

**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

OHIO



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-HLP-EDEN (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: Ohio Department of Education		
Address: 25 S. Front Street Columbus, OH 43215-4183		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Dr. Ardith M. Allen, Social Science Research Specialist, Office of the State System of Support		
Telephone: 614-728-8054		
Fax: 614-752-1622		
e-mail: ardith.allen@ode.state.oh.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Deborah S. Delisle, Superintendent of Public Instruction		
		Wednesday, March 16, 2011, 2:25:36 PM
Signature _____		

**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.

At its June 2010 meeting the State Board of Education made Ohio the seventh state to adopt the Common Core State Standards for English and mathematics. The State Board also adopted revisions to its academic content standards for science and social studies. Current plans are to make these effective for the 2014-2015 school year, coterminous with completion of model curriculum and Ohio's next generation of assessments.

Future work includes: 1) completion of model curriculum in English, mathematics, science, and social studies by March 31, 2011; 2) adoption of revisions to academic content standards for foreign language, art, technology, and business during the 2011-2012 school year; 3) adoption of model curriculum for foreign language, art, and technology during the 2012-2013 school year; 4) adoption of academic content standards and model curriculum for financial literacy and entrepreneurship during the 2012-2013 school year; and 5) revision of academic content standards for physical education during the 2014-2015 school year.

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.

Pursuant to Ohio Revised Code §3301.0712, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor of Higher Education are to promulgate rules that make the following changes to Ohio's assessment system: 1) combine the reading and writing tests in grades 4 and 7 into a single English test and make the reading tests in grades 3 and 5-8 English tests; 2) reduce the number of performance level descriptions from five to three for all state assessments; and 3) replace the Ohio Graduation Tests in reading, writing, science, mathematics, and social studies with a three-tiered college- and career-ready high school assessment system in which students must earn a certain composite score or higher on: a) a nationally standardized college readiness exam that measures competencies in reading, mathematics, and science; b) a series of end-of-course exams; and c) a senior project. The latter changes are being held while Ohio participates in both the SMARTER Balanced Assessment (SBAC) and Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) state consortia as they develop common assessments as part of Race to the Top funding for a new generation of assessments for grades 3-8 and high school. The new assessments include universal design among their features, and both consortia are pursuing new forms of alternate assessments to accompany the new tests. Ohio is committed to revising its current collection-of-evidence approach to alternate assessments, and it is piloting performance assessments to become a component of any new assessment system to be promulgated. The target date for all of these activities is the 2014-2015 school year.

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)	20.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	80.0
Comments:	

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

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

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments: ,	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	944,587		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,406		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,583		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	152,133		>97
Hispanic	26,526		>97
White, non-Hispanic	710,714		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	144,257		>97
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	20,250		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	416,008		>97
Migratory students	202		>97
Male	484,943		>97
Female	459,644		>97

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 38,225 enrolled, XX participating, >97% participating.
2) Students who repeat a grade may bring forward a prior year's assessment result without taking the test (participating) again. This situation occurs most frequently among grade 10 students.

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	44,948	31.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	80,638	56.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,740	11.8
Total	142,326	

Comments: Students who repeat a grade may bring forward a prior year's assessment result without taking the test (participating) again. This situation occurs most frequently among grade 10 students.

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	949,780		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,413		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,781		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	153,064		>97
Hispanic	26,782		>97
White, non-Hispanic	714,186		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	144,999		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,442		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	419,343		>97
Migratory students	224		>97
Male	487,666		>97
Female	462,114		>97

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 38,554 enrolled, XX participating, >97% participating.

2) Students who repeat a grade may bring forward a prior year's assessment result without taking the test (participating) again. This situation occurs most frequently among grade 10 students.

3) The reading participation counts for LEP students include English language proficiency (ELP) test counts for first-year LEP students who did not take the regular reading assessment.

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	45,481	31.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	80,939	56.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,754	11.7
Total	143,174	

Comments: Students who repeat a grade may bring forward a prior year's assessment result without taking the test (participating) again. This situation occurs most frequently among grade 10 students.

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	409,636		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	623		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,401		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	66,778	64,469	96.5
Hispanic	10,889		>97
White, non-Hispanic	310,110		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	63,363		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,514		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	171,238		>97
Migratory students	74		>97
Male	210,072		>97
Female	199,564		>97

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 14,835 enrolled, XX participating, >97% participating.

2) Students who repeat a grade may bring forward a prior year's assessment result without taking the test (participating) again. This situation occurs most frequently among grade 10 students.

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	18,201	29.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	36,670	59.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,173	11.6
Total	62,044	

Comments: Students who repeat a grade may bring forward a prior year's assessment result without taking the test (participating) again. This situation occurs most frequently among grade 10 students.

