnosis Phase
- Design Phase
- Implementation/Monitoring Phase
- Monitoring/Assessment Phase

The final plan outlines actions and timelines to be taken in the areas of reading and mathematics, parent engagement, assessing evaluability, needs of students, mentoring of staff and implementation of evidence-based research.

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	2
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	2
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 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	4	3
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	08/17/10
---	----------

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	28,562	29,095
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	18,918	18,771
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	66.2	64.5
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	28,599	29,171
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	17,953	18,064
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	62.8	61.9
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	26
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	4

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	94
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.
1	Professional Development was delivered to LEAs in the following areas: Literacy coaches, math coaches, professional learning communities, Positive Behavior Supports, Cultural proficiency, ways to increase parent involvement within the LEAs as well as formative assessment training.	33	0	0	D	LEAs showed improvement as a result of this professional development, but not at a significant rate to make AYP increases or exit improvement status.
2	Research based instructional strategies utilized by the LEAs include fluency instruction, writing instruction, math strategies, differentiation strategies, co-teaching, Daily 5 and CAFE in literacy and implementing a new basal series	84	0	4	D	Although 4 LEAs made AYP based on testing after receiving the assistance, the remainder of the LEAs showed improvement as a result of this professional development, but not at a significant rate to make AYP increases or exit improvement status.
4	Meetings are held throughout the year to provide professional development to the Iowa Support Team in the area of implementing the Iowa Core Curriculum, Fierce Conversations, Root Cause, how to assist LEAs in writing action plans, how to review action plans and ways to assist LEAs in monitoring and implementing the action plans.					
						Although 4 LEAs

The Iowa Support Team in conjunction with the Area Education Agencies (AEA), provide the intermediate support to LEAs in the area of professional development and technical assistance. The professional development and technical assistance provided is based on the needs of the LEAs as determined by data.

made AYP based on testing after receiving the assistance, the remainder of the LEAs showed improvement as a result of this professional development, but not at a significant rate to make AYP increases or exit improvement status.

3		110	0	4	D	

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.

Strategies were shared with LEAs through workshops, State Support Team trainings, through the Area Educational Agencies (AEAs) that work with districts and schools, and through websites. Also trainings on different strategies, for example, on Fierce Conversations were provided throughout the state.

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.

The 5% reserve helps to cover part of the cost for a facilitator and expert to the School Support team. The facilitator helps to design and deliver technical assistance to both State Support Team members and schools that have been identified as in need. Funds are also used to assist schools in interpreting school data-student achievement, demographic, program, and perception- in order to identify trends. The training also assist schools in developing clear, measurable, attainable goals for improvement based on data and develop specific research-based strategies, timelines, and role assignment. Technical assistance has been provided in partnering with parents, as well as, curriculum and instruction alignment.

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.

In Iowa, the Area Educational Agencies(AEAs) across the state provided consultants out of their budgets to serve as team members on the State Support Team and worked with Title I districts and schools identified as in need.

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	48,141
Applied to transfer	350
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	350
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	\$ 0

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	20

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	8,101
Applied for supplemental educational services	697
Received supplemental educational services	697
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	\$ 706,379
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
				Qualified	
All classes	126,989	126,935	100.0	54	0.0
All elementary classes	75,834	75,794	99.9	40	0.1
All secondary classes	51,155	51,141	100.0	14	0.0

The LEA level file was submitted twice, the first time I used the building level and I should have used grades 9-12. In doing this some districts should have shown 0, but because they weren't in the second file (no grades 9-12) the number of teachers weren't reduced with the second submission. In January I resubmitted a file with those districts having a 0 count. I believe this was after the CSPR Part 1 Certification date. This should now be fixed.

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.

Iowa counts a self-contained class as one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Iowa Department of Education has developed a system whereby schools enter data regarding teachers' licensure information. In the event a teacher is assigned to an area for which he or she is not highly qualified, the system is alerted. Also at any point during the school year, a district may hire a teacher who is not highly qualified. In either situation, the Department works with the district to ensure correction, including taking steps to force the district to remove the teacher or reassign the teacher to an area for which he/she is highly qualified.

	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)	0.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.0
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)	100.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Iowa Department of Education has developed a system whereby schools enter data regarding teachers' assignment that is linked with each teachers' licensure information. In the event a teacher is assigned to an area for which he or she is not highly qualified, the system is alerted. Also, at any point during the school year, a district may hire a teacher who is not highly qualified. In either situation, the Department works with the district to ensure correction, including taking steps to force the district to remove the teacher or reassign the teacher to an area for which he/she is highly qualified.

