

**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
IDAHO**



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2009-10 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<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: Idaho State Board of Education		
Address: 650 W. State Street Boise, ID 83720-0037		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Scott Grothe		
Telephone: (208) 332-1572		
Fax: (208) 334-2632		
e-mail: scott.grothe@osbe.idaho.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Scott Grothe		
Friday, March 4, 2011, 2:35:32 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.

Idaho Content Standards in Mathematics (9-12 Course Specific Standards) were approved by the Idaho State Legislature in January 2009. These standards were implemented in the fall of 2009 by Idaho school districts. The 9-12 course specific standards are in addition to our grade-level content standards and are designed to more fully support classroom instruction. Content Standards in Chemistry (Grade 11-12) were adopted into temporary rule by the State Legislature in January 2009. Revision work began on the K-8 content standards in mathematics in 2009, but was halted when the Common Core State Standards Initiative memorandum of agreement was signed by the Idaho State Superintendent of Public Instruction and Idaho Governor. Focus groups have been convened to review the draft College and Career Readiness Standards and the Draft K-8 Common Core Standards in mathematics. Public comments have been gathered and reviewed and forwarded on to CCSSO and NGA for further study. Idaho is pursuing adoption of the Common Core Standards in Mathematics, with the process beginning in April 2010 with the document being sent to the State Board of Education to begin the rulemaking process. Following a period of public comment, the common core standards in Science were given final approval by the Board on November 17, 2010. The final step will be to seek Legislative approval in the Legislative session beginning in January 2011.

The Idaho Content Standards in English Language Arts have been reviewed and revised during the 2010-2011 school year by incorporating and following the common core standards, as with Mathematics [see above]. The State Board of Education gave final approval on Nov. 17, 2010 and the the revised Idaho Content Standards in ELA (Grade K-12) will be sent to the State Legislature in January 2011 for approval with curricular material adoption in September 2012.

Content Standards in Chemistry (Grade 11-12) were adopted into temporary rule by the State Legislature in January 2009. The revised Idaho Content Standards in Science (Grade K-12) will be sent to the State Legislature in January 2011 for approval with curricular material adoption in September 2011.

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.

The State will continue to use the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) in reading, math and language usage for grades 3-8 and 10, and grades 5,7 and 10 in science. The ISAT in reading, math and language usage was peer reviewed and received full approval in November 2006, science in September 2008.

The ISAT-Alt, the alternate assessment, was revised in science, math, reading and language usage into a portfolio system in 2010 and was administered in spring 2010. The entire new ISAT-Alt online collection and scoring system in reading, math, and language usage has been submitted for peer review in fall 2010.

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)	33.4
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	66.6
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)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	No
Other	No
Comments: Do note that some of the activities noted as "no" under ESEA 6111 funding were done but paid for with other funds including state funding.	

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	147,203		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,265		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,601		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	1,725		>97
Hispanic	22,318		>97
White, non-Hispanic	116,766		>97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,553		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,637		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	69,997		>97
Migratory students	1,253		>97
Male	75,505		>97
Female	71,698		>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	4,075	30.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,065	60.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,278	9.5
Total	13,418	
Comments: State does not test students based on "Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards" or "Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards" and the responses blank.		

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	146,775		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,262		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,455		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	1,667		>97
Hispanic	22,178		>97
White, non-Hispanic	116,690		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,546		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,209		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	69,668		>97
Migratory students	1,211		>97
Male	75,288		>97
Female	71,487		>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	12,074	90.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	68	<3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,268	9.5
Total	13,410	
Comments: State does not test students based on "Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards" or "Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards" and the responses blank.		

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	62,021		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,009		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,099		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	679		>97
Hispanic	9,157		>97
White, non-Hispanic	49,480		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,515		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,097		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	28,359		>97
Migratory students	512		>97
Male	31,829		>97
Female	30,192		>97

Comments: The State will continue to use the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) in science for grades 5, 7, and 10. The ISAT-Science was peer reviewed and received unofficial full approval in November 2009.

The ISAT-Alt Science was submitted for peer review in October 2009. The state has received preliminary notes back has working with the US Department of Education to meet the remaining requirements.