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	133,008	102,200	76.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	203	144	70.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,442	2,137	87.5
Black, non-Hispanic	21,182	11,125	52.5
Hispanic	4,156	2,629	63.3
White, non-Hispanic	98,534	81,406	82.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19,112	9,552	50.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,830	2,370	61.9
Economically disadvantaged students	63,470	41,317	65.1
Migratory students	37	23	62.2
Male	68,155	52,759	77.4
Female	64,853	49,441	76.2

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 6,491 tested, 4,759 proficient, 73.3% proficient.
2) The number of LEP students is increasing, in part because of improved identification efforts.
3) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.
4) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	138,018	108,226	78.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	159	74.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,517	2,215	88.0
Black, non-Hispanic	22,311	12,571	56.3
Hispanic	4,418	2,801	63.4
White, non-Hispanic	101,750	85,361	83.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19,895	10,478	52.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,739	2,348	62.8
Economically disadvantaged students	66,997	44,757	66.8
Migratory students	68	34	50.0
Male	70,728	53,516	75.7
Female	67,290	54,710	81.3

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 6,808 tested, 5,119 proficient, 75.2% proficient.
2) The number of LEP students is increasing, in part because of improved identification efforts.
3) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.
4) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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: Science achievement tests are given only in grades 5, 8, and 10.			

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	133,463	101,685	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	139	76.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,482	2,193	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21,090	10,873	51.6
Hispanic	3,905	2,396	61.4
White, non-Hispanic	99,616	81,681	82.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,258	9,432	46.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,460	2,084	60.2
Economically disadvantaged students	62,644	39,874	63.7
Migratory students	35	19	54.3
Male	68,507	52,117	76.1
Female	64,956	49,568	76.3

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 6,189 tested, 4,403 proficient, 71.1% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	133,415	108,046	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	140	77.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,459	2,149	87.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21,077	12,683	60.2
Hispanic	3,886	2,661	68.5
White, non-Hispanic	99,616	85,561	85.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,255	10,872	53.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,180	2,035	64.0
Economically disadvantaged students	62,607	44,230	70.6
Migratory students	34	25	73.5
Male	68,501	53,858	78.6
Female	64,914	54,188	83.5

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 6,196 tested, 4,852 proficient, 78.3% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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: Science achievement tests are given only in grades 5, 8, and 10.			

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	132,445	88,763	67.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	129	61.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,189	1,815	82.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20,929	7,769	37.1
Hispanic	3,789	1,911	50.4
White, non-Hispanic	99,507	73,609	74.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,430	7,099	34.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,144	1,525	48.5
Economically disadvantaged students	60,777	31,138	51.2
Migratory students	31	17	54.8
Male	67,765	45,898	67.7
Female	64,680	42,865	66.3

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 5,820 tested, 3,530 proficient, 60.7% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	132,388	94,975	71.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	140	66.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,164	1,818	84.0
Black, non-Hispanic	20,915	9,578	45.8
Hispanic	3,771	2,197	58.3
White, non-Hispanic	99,505	77,272	77.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,438	8,228	40.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,904	1,580	54.4
Economically disadvantaged students	60,719	35,131	57.9
Migratory students	31	21	67.7
Male	67,738	46,904	69.2
Female	64,650	48,071	74.4

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 5,822 tested, 3,970 proficient, 68.2% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	132,407	92,502	69.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	136	64.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,192	1,803	82.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,903	7,932	37.9
Hispanic	3,786	1,973	52.1
White, non-Hispanic	99,498	76,902	77.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,419	8,368	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,144	1,517	48.3
Economically disadvantaged students	60,731	32,893	54.2
Migratory students	31	18	58.1
Male	67,746	47,512	70.1
Female	64,661	44,990	69.6

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 5,817 tested, 3,756 proficient, 64.6% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	133,043	102,958	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	146	73.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,232	2,019	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	21,142	10,998	52.0
Hispanic	3,801	2,482	65.3
White, non-Hispanic	100,196	83,301	83.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,588	8,374	40.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,889	1,762	61.0
Economically disadvantaged students	59,594	38,315	64.3
Migratory students	32	16	50.0
Male	68,094	51,869	76.2
Female	64,949	51,089	78.7

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 5,473 tested, 4,012 proficient, 73.3% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	133,228	112,057	84.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	158	79.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,247	2,047	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	21,136	13,811	65.3
Hispanic	3,779	2,861	75.7
White, non-Hispanic	100,385	88,678	88.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,601	10,859	52.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,610	1,804	69.1
Economically disadvantaged students	59,578	44,265	74.3
Migratory students	32	20	62.5
Male	68,180	55,294	81.1
Female	65,048	56,763	87.3

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 5,482 tested, 4,502 proficient, 82.1% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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: Science achievement tests are given only in grades 5, 8, and 10.			

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	132,965	94,534	71.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	189	121	64.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,039	1,765	86.6
Black, non-Hispanic	20,632	8,393	40.7
Hispanic	3,553	2,036	57.3
White, non-Hispanic	101,422	78,871	77.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,151	6,700	33.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,444	1,228	50.2
Economically disadvantaged students	56,949	31,445	55.2
Migratory students	23	12	52.2
Male	68,729	48,113	70.0
Female	64,236	46,421	72.3

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 5,130 tested, 3,348 proficient, 65.3% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	132,945	106,593	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	189	146	77.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,024	1,798	88.8
Black, non-Hispanic	20,636	12,153	58.9
Hispanic	3,540	2,450	69.2
White, non-Hispanic	101,422	86,026	84.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,161	9,074	45.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,194	1,331	60.7
Economically disadvantaged students	56,942	38,839	68.2
Migratory students	23	15	65.2
Male	68,747	52,673	76.6
Female	64,198	53,920	84.0

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 5,134 tested, 4,020 proficient, 78.3% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science achievement tests are given only in grades 5, 8, and 10.			