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	21,174	21,174	100.0
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	18,208	18,208	100.0
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	13,199	13,198	100.0
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	14,547	14,540	100.0

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	50.9	25.1
Poverty metric used	High/low poverty is based upon the top and bottom 25% of schools in terms of percent of their students that are eligible for free/reduced price lunch. Iowa has more schools in the high poverty quartile than the low poverty quartile. The number of not highly qualified teachers falls mostly in the group of schools that would be considered neither high poverty or low poverty, so the percent HQT would be correct for elementary schools.	
Secondary schools	38.6	21.6
Poverty metric used	High/low poverty is based upon the top and bottom 25% of schools in terms of percent of their students that are eligible for free/reduced price lunch.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

- 1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/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	
No	Transitional bilingual programs	
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
No	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
<u>No</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the 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 20,934

Comments: The number submitted reflects numbers of students in the fall of 2009. We test students in the Spring of 2010. So, we have the overall Spring 2010 student population as 21517.

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.	20,934

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	14,852
Bosnian	882
Vietnamese	852
Reserved for local use	399
Arabic	342

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	20,094
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	840
Total	20,934
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	# 4,578
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP	22.8
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	20,094
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	840
Total	20,934
Comments: Some students leave the state, are ill, or go into non-public schools. There is always some discrepancy in accounting at the district level.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose 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.	4,932

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	8,491	56.0	8,612	56.80
Attained proficiency	4,578	22.8	3,093	20.40
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).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

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)

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

Language(s)

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
1,160	865	2,025
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
1,959	1,549	79.1	410
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
1,959	1,492	76.2	467
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
772	629	81.5	143
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	12
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	6
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	10
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	10
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	7
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	4
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	2
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	2

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: The state has 10 area education agencies (AEAs). Two subgrantees are actually very large districts.

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: The State has not met AMAO 3. We have improved about 25 from last year on all AMAOs.

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: The only subgrantees that did not make AMAOs for 4 consecutive years are large districts. They are working on Corrective Action Plans as part of the sanctions of NCLB.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
4,102	2,043	9

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.	395
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,100

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.

The student:teacher ratio for ELLs is about 53 to 1. In favor of equitable access to instruction, we need to reduce this for what is a very fast-growing population. We will have over 25,000 ELLs in the next 5 years.

* 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	11	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	11	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	11	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	11	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	11	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	11	3,321
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	2,501
PD provided to principals	11	346
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	11	467
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	11	890
PD provided to community based organization personnel	11	364
Total	66	7,889

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

PD is carried out by Area Education Agencies for all school districts.

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
07/01/20	07/01/20	0
Comments: Subgrantees are reimbursed for expenses incurred. Funds are available the instant we get the notification from the Federal Government.		

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.

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: I am unable to make an entry in the box provided above. Iowa has 0 schools that meet the definition of Persistently Dangerous Schools.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	87.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	69.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	68.6
Hispanic	71.6
White, non-Hispanic	89.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	79.6
Limited English proficient	66.9
Economically disadvantaged	75.9
Migratory students	62.5
Male	85.3
Female	89.2
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
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	5.3
Hispanic	3.5
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	<3
Limited English proficient	3.3
Economically disadvantaged	<3
Migratory students	3.2
Male	<3
Female	<3
Comments:	

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	340	340
LEAs with subgrants	19	19
Total	359	359
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)	49
K	161	373
1	195	407
2	145	398
3	166	397
4	157	365
5	134	329
6	121	295
7	113	308
8	99	283
9	93	359
10	130	288
11	193	258
12	369	300
Ungraded		
Total	2,125	4,506

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	438	1,082
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,553	3,125
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	30	63
Hotels/Motels	104	236
Total	2,125	4,506

Comments: Sub-grantees reviewed their data and were able to verify the nighttime residence of all identified homeless students.