The ISAT-Alt, the alternate assessment, continues to be revised. The ISAT-Alt Science was revised into a portfolio system and administered in spring 2009. In addition, the ISAT-Alt in science will be an electronic portfolio submission and scoring system.

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	1,791	33.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,095	57.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	N<10	
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	N<10	
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	523	9.7
Total	5,409	
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	21,681	18,982	87.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	302	220	72.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	396	338	85.4
Black, non-Hispanic	277	209	75.5
Hispanic	3,461	2,694	77.8
White, non-Hispanic	16,999	15,300	90.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,143	1,242	58.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,385	841	60.7
Economically disadvantaged students	11,144	9,213	82.7
Migratory students	217	148	68.2
Male	11,033	9,604	87.0
Female	10,648	9,378	88.1
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	21,618	19,193	88.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	301	241	80.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	372	334	89.8
Black, non-Hispanic	269	222	82.5
Hispanic	3,441	2,742	79.7
White, non-Hispanic	16,989	15,436	90.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,138	1,235	57.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,323	852	64.4
Economically disadvantaged students	11,093	9,360	84.4
Migratory students	208	145	69.7
Male	11,010	9,495	86.2
Female	10,608	9,698	91.4
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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: ISAT Science testing is not administered in the 3rd grade.			

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	21,425	18,158	84.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	302	193	63.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	373	324	86.9
Black, non-Hispanic	242	149	61.6
Hispanic	3,362	2,508	74.6
White, non-Hispanic	16,905	14,789	87.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,187	1,073	49.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,154	614	53.2
Economically disadvantaged students	10,781	8,502	78.9
Migratory students	184	121	65.8
Male	11,032	9,374	85.0
Female	10,393	8,784	84.5
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	21,353	18,378	86.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	301	211	70.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	357	310	86.8
Black, non-Hispanic	227	164	72.2
Hispanic	3,333	2,480	74.4
White, non-Hispanic	16,895	15,013	88.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,189	1,062	48.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,083	545	50.3
Economically disadvantaged students	10,725	8,613	80.3
Migratory students	179	123	68.7
Male	10,985	9,308	84.7
Female	10,368	9,070	87.5
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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: ISAT Science testing is not administered in the 4th grade.			

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	21,468	17,119	79.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	348	204	58.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	363	307	84.6
Black, non-Hispanic	219	120	54.8
Hispanic	3,284	2,192	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	17,009	14,098	82.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,114	890	42.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,176	505	42.9
Economically disadvantaged students	10,782	7,793	72.3
Migratory students	199	110	55.3
Male	10,909	8,696	79.7
Female	10,559	8,423	79.8
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	21,405	18,786	87.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	345	251	72.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	343	315	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	213	147	69.0
Hispanic	3,260	2,531	77.6
White, non-Hispanic	17,001	15,328	90.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,114	1,090	51.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,107	589	53.2
Economically disadvantaged students	10,737	8,857	82.5
Migratory students	193	116	60.1
Male	10,878	9,318	85.7
Female	10,527	9,468	89.9
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	21,451	13,927	64.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	349	157	45.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	362	256	70.7
Black, non-Hispanic	218	94	43.1
Hispanic	3,278	1,340	40.9
White, non-Hispanic	16,998	11,910	70.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,105	741	35.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,171	214	18.3
Economically disadvantaged students	10,774	5,844	54.2
Migratory students	197	51	25.9
Male	10,901	7,212	66.2
Female	10,550	6,715	63.6
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	20,890	16,543	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	328	179	54.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	347	284	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic	253	151	59.7
Hispanic	3,244	2,081	64.1
White, non-Hispanic	16,495	13,680	82.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,909	698	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,042	395	37.9
Economically disadvantaged students	10,283	7,301	71.0
Migratory students	180	105	58.3
Male	10,776	8,468	78.6
Female	10,114	8,075	79.8
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	20,849	17,862	85.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	328	217	66.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	329	287	87.2
Black, non-Hispanic	244	182	74.6
Hispanic	3,232	2,331	72.1
White, non-Hispanic	16,494	14,656	88.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,908	841	44.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	988	429	43.4
Economically disadvantaged students	10,245	8,115	79.2
Migratory students	175	112	64.0
Male	10,755	9,038	84.0
Female	10,094	8,824	87.4
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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: ISAT Science testing is not administered in the 6th grade.			