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	133,307	92,290	69.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	189	122	64.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,073	1,820	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	20,862	8,554	41.0
Hispanic	3,484	1,915	55.0
White, non-Hispanic	101,935	76,895	75.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,498	6,175	30.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,359	1,131	47.9
Economically disadvantaged students	55,241	29,252	53.0
Migratory students	23	11	47.8
Male	68,318	46,298	67.8
Female	64,989	45,992	70.8

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 4,764 tested, 2,984 proficient, 62.6% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	133,398	107,913	80.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	189	141	74.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,085	1,869	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	20,863	12,678	60.8
Hispanic	3,469	2,424	69.9
White, non-Hispanic	102,027	87,083	85.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,528	9,094	44.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,107	1,239	58.8
Economically disadvantaged students	55,238	38,077	68.9
Migratory students	22	11	50.0
Male	68,377	52,579	76.9
Female	65,021	55,334	85.1

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 4,765 tested, 3,718 proficient, 78.0% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	133,299	86,384	64.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	189	101	53.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,107	1,688	80.1
Black, non-Hispanic	20,811	6,630	31.9
Hispanic	3,481	1,589	45.6
White, non-Hispanic	101,956	73,659	72.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,471	6,382	31.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,361	811	34.3
Economically disadvantaged students	55,165	25,557	46.3
Migratory students	23	N<10	
Male	68,303	45,263	66.3
Female	64,996	41,121	63.3

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 4,755 tested, 2,717 proficient, 57.1% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	140,464	112,933	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	217	167	77.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,077	1,889	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,245	13,402	57.7
Hispanic	3,362	2,342	69.7
White, non-Hispanic	107,422	91,998	85.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,433	8,500	39.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,870	1,086	58.1
Economically disadvantaged students	52,684	35,568	67.5
Migratory students	19	14	73.7
Male	72,039	57,414	79.7
Female	68,425	55,519	81.1

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 4,141 tested, 3,135 proficient, 75.7% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	140,490	116,628	83.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	174	80.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,069	1,843	89.1
Black, non-Hispanic	23,287	15,164	65.1
Hispanic	3,353	2,459	73.3
White, non-Hispanic	107,423	93,629	87.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,451	9,692	45.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,684	969	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	52,735	37,822	71.7
Migratory students	18	12	66.7
Male	72,048	58,114	80.7
Female	68,442	58,514	85.5

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 4,142 tested, 3,359 proficient, 81.1% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	140,006	102,193	73.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	145	66.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,074	1,723	83.1
Black, non-Hispanic	23,050	9,981	43.3
Hispanic	3,345	1,892	56.6
White, non-Hispanic	107,201	85,676	79.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,287	7,765	36.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,862	732	39.3
Economically disadvantaged students	52,363	29,601	56.5
Migratory students	18	N<10	
Male	71,798	53,192	74.1
Female	68,208	49,001	71.8

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 4,118 tested, 2,776 proficient, 67.4% proficient.

2) For the 2009-2010 school year, migratory student results are included only from LEAs known to have migratory students and/or to be versed in the correct identification of migratory students.

3) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases, relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.

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	3,663	2,238	61.1
Districts	612	284	46.4
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	2,283	1,294	56.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,214	524	43.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,069	770	72.0
Comments:			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
609	280	46.0
Comments:		

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	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
<p>Comments: Ohio is a Differentiated Accountability state, so the above listed actions that are recommended for Corrective Action and Restructuring plans are implemented and measured differently than they were prior to our Differentiated Accountability Model being approved. Under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model, a district and all of its buildings are treated as a system to which appropriate improvement strategies are applied. The last school year for which building-level data on the implementation of Corrective Action and Restructuring strategies were collected is 2008-2009. Please see our response to Question 1.4.5.3 for additional detail.</p>	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
<p>Comments: Ohio is a Differentiated Accountability state, so the above listed actions that are recommended for Corrective Action and Restructuring plans are implemented and measured differently than they were prior to our Differentiated Accountability Model being approved. Under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model, a district and all of its buildings are treated as a system to which appropriate improvement strategies are applied. The last school year for which building-level data on the implementation of Corrective Action and Restructuring strategies were collected is 2008-2009. Please see our response to Question 1.4.5.3 for additional detail.</p>	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2009-2010, 116 districts and 1,138 buildings (including 175 community schools) were in improvement under Ohio's Differentiated Accountability Model and were required to implement the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) using the tools developed by the State. Each of the 116 districts (100%) and 826 of the 1,138 buildings (72.6%) received Title I funds. The OIP is Ohio's strategy for ensuring a systematic and coherent approach for building the capacity of all districts and schools to improve instructional practice and student performance on a district-wide basis, and is a strategy for assisting districts to enact the Ohio Leadership Development Framework (OLDF; www.ohioleadership.org), which articulates essential practices for superintendents, district leadership teams (DLTs), and building leadership teams (BLTs). The OIP requires the intentional use of the following four-stage process, across which structures, tools, and people are connected, to help districts: 1) use data to identify areas of greatest need; 2) develop a plan to address those areas of need that are built around a limited number of focused goals and strategies to improve instructional practice and student performance; 3) fully implement and monitor the degree of implementation of the plan; and 4) evaluate the effectiveness of the improvement process in changing instructional practice and impacting student performance. Selected districts also receive an on-site diagnostic review from the State Diagnostic Team (SDT) to help them analyze their current practices against indicators of effective instructional practices.