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)	128
K	259
1	256
2	248
3	279
4	208
5	222
6	188
7	186
8	183
9	232
10	209
11	156
12	188
Ungraded	
Total	2,942
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	80
Migratory children/youth	14
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	861
Limited English proficient students	400
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	16
Expedited evaluations	9
Staff professional development and awareness	17
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	15
Transportation	17
Early childhood programs	15
Assistance with participation in school programs	16
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	13
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	15
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	15
Coordination between schools and agencies	17
Counseling	17
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	13
Clothing to meet a school requirement	15
School supplies	16
Referral to other programs and services	17
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	14
Other (optional – in comment box below)	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Case management and follow-up
Information Fair for homeless families regarding local services
Primary and Preventative Health Services

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School Selection	5
Transportation	8
School records	4
Immunizations	2
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Lack of employment opportunities for homeless families; lack of affordable housing; attendance support; buildings requesting delayed entry for evaluation or waiting for beginning of new term.

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	195	93
4	167	99
5	154	88
6	141	49
7	133	49
8	147	58
High School	102	51
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	196	101
4	166	101
5	153	87
6	142	58
7	128	58
8	143	61
High School	101	41
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)	97
K	102
1	127
2	129
3	132
4	114
5	123
6	98
7	106
8	120
9	115
10	95
11	82
12	57
Ungraded	17
Out-of-school	33
Total	1,547
Comments: Counts were amended by districts after Part I closed.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 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<10
K	15
1	26
2	25
3	23
4	23
5	26
6	19
7	19
8	23
9	19
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	236
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 summer session for 2010 saw an increased enrollment of 100 students compared to 2009. The four districts that provided a summer session actively recruited eligible migrant students. One district also saw an increase in the number of students enrolling for summer only.

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.

<p>1. Student Information System Iowa uses MIS 2000 to compile & generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period. Child counts for 2008-09 were also compiled & generated through MIS 2000. Iowa will continue to use MIS 2000 to compile & generate child counts for 2010-</p>
--

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.

2. The child count data is first collected through parent/family interviews at the time of registration for & enrollment in school. The following data is collected during the initial interview:

- Parent/guardian names, addresses, telephone numbers
- Child data
 - o Iowa Student ID# (if known)
 - o Last, first, middle names of each child in the family
 - o Race of each child in the family
 - o Sex of each child in the family
 - o Birth date of each child in the family
 - o Verification of multiple births
 - o Verification of birth dates of children
 - o Residency dates for children
 - o Grade levels and building placements for each child enrolled
- Eligibility data
 - o Qualifying work of parent/guardian
 - o QAD
 - o Clarifying comments to verify qualifying employment

The interviewer reviews the data collected, verifies spellings, birth dates, employment, etc. and enters the information on the COE. Iowa uses the national COE form with the addition of race, and facility number to the child data section. COEs are reviewed at the local level prior to being sent to the State MEP office where they are reviewed for approval by the State MEP Director. If there any errors or omissions, the COE is sent back to the District for correction. Usually, the interviewer must re-interview the family in order to make the corrections. When the COEs are approved, a letter is sent by email to the District listing the eligible child(ren)'s name(s), birth date, grade level, QAD and eligibility expiration date. This letter is used to verify with the District food service that the child(ren) listed are eligible for MEP services and for free meals. After approval, the COE is given to the data entry staff person to be inputted into the MIS 2000 data base.

All districts in Iowa must follow this procedure before identifying and counting any child as an eligible migrant. This requirement has led to a more accurate count of eligible migrant students state wide. Iowa Districts must also use a Withdrawal Form when migrant students move out of the District. This form is sent to the State MEP office and the information is entered into the MIS 2000 database.

Addendum:

- Students with verified eligibility (QADs between 9/1/2007-8/31/10; still in Iowa; parents employed in agribusiness; non-graduates) are counted. Districts must submit a completed COE for State review before a student can be verified as an eligible migrant.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child data is organized by several criteria such as facility, enrollment date, and grade level. Several reports can be generated through MIS 2000 based on these criteria in order to verify student enrollment/withdrawal status. This data can also be cross-checked against the State data collection process to ensure that Districts have not counted migrant students who do not have approved COEs and who are not in the MIS 2000 system. If a District has identified a student as migrant, but there is no verification of this, then the District must complete a COE for State approval, or remove the student from the migrant count. Any student data that cannot be verified through approved COEs or MIS 2000 reports is not included in the child counts for Categories 1 and 2.

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.

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.