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	20,522	15,468	75.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	329	184	55.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	353	276	78.2
Black, non-Hispanic	243	136	56.0
Hispanic	3,101	1,810	58.4
White, non-Hispanic	16,327	12,925	79.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,745	533	30.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,014	325	32.1
Economically disadvantaged students	9,634	6,403	66.5
Migratory students	180	82	45.6
Male	10,597	8,030	75.8
Female	9,925	7,438	74.9
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	20,481	17,879	87.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	331	247	74.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	334	297	88.9
Black, non-Hispanic	238	183	76.9
Hispanic	3,085	2,312	74.9
White, non-Hispanic	16,324	14,696	90.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,746	789	45.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	963	435	45.2
Economically disadvantaged students	9,598	7,802	81.3
Migratory students	175	104	59.4
Male	10,570	8,999	85.1
Female	9,911	8,880	89.6
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	20,498	11,010	53.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	329	110	33.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	352	203	57.7
Black, non-Hispanic	244	95	38.9
Hispanic	3,099	912	29.4
White, non-Hispanic	16,306	9,587	58.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,733	307	17.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,007	79	7.8
Economically disadvantaged students	9,624	3,988	41.4
Migratory students	178	30	16.9
Male	10,580	5,900	55.8
Female	9,918	5,110	51.5
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	20,875	16,677	79.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	318	214	67.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	379	306	80.7
Black, non-Hispanic	272	174	64.0
Hispanic	3,019	1,947	64.5
White, non-Hispanic	16,671	13,870	83.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,725	589	34.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	911	321	35.2
Economically disadvantaged students	9,260	6,610	71.4
Migratory students	153	84	54.9
Male	10,658	8,537	80.1
Female	10,217	8,140	79.7
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	20,819	18,940	91.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	317	271	85.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	350	323	92.3
Black, non-Hispanic	260	203	78.1
Hispanic	3,008	2,473	82.2
White, non-Hispanic	16,669	15,482	92.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,723	877	50.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	850	493	58.0
Economically disadvantaged students	9,223	7,948	86.2
Migratory students	148	104	70.3
Male	10,627	9,458	89.0
Female	10,192	9,482	93.0
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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: ISAT Science testing is not administered in the 8th grade.			

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	19,651	15,108	76.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	324	185	57.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	376	287	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic	205	110	53.7
Hispanic	2,687	1,645	61.2
White, non-Hispanic	15,881	12,741	80.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,595	453	28.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	879	339	38.6
Economically disadvantaged students	7,757	5,211	67.2
Migratory students	124	59	47.6
Male	10,113	7,747	76.6
Female	9,538	7,361	77.2
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	19,615	16,906	86.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	323	235	72.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	353	295	83.6
Black, non-Hispanic	206	139	67.5
Hispanic	2,671	1,900	71.1
White, non-Hispanic	15,883	14,177	89.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,592	644	40.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	818	330	40.3
Economically disadvantaged students	7,732	6,053	78.3
Migratory students	119	61	51.3
Male	10,098	8,489	84.1
Female	9,517	8,417	88.4
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	19,566	13,306	68.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	149	46.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	375	254	67.7
Black, non-Hispanic	204	96	47.1
Hispanic	2,667	1,141	42.8
White, non-Hispanic	15,822	11,542	72.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,571	382	24.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	863	137	15.9
Economically disadvantaged students	7,710	4,286	55.6
Migratory students	123	28	22.8
Male	10,070	6,924	68.8
Female	9,496	6,382	67.2
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	655	408	62.3
Districts	138	58	42.0
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	416	268	64.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	211	132	62.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	205	136	66.3
Comments: The number of schools increased due to the addition of ARRA funds.			

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
129	53	41.1
Comments: With the increase of LEA Charter districts, Idaho has an increase of districts accepting funds.		

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	13
Extension of the school year or school day	35
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	4
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	5
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	4
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	27
Comments: NA	

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)	5
Reopening the school as a public charter school	3
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	1
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	7
Comments: Idaho did not takeover any schools.	

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.

No other major restructuring was implemented.