Technical Assistance. The technical assistance provided to districts in improvement status included structured facilitation by personnel assigned from State Support Teams (SSTs) or Educational Service Centers (ESCs). These trained personnel work with districts and schools as follows:

Stage 0: Preparing district personnel to implement the OIP by supporting them to: 1) (re)establish a district leadership team (DLT) and building leadership teams (BLTs) in each school within the district, or a community school leadership team (CSLT); 2) develop a common understanding of the role of leadership teams in implementing the OIP; and 3) measure their team's level of practice against standards of effective practice as outlined in the OLDF using an electronic performance assessment.

Stage 1: Working with leadership teams in using the OLDF tool (i.e., the major tool at stage 1 of the OIP) to complete a needs assessment that identifies the most critical needs and probable causes based on data by supporting them to: 1) effectively summarize and analyze data sets; 2) understand/apply the Decision Framework (DF); 3) interpret key findings from the needs assessment; and 4) prioritize data-based critical problems in the creation of their needs assessment. A state-developed data warehouse makes relevant data needed for the DF process readily available to districts, buildings, and community schools. The DF is organized around the following four levels: 1) Level I: Student Proficiency: Reviewing student proficiency data across four years by grade level, building level/grade span, and disaggregated student groups to identify up to two content areas of greatest concern. Further analyses using subscale performance data are completed by the team only for those content areas identified as areas of greatest concern; 2) Level II: Instructional Management: Answering essential questions in relation to each of the content areas of greatest concern identified under Level I. Essential questions focus on curriculum, assessment, and instructional practices; educator qualifications and teacher and principal turnover; and the degree to which district professional development (PD) is aligned to problem areas, designed to promote shared work across the district/buildings, and effective in helping teachers acquire and apply needed knowledge and skills related to the improvement of instructional practice and student performance; 3) Level III: Expectations and Conditions: Answering essential questions related to leadership; school climate (including student discipline occurrences, student attendance and mobility, students with multiple risk factors, and teacher and student perception); and parent/family, student, and community involvement and support; and 4) Level IV: Resource Management: Answering essential questions related to resource management, which is defined as the intentional use of time, personnel, data, and programmatic and fiscal resources. Responses to Levels II-IV are used to identify probable causes contributing the areas of greatest need identified in Level I.

Stage 2: Working with leadership teams to develop a limited number of focused district goals, strategies, and action steps based on data, as well as a limited number of focused building actions aligned with district goals and strategies, by supporting them to: 1) develop focused SMART goals; 2) determine prioritized cause-and-effect relationships; 3) compose strategies for each goal; and 4) create actions that have the greatest likelihood of increasing student performance and improving instructional practices. These goals/strategies/actions form the basis of the district/school plan, which is formalized as part of each district's Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP).

Stage 3: Working with leadership teams to implement and monitor the degree of implementation of the focused plan by supporting them to: 1) establish and implement collaborative structures/processes/practices that support a culture of inquiry; 2) implement the plan systemically and systematically; and 3) monitor, using the Implementation Monitoring/Management (IMM) tool, the degree of implementation of the focused strategies and actions to gauge whether implementation is having the desired effect on changes in adult practice and student achievement, and make and report necessary course corrections to the plan. The IMM is accessible through the CCIP for teams to establish expected levels of performance for both adults and students, assign persons responsible, and monitor and communicate progress.

Stage 4: Working with leadership teams to evaluate the improvement process and make necessary changes to continually improve instructional practice and student performance by supporting them to: 1) evaluate plan implementation, impact, and changes needed; 2) report summative plan progress; and 3) modify instructional practice and revise plan. Ohio has established several structures to ensure consistency in the design and delivery of ongoing training and development of regional facilitators assigned to support districts and schools in improvement, which include a State-level Design Team and a quadrant lead structure. In addition to implementation of the OIP as a required intervention, districts in improvement status are required to implement additional consequences/interventions under the Differentiated Accountability Model depending on their category of support (High, Medium, or Low Support). For example, Public School Choice (PSC) is required for all identified Title I funded buildings. Supplemental Educational Services (SES), likewise, are required for all Title I funded buildings identified and failing to make AYP for three or more years. Districts and buildings that remain in the same