MIS 2000 generates reports that calculate the number of eligible children between the ages of 3 and 21 based upon the COE data entered into the system between 9/1/09 and 8/31/10. The two reports used are: 1. Identification of students enrolled for the first time during the 9/1/09-8/31/10 count period and 2. Verification of enrollment and eligibility of migrant students for the previous two count periods. These reports are sent to Districts for review, verification and correction. The reports are then cross-checked against the State database (Project Easier) which contains data from all Iowa districts regarding the number of migrant students enrolled between the 2009-10 count dates. The majority of the student information kept in the MIS 2000 database comes from COEs submitted by the federally-funded MEPs. Occasionally, however, a local non-MEP District will enter a migrant student in the State database without completing a COE on that student. Cross-checking between the two databases helps us to be sure that all eligible migrant students are identified and accounted for. Students who cannot be verified with COE data are not included in our count.

We rely on the MIS 2000 reports and the Project Easier database to give accurate information for the number of children meeting eligibility criteria, children in Iowa for at least 1 day during the count period, children receiving MEP-funded summer/intersession services and to count children once per grade/age level in each child count category. Data from COEs cannot be entered if it doesn't contain the information required by the online form. Therefore, we are pretty much assured that when a child's information is accepted by the system, it is accurate.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Prior to the determination of the count, two reports generated by MIS 2000 are sent to each MEP to verify that students listed on the reports were in the District during the count period: 1. a list of students whose QAD occurred during the 9/1/09-8/31/10 period and 2. a list of students previously enrolled in the district during the prior two count periods. Districts review each list and return any changes or corrections to the State MEP office. All reports generated by either MIS 2000 and Project Easier are cross-checked against District data.

MEP staff participate in two trainings per year that include focus on eligibility criteria, interviewing for accuracy, and completing COEs with accuracy. The Iowa ID & R Manual was recently updated to reflect changes in guidance from OME. All Iowa MEPs have received the updated Manual. State trained staff assist local MEP interviewers with questions regarding procedure or sit in on interviews to assist as needed.

Eligibility issues are resolved through regular and frequent communication between the State MEP office and the local MEPs. All COEs are reviewed and approved at the State level. Any questions arising during this process are dealt with immediately.

The effectiveness of ID & R activities is evaluated through on-site monitoring and training requests of the local MEPs, review of the COEs at both the state and local levels and during the re-interviewing process.

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.

Six of ten Iowa MEPs have completed their first re-interviewing activity. Each re-interviewed five randomly selected families using forms created by the State MEP office. All six programs reported that there were no instances of non-verifiable information and that the re-interview supported the information collected in the first eligibility interview. This has been substantiated by a State review of the forms submitted by the Districts. The remaining four MEPs must have their re-interviewing completed by the end of November, 2010.

The second re-interviewing activity will begin in March, 2011 and must be completed by May 30, 2011. The State will contract with an outside vendor (TBD) to complete the third phase of the re-interviewing which will take place during the Fall of 2011.

Addendum:

- Families are re-interviewed in person whenever possible. Random selection identifies the re-interviewees and appointments are made with the families to conduct and complete the interview. Interviewers were given a script to follow and used a form similar to the COE to gather data. All staff conducting the re-interviews were trained in the process by the State ID & R Coordinator, State MEP Director and/or the local migrant education coordinator.
- The MIS2000 data system used by Iowa can generate reports that show all eligible migrant students entered into the database. A regular and frequent check of the database using this report format can verify that eligible migrant students are being entered into the database.

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.

Upon approval by the State MEP Director, all COEs are given to the data entry staff person to input into the MIS 2000 system. Built-in error checks in the MIS 2000 system prevent the data entry staff from entering incorrect/incomplete data. If errors are flagged, the COE in question goes back to the State MEP Director for additional review. If the error can't be corrected at the State level, the COE is sent back to the local MEP for review and correction. All corrected COEs must have initials and dates by the areas that were revised. Any COEs with revisions/corrections will be reviewed again before being entered into MIS 2000. COEs with data that cannot be clarified or verified are not entered into the database.

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.

Data collected in the MIS 2000 system is cross-checked with the state database to ensure that all eligible migrant students are included in the count. Reports generated by the MIS 2000 system will be reviewed at both the local and State level to ensure that all eligible students have been entered into that database.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- a. Continue to hold a minimum of two yearly trainings for local MEP and focus on eligibility issues with updated materials.
- b. Provide copies of the most current non-regulatory guidance.
- c. Continue to employ a part-time State level migrant staff person who conducts frequent technical assistance visits to local MEPs.
- d. Improve coordination of migrant data collection between the State data system and MIS 2000

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.

NA