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.

Identification:

Based on the Spring 2009 ISAT results, a large number of schools and districts in Idaho were identified as on Alert status, Needs Improvement Year 1, Needs Improvement Year 2, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (see table below). Improvement plans were required, support was provided during the development process, and a review including feedback was conducted. All in improvement status, regardless of the level, were invited to participate in a series of technical assistance opportunities further described below. Additional support was provided to those in Restructuring.

Districts

Districts that Met AYP 50 39%

Districts on Alert 10 8%

Districts in Needs Improvement Year 1 8 6%

Districts in Needs Improvement Year 2 10 8%

Districts in Needs Improvement Year 3 21 16%

Districts in Needs Improvement Year 4 12 9%

Districts in Needs Improvement Year 5 6 5%

Districts in Needs Improvement Year 6 12 9%

Districts in Needs Improvement Years 1-6 69

Schools

Schools that Met AYP 327 51%

Schools on Alert 66 10%

Schools in Needs Improvement Year 1 86 13%

Schools in Needs Improvement Year 2 57 9%

Schools in Needs Improvement Year 3 49 8%

Schools in Needs Improvement Year 4 41 6%

Schools in Needs Improvement Year 5 14 2%

Schools in Needs Improvement Year 6 12 1%

Schools in Needs Improvement Year 1-6 259

WISE Tool Regional Support Sessions:

A series of District & School Improvement Planning Support Sessions were offered regionally throughout the state in the fall of 2009. 171 educators including superintendents, central office staff, principals, other building leadership, instructional coaches, and teachers participated in the sessions, representing 108 different districts and schools. Some came as individuals, and others brought teams to participate in the sessions which provided hands-on technical assistance related to the WISE Tool (Idaho's online District & School Improvement Planning Tool, created by the Center on Innovation and Improvement). These support sessions were presented by the State School Improvement Coordinator, and a team of 2-3 other exemplary educators in each region, including the Regional School Improvement Coordinators in partnership with Idaho Universities.

WISE Tool Webinars:

In addition to the WISE Tool Regional Support Sessions, webinar sessions were presented for anyone needing assistance in transitioning to the WISE Tool for writing and submitting required school improvement plans. 25 registrations were submitted for this webinar series, however it is unknown if it was an individual participating in the webinar, or a team of educators that logged in for the distance learning. Additionally, the webinar sessions were archived and made available for later access.

Training for Idaho Instructional Leaders:

A series of trainings were offered regionally throughout the state in the fall of 2009 and spring of 2010 in partnership with the Center on Innovation and Improvement. 183 educators including superintendents, central office staff, principals, other building leadership, instructional coaches, and teachers participated in the sessions, representing 53 different districts and schools. The sessions were designed to drive the impact of school improvement efforts into the classroom through research-based strategies that focused on systematic implementation of standards-aligned instruction in a classroom culture supportive of individual mastery. Participating sites sent teams of 4 - 5 exemplary educational leaders (1 district administrator, the building principal, and 2 - 3 teacher leaders/coaches) to attend this series of trainings. Participants were committed to attending all four sessions in their region. These representative school groups worked as leadership teams during the four sessions to reflect on improving school practices, discuss the viability of employing suggested strategies within their school, and provide responses within the construct of the training. Back-at-school (between sessions) the teams continued this process to further explore opportunities for instructional improvement as they informed and guided implementation. Having a district support person participate with each team was a critical component to the success and sustainability of the professional development.

Mega Systems Webinars:

In order to help provide clarity and ready to use resources from Dr. Sam Redding's work *The Mega System: A Handbook for Continuous Improvement Within a Community of the School*, a webinar series was launched in partnership with the Idaho State Department of Education, the Boise State University Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies, the Academic Development Institute, and the Idaho Digital Learning Academy. There were four total webinars to support the reading and activities that Instructional Leadership Teams (described above) were experiencing. This webinar series included a web interview with the researcher, Dr. Sam Redding, about the background to this book's research as well as additional support for each of the four chapters in the handbook. Again, for each registration it is unknown if it was an individual participating in the webinar, or a team of educators that logged in for the distance learning. Additionally, the webinar sessions were archived and made available for later access. Presentations and materials from these sessions were widely accessed and utilized across the state.