risk/support category and do not make significant progress (i.e., an average increase in scores over the latest three years of assessments for each identified student group that, if maintained, indicates that all students in identified groups will be proficient by 2013-2014) would be required to add an additional intervention once every three years.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	
<p>Comments: Ohio's Differentiated Accountability Model allows the state to implement an intervention model that distinguishes between those districts that require intensive intervention and those that are closer to meeting their student achievement goals. Under the Differentiated Accountability Model, Ohio treats districts and buildings as a system and stratifies districts into three risk categories (High, Medium, and Low Support) based on the aggregate percentage of student groups not meeting AYP, rather than on the amount of time that the district has not met AYP. These identified districts are provided with different options for interventions in addition to those required by law. As such, Ohio's 51 Corrective Action districts are not the focus of the State's intervention model; instead, our attention has focused on the districts identified under the new Differentiated Accountability Model.</p> <p>In the 2009-2010 school year, Ohio identified 291 school districts, which included all 51 Corrective Action districts, across the three risk categories. Of these 291 districts, 23 were identified as needing High Support (including 18 districts in Corrective Action) and received full intervention from the State System of Support. All 23 High Support districts, as well as 49 Medium Support districts (14 of which were in Corrective Action) and 219 Low Support districts (19 of which were in Corrective Action), implemented the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) as required under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model. This implementation of the OIP included: development of District Leadership Teams (DLTs) and Building Leadership Teams (BLTs); use of the State's Decision Framework (DF) tool to complete a deep review of district-level data and create district and building needs assessments; development of focused improvement plans based on the district- and building-level needs assessments; and, if selected by the State, a review by the State Diagnostic Team (SDT). Plans were developed at the district and building levels in 2009-2010 for implementation in the 2010-2011 school year.</p>	

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	1	0
Schools	5	1
Comments: The one AYP designation that was modified as the result of an appeal changed from "Met" to "Not Met."		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	08/06/10
---	----------

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	135,949	138,928
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	71,557	73,493
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	52.6	52.9
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	136,074	139,124
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	85,321	82,277
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	62.7	59.1
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	156
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	57

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

Comments: An additional eight schools (not included in the count of 57) are also out of improvement status for 2010-2011 because they are using Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds to implement the turnaround model and were granted a waiver to "start over" on the school improvement timeline.

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	Combination of strategies 1, 2 and 3	663	48	108	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective use of relevant data to identify areas of greatest need • Development of focused plans with a limited number of goals and strategies directly related to identified areas of greatest need
5	Development of building leadership team (BLT)	663	48	108	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective use of relevant data to identify areas of greatest need • Development of focused plans with a limited number of goals and strategies directly related to identified areas of greatest need
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box
1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers

who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Information about these strategies as part of implementation of the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) was shared through a variety of mechanisms. Face-to-face meetings with partner organizations, such as the Ohio Educational Service Center Association (OESCA), the Ohio Federation of Teachers (OFT), the Buckeye Association of School Administrators (BASA), the Ohio Education Association (OEA), the Ohio Association of Elementary School Administrators (OAESA), the Ohio Association of Secondary School Administrators (OASSA), and the Committee of Practitioners (COP), were held to share information and seek involvement in supporting the work. Partner organizations such as the ones listed above also include information about the OIP and related strategies on their Web sites. BASA has embedded the OIP, in combination with information about the work of the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council (OLAC), into its ongoing professional development for aspiring, new, and veteran superintendents across the state. OASSA included sessions on the work at association-sponsored conferences as well as regional meetings (i.e., zone meetings) for principals and other secondary-level administrators from all parts of the state. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction, on top of individual communication with districts in improvement, shares information about the work in her communication with all districts in Ohio. In addition to information dissemination and conference activities, the strategies embedded within the OIP have been incorporated into online professional development modules available through the OLAC Web site, as have articles written about the work. The statewide 2010 Leadership Summit held that spring featured district implementation of the OIP and lessons learned by districts in Ohio, and follow-up action forms and communities of practice sessions were conducted in December 2010. Information regarding the school improvement intervention models was shared at a series of five regional technical assistance sessions in spring 2010.

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0%

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003(g) funds were used to support the following technical assistance and evaluation activities during the 2009-2010 school year: 1) funding State Diagnostic Team (SDT) reviewers and related costs; 2) funding training and start-up costs for Educational Service Center (ESC) personnel who completed training in the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) and worked with districts and schools to implement the OIP; 3) developing the Implementation Monitoring/Management (IMM) tool, which provides a way for LEAs to document how their district and school plans will be implemented by allowing them to identify items to be measured, resources needed, persons/groups responsible, and the timeline for implementing; and 4) funding a technical assistance session, in partnership with The Ohio State University, for LEA teams representing schools identified as "persistently lowest achieving" under the Title I School Improvement Grant.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The core work of the State Support Teams (SSTs), as defined in section 1.4.5.2, was primarily supported through State general revenue funds. Additionally, IDEA Part B discretionary dollars funded to SSTs supported facilitation, consultation, technical assistance, and professional development provided by the SST personnel working with districts and schools in improvement. These dollars supported more effective use of data, particularly subgroup data for students with disabilities, and the use of strategies to address district-identified needs as part of the OIP. IDEA Part D (State Personnel Development Grant [SPDG]) dollars were used to test the development of the process and related tools with selected cohorts of districts that were in improvement for not meeting AYP for students with disabilities.