Restructuring:

Deputy Superintendent Dr. Marybeth Flachbart personally developed and delivered additional support provided to schools identified for restructuring. This support was a mixture of additional requirements, such as individual action plans for each indicator that AYP was not met that were written, reviewed, and utilized for coaching conversations. Additional webinars and support sessions were provided, as well as one-on-one visits and coaching conversations.

One-on-one Technical Assistance:

Additional one-on-one technical assistance was provided on an individual basis as requested by schools and districts, or as identified by the State Department of Education.

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	12
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	16
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	2
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	3
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	3
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	3	2
Schools	91	2
Comments: Both districts above which had a change in AYP designation were "one school" districts. Thus, in these cases, the school and district are represented in each group above right. One other district filed appeals to affect change at the district level but was unsuccessful, thus accounting for the 3 districts filing appeals for school year 2009-10.		

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2009-10.

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

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

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

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

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

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

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	10,312	10,196
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	7,436	7,165
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	72.1	70.3
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	10,300	10,166
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	8,468	8,192
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	82.2	80.6
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	18
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	18
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.
6 = Combo 1	The Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) project is a cornerstone of Idaho's Statewide System of Support for schools and districts that are in needs improvement status. . In partnership with Idaho Universities, Regional School Improvement Centers have been established at the Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies (CSI & PS) at Boise State University (Southwestern Region), the University of Idaho (Northern Region) and Idaho State University (Southeastern Region).	61	4	18	A	NA
	NA					NA
	NA					NA
	NA					NA
	NA					NA
	NA					NA
	NA					NA
	NA					NA
Comments: No responses for other rows since we used 6 Combination 1						

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.

School improvement strategies were shared with LEAs and schools through fall annual meetings, regional support sessions, the distribution of hard copy and electronic resources, webinars, teleconferences, weekly e-newsletters sent from the State Department of Education, mass emailing, the Idaho school improvement website <http://csi.boisestate.edu/Improvement/> and one-on-one technical assistance visits and meetings. Additionally, feedback was provided through narrative comments and a scoring rubric used to evaluate the quality of strategies being used in district and school improvement plans.

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: We reserved 4% of the Title I, Part A allocation for School Improvement

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 1003g funds were used to support the Idaho Building Capacity project, a cornerstone of Idaho's statewide system of support. Through this project, 91 school and district sites were served at an increased level that included up to 8 hours a week on-site technical assistance from an outside trained consultant (distinguished educator), professional development, and additional resources. 5% was utilized for administrative support, and 95% flowed through to districts, which they used to secure contracts with one of Idaho's Regional School Improvement Centers, housed at Idaho Universities, recognized by the State as IBC providers.

The State Department is currently working with both our Regional Comprehensive Center (ED Northwest), and one of the Content Centers (Center on Innovation and Improvement) to develop and implement an effective evaluation system for our statewide system of support, including the Idaho Building Capacity project.

1003(a) and 1003(g) funds were combined to support the administrative costs of the Superintendents Network of Support and the Instructional Focus Visits. Districts utilized flow-through funds to purchase these services from the SDE.

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.

Idaho did not use any other funds to support the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

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	74,448
Applied to transfer	700
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	245
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	\$ 104,855

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	0

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	31,958
Applied for supplemental educational services	2,271
Received supplemental educational services	1,954
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	\$ 2,319,479
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	34,655	33,234	95.9	1,421	4.1
All elementary classes	9,788	9,369	95.7	419	4.3
All secondary classes	24,867	23,865	96.0	1,002	4.0

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

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

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

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a

departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	65.7
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	25.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	8.4
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	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)	85.5
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	6.9
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	7.6
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	2,095	2,016	96.2
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	2,494	2,402	96.3
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	4,035	3,741	92.7
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	9,175	8,980	97.9

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	63.8	41.0
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	59.7	36.0
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Idaho considers 2-way Immersion and Developmental Bilingual as the same. The "other" category includes full day/extended day kindergarten, push-in models of instruction, and instructional support classes.

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	17,125
---	--------

Comments:

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

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

#	
LEP	
students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	15,555

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	14,231
North American Indian	268
Russian	237
Arabic	227
Nepali	177

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	15,830
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,295
Total	17,125
<p>Comments: There were 1,295 LEP students who were not tested on the 2009-2010 Idaho English Language Assessment. This is due to the following reasons; students were withdrawn from school, the student was exited from the LEP program prior to testing, and parents refusal of testing.</p>	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	# 5,709
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP	36.1
<p>Comments:</p>	

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	14,423
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,132
Total	15,555
Comments: 1,132 Title III LEP students did not test on the 2009-2010 Idaho English language assessment. The reasons are the same as for the whole state LEP population: students withdrew from the district prior to testing, students were exited from the LEP program prior to testing, or parents refused testing.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	1,171

1.6.3.2.2**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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	5,028	37.9	0	26.00
Attained proficiency	5,203	36.1	0	14.00
Comments: Idaho does not have an annually increasing number for the making progress and attaining proficiency targets, as the LEP population is so mobile. Therefore, Idaho only uses a percentage for the target.				

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: Idaho does not offer native language assessments.	

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)
NA
NA

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

Language(s)

- NA
- NA
- NA
- NA
- NA

Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2,809	1,536	4,345
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
1,955	1,737	88.8	218
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
2,159	1,941	89.9	218
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
742	349	47.0	393
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	39
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	19
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	39
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	39
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	19
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	16

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: Idaho has 2 consortia which each have 2 LEAs. Therefore the 4 LEAs are included in all of the above totals for AMAO results. All 4 LEAs in the 2 consortia are considered their own entity for accountability purposes.

16 LEAs are currently in Corrective Action for not meeting AMAOs for 4 consecutive years.

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: Idaho did not meet AMAO #1 - AYP for the LEP subgroup.

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	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
2,590	2,486	22

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) û The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course 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.	641
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	25

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the

number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	37	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	29	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	27	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	26	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	31	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	39	6,007
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	34	537
PD provided to principals	37	317
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	29	204
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	31	1,193
PD provided to community based organization personnel	7	154
Total	39	8,412

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/09	07/01/09	1
Comments:		

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Idaho uses a quarterly cash balance report process for the request of monthly federal funds. Each LEA is required to submit a quarterly report. Payments are made monthly, immediately after the LEA request is received if there is an approved LEP Application/Plan on file. Therefore, there is no need for Idaho to shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to sub-grantees.

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: No Persistently Dangerous Schools were identified in Idaho	

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	91.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	84.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	95.2
Black, non-Hispanic	91.0
Hispanic	80.4
White, non-Hispanic	92.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	88.8
Limited English proficient	84.6
Economically disadvantaged	90.3
Migratory students	76.5
Male	90.2
Female	92.4

Comments: Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) is using completers from the Special Ed data collection system which identified more completers than in prior years. Data is valid.

Data reviewed for Migratory students graduation rate increase is valid. Migrant populations are very small in comparison to all other populations and this may contribute to large variations in rate from year to year.

Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) is using completers from the Special Ed data collection system which identified more completers this year.

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.

The data reported is derived from the transitional graduation rate used by Idaho. Idaho is using the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) formula outlined in the Idaho Accountability Workbook, section 7.1. Idaho is working toward full implementation of the required graduation rate in Section 200.19. Our progress is such: In November 2010 all but six districts uploaded all student and staffing files into the new Idaho Longitudinal Data System. The uploads will continue through each month and will provide the core 9th grade cohort data upon which to set up the graduation rate calculations in 4 years. In July 2014, Idaho will begin reporting the four-year cohort graduation rate for the remaining high schools.

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	<3
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	<3
Hispanic	3.0
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	<3
Limited English proficient	<3
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	3.2
Male	<3
Female	<3
<p>Comments: Asian or Pacific Islander dropout rate is verified and is less than 1%. Note that last year the rate was 1.1% ,very close to being under 1%.</p> <p>Cannot calculate a dropout event rate for the Economically Disadvantaged student group as grade level information on total enrollment data is not collected.</p>	

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	126	126
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	136	136
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)	32
K	141	258
1	152	286
2	151	290
3	137	274
4	129	272
5	131	260
6	109	193
7	88	139
8	85	171
9	87	142
10	83	133
11	84	106
12	133	225
Ungraded	N<10	N<10
Total	1,542	2,800