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	240,830
Applied to transfer	5,851
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	3,111
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	\$ 6,927,984

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	45

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	215,781
Applied for supplemental educational services	34,449
Received supplemental educational services	24,626
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	\$ 42,417,133
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	569,242	562,861	98.9	6,381	1.1
All elementary classes	286,121	284,379	99.4	1,742	0.6
All secondary classes	283,121	278,482	98.4	4,639	1.6

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.	<u> </u> 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.

The State uses departmentalized classrooms where each class is counted multiple times, once for each subject.

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	37.4
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	19.3
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	16.4
Other (please explain in comment box below)	26.9
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not properly certified

	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)	39.7
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	29.3
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.6
Other (please explain in comment box below)	19.4
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not properly certified

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	69,998	67,956	97.1
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	77,448	77,257	99.8
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	57,360	55,520	96.8
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	87,911	87,510	99.5

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	65.9	24.5
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantage	
Secondary schools	65.5	24.2
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantage	

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/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Dual language	French, Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Arabic, Cambodian, Chinese, French, Hindi, Nepalese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, Swahili, Ukrainian, Vietnamese
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Developmental bilingual	Chinese, Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Structured English immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Content-based ESL	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Pull-out ESL	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs provided the following descriptions of other services not captured by the above list:

- After-school ESL tutoring;
- Newcomer Program for refugee and overage students to provide intensive ESL and academic support;
- Computer-based English-language learning during intervention periods;
- Classroom Coaching;
- Summer Program;
- In-class support (inclusion) with trained ESL teacher and/or instructional assistant;
- Push-in: in-class coaching/tutoring and academic support; and
- Immersion in the regular (English) classrooms with assistance from pull-out bilingual tutor.

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	40,933
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.	39,581
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	14,554
Somali	3,165
Arabic	2,355
German	1,357
Japanese	901

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The next five most commonly spoken non-English languages in the State among all LEP students are Chinese (896 LEP students), Vietnamese (647 LEP students), Russian (606 LEP students), Korean (536 students), and Ukrainian (500 LEP students).
--

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	36,450
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,853
Total	38,303
Comments: The student count reported for Question 1.6.3.1.1 (38,303) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled in Ohio schools during the ELP assessment window. The student count reported for Question 1.6.2.1 (40,933) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled at any time during the school year. A total of 2,630 students were not enrolled during the ELP testing window.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	13,134
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	36.8
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	35,292
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,745
Total	37,037
Comments: The student count reported for Question 1.6.3.2.1 (37,037) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled in Ohio Title III schools during the ELP assessment window. The student count reported for Question 1.6.2.2 (39,581) represents the total number of Title III LEP students enrolled at any time during the school year. A total of 2,544 students were not enrolled during the ELP testing window.	
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.	7,791

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	20,914	76.0	20,625	75.00
Attained proficiency	11,382	32.3	9,629	26.00
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: There are no languages in which native language assessments are given for ESEA accountability determinations for mathematics.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
1,523	858	2,381
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
1,664	1,573	94.5	91
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,674		>97	49
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
750	670	89.3	80
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	288
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	186
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	221
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	227
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	270
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	6
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	12
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	102
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	23

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: In each of the figures in Table 1.6.4.1, consortia members were counted as individual subgrantees, of which there are 288 in Ohio. Consortia members are considered individual subgrantees solely for the purpose of AMAO calculations.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u> </u> No
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u> </u> No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> 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
13,753	6,165	41

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) The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course: (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,685
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	579

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	190	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	138	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	101	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	47	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	94	
Other (Explain in comment box)	60	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	177	11,545
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	169	1,133
PD provided to principals	124	761
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	138	477
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	91	1,020
PD provided to community based organization personnel	20	237
Total	719	15,173

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The total number of subgrantees (LEAs) is 288.

Other Professional Development topics include:

- training for paraprofessionals in parental engagement and interpreting services;
- cultural awareness for staff and students;
- Professional Learning Teams with focus often on LEP student instruction;
- instructional strategies related to LEP students;
- ESL technology;
- differentiated instruction related to LEP students;
- second language acquisition, acculturation, and bi/multilingualism;
- Scientifically Based Research interventions for LEP students;
- pedagogical instruction;
- Response to Intervention;
- Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol;
- Ohio Improvement Process training and research on site; and
- Culturally Responsive Practices (district PD initiative).

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	07/15/09	14
Comments:		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Ohio SEA can shorten the process of distributing funds to subgrantees by continuing to provide ongoing technical assistance so that they submit their Consolidated Application for all programs funded under Title III by July 1 of each fiscal year. When an Ohio subgrantee submits a Superintendent Approved Consolidated Application to the Ohio SEA through an online allocation and application process, it is considered to be substantially approved, and as of that date legal obligations can be incurred for as long as the budget meets the requirements for use of funds. Cash disbursements to subgrantees become available within two weeks after the Consolidated Application is reviewed by the SEA consultant and approved by the Executive Director.