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	136	366
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,285	2,146
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	62	152
Hotels/Motels	59	136
Total	1,542	2,800

Comments:

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	105
K	156
1	190
2	182
3	186
4	180
5	174
6	129
7	100
8	117
9	104
10	98
11	72
12	157
Ungraded	24
Total	1,974
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	266
Migratory children/youth	67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	314
Limited English proficient students	386
Comments:	

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School Selection	2
Transportation	4
School records	3
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	253	185
4	270	198
5	255	199
6	201	153
7	141	105
8	158	130
High School	136	95
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	260	201
4	275	187
5	257	158
6	203	128
7	142	69
8	159	93
High School	139	75
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)	678
K	303
1	310
2	307
3	339
4	280
5	272
6	244
7	255
8	238
9	235
10	191
11	171
12	85
Ungraded	91
Out-of-school	195
Total	4,194
Comments:	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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)	114
K	98
1	76
2	90
3	86
4	76
5	56
6	60
7	21
8	16
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	719
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 decrease in the number of students reported for Category 2 is a result of the decrease of Title I-C funding to LEAs for SY0910. The Idaho MEP received approximately \$1 million less than previous years due to the misidentification of migrant students based on the results of the OME Reinterviewing. Fewer LEAs were able to provide migrant summer school services.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Idaho State Migrant Student Information System has been in use for close to 7 years now. The system was built by contract and inhouse resources and is a secure web application using SQL 2008 to house data. The system generates and compiles reports using SQL queries on the Student level information. The system was used to compile and report Idaho's Category 1 and 2 Migrant counts for SY0910 and SY0809.

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.

Idaho utilizes the following people to collect and manage the child count data: 7 Migrant Regional Coordinators, 1 Migrant data administrator and IT management (Federal Data Manager Programmer Project Manager) at the State level. The Migrant system collects details on student demographics, student enrollment, movement history, regular and summer services being provided, test scores, secondary grades/credits and immunization records on active students enrolled in the State's MEP program. Each year the system is rolled over and all students are re-qualified and re-certified by the Regional Coordinators and districts for accurate counts. The rollover of the Migrant application for SY 08-09 occurred in November 2009 and in October 2010 for SY 09-10. Prior to the rollover, Regional Coordinators are required to verify migrant student information and reconcile Migrant student counts with each district. District reports are populated through the system that the Regional Coordinators and each MEP district use to verify student counts and student data.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Migrant data administrator is the only person who can add new students to the MSIS with a valid COE. Identity search functions in the system are used to insure that a new student does not already exist in the Migrant Student Information System. If the student does not exist in the system, the data administrator enters the new student using the information collected on the COE and adds an enrollment history record for the current location of the student. If the student exists, the data administrator manages the enrollment history record for that student and updates Student Demographic details and Student Enrollment details, as needed. If there is a duplicate, IT management is contacted with specific instructions for removing duplicate information. Regional Coordinators update all student information as needed, but do not have the ability to add new students. A request must be made to the Migrant data administrator for removal of duplicate information. Regional Coordinators and districts use the district reports to validate counts. IT management uses the same reports and queries to organize the child counts for all reporting purposes.

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.

NA

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.

Children are counted if they reach 3 years old by the end of the eligible period 8/31/2010 for SY 0910 and if they are not older than 21 at the start of the eligible period 9/1/2009 for SY 0910. This is done by queries when the reports are generated and compiled.

Students are activated for the SY0910 by the Regional Coordinators and Migrant data administrator if they are active as a resident or student for at least one day from 9/1/2009 to 8/31/2010 for the SY0910.

The District reports do not display children whose: QA date generates an eligibility date that does not fall into the range of 9/1/2009 to 8/31/2010 for SY0910 and the EOE data is out of range for SY0910.

Summer students are marked on the same student record and cannot be included again in the regular school year count. The district reports include validation for Summer and Regular year students and their services.

There is only one age/grade category for each student, and the State queries return counts based on this fact to insure that migrant student counts are compiled only once per grade.

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.