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: These data have been verified as correct. There were zero schools in Ohio identified as "Persistently Dangerous" for the 2009-2010 school year.	

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	83.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	76.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.0
Black, non-Hispanic	61.3
Hispanic	61.4
White, non-Hispanic	88.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	82.9
Limited English proficient	70.1
Economically disadvantaged	70.9
Migratory students	55.2
Male	81.7
Female	84.3
Comments: Multiracial student group: 75.2%.	

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	9.9
Hispanic	7.9
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4.4
Limited English proficient	5.1
Economically disadvantaged	6.3
Migratory students	12.4
Male	4.4
Female	3.9
Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 6.1%.	
2) These data have been verified as correct. In some cases (e.g., Migratory Students), relatively small changes in numbers have led to large percentage changes across school years.	

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 automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	956	956
LEAs with subgrants	91	91
Total	1,047	1,047
Comments: The total includes operational public districts, educational service centers (ESCs), joint vocational school districts, charter school LEAs, and state agencies. The number of LEAs with subgrants includes 17 public district subgrantees, 3 ESC subgrantees, 36 public districts served by the 3 ESC subgrantees, and 35 public district ARRA subgrantees.		

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 <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	512
K	280	1,332
1	251	1,432
2	239	1,446
3	215	1,352
4	237	1,331
5	177	1,184
6	182	1,163
7	147	1,205
8	161	1,133
9	227	1,694
10	150	1,004
11	140	906
12	160	797
Ungraded	N<10	52
Total	2,570	16,543
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 <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	368	5,583
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,929	10,397
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	103	106
Hotels/Motels	170	457
Total	2,570	16,543
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)	1,484
K	1,359
1	1,446
2	1,459
3	1,358
4	1,339
5	1,223
6	1,209
7	1,262
8	1,172
9	1,770
10	1,063
11	936
12	817
Ungraded	223
Total	18,120
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	1,794
Migratory children/youth	10
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,210
Limited English proficient students	287
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	53
Expedited evaluations	25
Staff professional development and awareness	57
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	35
Transportation	63
Early childhood programs	42
Assistance with participation in school programs	51
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	43
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	54
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	41
Coordination between schools and agencies	55
Counseling	47
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	32
Clothing to meet a school requirement	38
School supplies	61
Referral to other programs and services	48
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	34
Other (optional – in comment box below)	23
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other services include providing lunch, uniforms, speech and language services, instructional materials, and family support and monitoring.

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	25
School Selection	26
Transportation	48
School records	25
Immunizations	15
Other medical records	11
Other Barriers – in comment box below	14

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other barriers include getting information from parents, providing uniforms, identifying nighttime residence situations, and providing after school transportation.

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	1,016	515
4	872	472
5	806	353
6	796	470
7	765	391
8	735	390
High School	577	370
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	938	477
4	877	415
5	814	267
6	803	366
7	768	273
8	736	227
High School	572	311
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)	370
K	156
1	159
2	138
3	132
4	111
5	106
6	84
7	89
8	100
9	94
10	65
11	71
12	33
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	499
Total	

Comments:

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 child count decreased 17.3% from the previous year. The decrease in the Category 1 count is attributed to an observable drop we experienced this year in the number of out-of-school youth (i.e., "here-to-work"). This drop was evident in both project and non-project areas of the State. We also saw a decrease in number of eligible migrant families, but the rate of decrease for this subgroup was significantly less.

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)	145
K	103
1	97
2	97
3	88
4	65
5	63
6	47
7	41
8	55
9	31
10	23
11	16
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	95
Total	973
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 Category 2 child count decreased by 9.4% from the previous year.

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 2009-2010 Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count were generated using the Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2). OMSIS2 is a client/server management information system that uses the FileMaker suite of hosted database tools. OMSIS2 is developed and maintained by the Tri-Rivers Educational Computer Association (TRECA), a non-profit entity providing K-12 educational technology services through a consortium of Ohio public school districts.

Ohio also maintains membership in the New Generation System (NGS) consortium. Historically, Ohio had used the NGS system to generate unique ID numbers. These historical numbers are maintained as a backup to the unique ID numbers generated by OMSIS2 and by the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system. NGS is sometimes used as a reference source when the Category 1 and Category 2 counts are being generated.

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.

On the Certificate of Eligibility (COE), the following information is gathered:

SECTION I Family Data - parent's/guardian's name, race, home language, current Ohio address, employer, residency date, school district arrival date, home base address and home base school district;

SECTION II Child Data - child(ren)'s name, sex, birth date, birthplace, grade level, ID number, and multiple birth;

SECTION III Eligibility Data - former residence, new residence, qualifying arrival date (QAD), reason for moving, qualifying activity, and description/type of agricultural work in which household members are engaged; and

SECTION IV Comments.