LEA recruiters are required to verify all information on the COE is accurate and true. The COE is then forwarded to the Regional ID&R Coordinator who is then responsible for verifying the accuracy and validity of the information on the COE. The Regional ID&R Coordinator must then sign the COE indicating this has been done and the eligibility is valid. The COE is then sent to the State. The IMEP administrative assistant reviews the COE for accuracy and validity. If corrections are necessary or the eligibility is invalid, the COE is returned to the Regional ID&R Coordinator for corrections and/or communication to LEA recruiter regarding eligibility. Before students are entered into the system or existing students' information is updated, the IMEP migrant data administrator reviews each new COE once more to ensure that all necessary information is provided by checking each qualifying activity to assure it is valid, time of year that the move was made and if the activity is done in the area that the move was made to. The data administrator then enters the data from the COE into the Idaho computerized data system. The Regional Coordinators update the existing student data for their assigned districts to maintain records and re-qualify eligible students. When a question or concern of possible duplication arises, Regional Coordinators contact the State Migrant data administrator for resolution. The State Migrant data administrator compares the COE data to what is in the computerized data system and makes any necessary changes or deletions so that the child count is accurate.

This quality control process is outlined in the State MEP's Quality Control Policies and Procedures Manual dated June 2010.

The Idaho Migrant Education Program (IMEP) has a statewide COE. Regional recruiters and district family liaisons determine student eligibility by interviewing the parents, guardians, or other responsible adult(s) of potential migrant students. In addition, regional recruiters and family liaisons interview the person directly if he or she is self eligible for the Migrant Education Program. Title I-C monitoring visits are also an assured process in evaluating quality control. Statewide re-interviewing was also completed during April/May of 2010 for SY 09-10. MERC provided family recruiters/liaisons with professional development in Identification and Recruitment during the regular and summer/intersession.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The IMEP conducted a State-wide Prospective Re-Interviewing during April/May of 2010 for SY0910 student counts. A random sample of 80 eligibility determinations was taken from Idaho's Migrant Student Information System. Regional Identification and Recruitment Coordinators conducted the re-interviews. They conducted the re-interviews in a region other than their own. The target was to complete 50 re-interviews. An additional 30 eligibility determinations were identified to serve as alternate re-interviews if any in the first 50 had moved or declined an interview. In total, there was an 84% participation rate (completed/attempted to contact). There were 49 completed interviews with an eligibility determination. 46 were found eligible and 3 were found to be ineligible. The defect rate was calculated at 6.1%. Of the original 50 identified in the random sampling 19 had moved and 1 interview was not completed.

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.

The districts and Regional Coordinators work together to re-certify and re-qualify students throughout the year. District reports (in real time) are accessible for both district staff and Regional Coordinators to view. Updates to student information can only be updated by the Regional Coordinators or the State Migrant administrators as needed. This allows for checks and balances that only eligible children are being served and counted for the State MEP Program.

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.

The State Migrant Coordinator verifies with Regional Coordinators that all child counts met the OME criteria for eligibility. The Migrant data administrator reports to the State Migrant Coordinator on the status of data entry of eligible COEs and any corrections and/or deletions of non-eligible students. The State Migrant Coordinator collaborates with the EDFacts Coordinator to review final child counts and all pertinent information so that accuracy is ensured.

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.

The Idaho Migrant Education Program (IMEP) has taken steps to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations. District

personnel working with the Migrant Program and Regional ID&R Coordinators will continue to receive ongoing training at the State and local level in ID&R to ensure consistency across all programs. The State Migrant Coordinator will monitor identification and recruitment in districts to

assure that Regional Coordinators and district personnel involved in eligibility determinations are following the OME criteria and guidelines for qualifying a student for the migrant program. COEs will be continually verified and collaboration with the EDFacts Coordinator will help maintain accuracy of student eligibility.

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.

An ongoing concern Idaho has about the accuracy of the reported child counts is the timeline and understanding of districts in providing the necessary and accurate information needed to report correct numbers to OME. A Statewide Migrant Data Collection Plan was developed and provided to all LEAs during SY0910. The intent of this development was to provide direction and clarity to LEAs of the importance of accurate and timely data. Idaho is also concerned with having a more efficient means of data collection and reporting to enable districts to spend more time helping the children and families in the MEP.