Eligibility data—specifically residency date, QAD, and qualifying activity—are secured by recruiters at the time of face-to-face interviews and recorded on a COE. A temporary copy of the COE is given to the LEA, and the original COE is sent to the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC). Quality control procedures are conducted at OMEC to ensure the completion and correctness of the written eligibility information before data entry. Teachers provide our Records Clerk with student enrollment and participation data for our on-site and in-home summer-term programs. This information is then submitted to OMEC for data entry and record storage.

Recruiters are responsible for the completion of the COE through a personal interview with the child's family. Generally, these data are collected beginning in May and ending in November during the period for Ohio's seasonal qualifying work (i.e., work with a variety of vegetables, fruits, processing plants, greenhouses, etc.). Summer programs are held during the period of time between when a district ends school in the spring and when it starts school in the fall. Although the specific dates vary slightly from district to district, these programs usually run from June to August. Our year-round and fall programs are held in districts during the school year for their migrant populations as appropriate.

All LEA programs are required to fill out attendance forms and transfer documents for every eligible child that is served in their summer and fall programs. The information collected includes days enrolled, days present, and all education information (e.g., reading skills, math skills, and English language proficiency). Secondary credit information forms are also required for all 7th-12th graders. The information gathered on these forms includes classes and credit hours in which a student participated. After these forms are completed, the Transfer Record Coordinator checks to make sure that the forms are complete, and the information is then entered into OMSIS2.

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 Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC) enters data into OMSIS2 from the original COE documents, comprehensive needs assessment forms, advocacy forms, verification forms, transfer documents, and secondary credit forms. COEs first go through an extensive quality control process in which the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator signs a statement that the COE is complete and accurate. The OMSIS2 interface provides fault tolerance during multiple-user access, and also provides extensive error checking at the time of input. Student information is updated as soon as the transfer records and secondary credit information are received from the LEA programs. Every year verification forms are run for each district to make sure that the students' current address, qualifying arrival date, parents' names, and residency dates are accurate. If any changes are necessary, the data entry staff at OMEC make the corrections in the student edit table in OMSIS2 to ensure accuracy.

OMSIS2 incorporates a FileMaker Pro client interface and a backend database hosted by the latest version of FileMaker Server Advanced. This not only affords programmatic record locking control, it also reduces the possibility of a simple clerical error causing major data loss. Some mass update capabilities exist, such as the ability to include up to six siblings on a single COE update. Multiple assessment records can be input simultaneously for a child, and a number of timesaving queries that are designed specifically around the data entry methods in use at OMEC are built into OMSIS2 and enhance OMEC's capability by allowing for point-and-click field population.

When a student is identified in Ohio for the first time, the OMSIS2 data system generates a unique ID for that student called the OHID. If a student has been identified previously, then his/her new records are always entered using the student's existing OHID to avoid duplication. This check of the OMSIS2 system is accomplished before any record is entered into the system as new. When eligible students are first identified and entered into the database, they are all Category 1 students. They are not counted in Category 2 unless they also are eligible for and receive funded summer services.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count differs from the Category 1 count only in terms of which backend database tables are required to produce accurate and complete numbers. The Category 2 count references additional tables.

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.

A query is run against the Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2) database described in Questions 1.10.3.1 and 1.10.3.2 to calculate the Category 1 child count. It identifies those students between ages 3 and 21 (as shown by the Student Identification Table) who have made a qualifying move within the past 36 months (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table) and who have also had a third birthday before the end date of the program in which they participated (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table, the Student Identification Table, and the Supplemental Program Information Table) or before the end of their residency in Ohio (we may reference an older sibling's enrollment information to determine this third criterion). A similar query that includes all of the above information is run to calculate the Category 2 child count, but it also has a summer service indicator. The fields used to run this particular query are SID.USID, SID.LastName, SID.FirstName, ED.USID, SID.DesceasedDate, SID.GraduationDate, SID.BirthDate, ED.LastQualifyingMove, ED.EnrollmentDate, ED.WithdrawalDate, ED.OhioArrivalDate, and several flag fields that serve to exclude specific instances (e.g., children who turn three during the school year, but for whom no Ohio residency can be guaranteed except at the age of two). The database administrator (or the administrator's representative) at the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC) executes these queries and updates a series of flags in a specific order. Each September, a home visit is made to each student for whom a valid COE exists to determine if the student is still a resident in the State. This verification date is added to our database, and it serves as an indication that the student is eligible to be included in Category 1 for the new program year. All students added through a new COE during the program year are also counted, as described in Question 1.10.3.2.

Summer program students are flagged in the Student Information Table. A query is run against these data to generate a list of all students served during the summer. These students are served in one or more of the following ways: district site-based summer programs, in-home instruction, ESL programs, and/or health fair participation. Recorded participation in a funding-eligible instructional service during the summer/intersession period is required and must be documented before an indicator can be updated in OMSIS2 that triggers the inclusion of a particular student in the child count. The timing of this participation is verified when the queries used for the child counts screen by the date of the service(s) provided. If the date shown for the service(s) does not fall during the designated summer period, then that child will not qualify to be counted. Each child who is counted always has at least one qualifying service for which a qualifying date has been documented. Services provided to children whose eligibility has just expired may be reported at the local level, but quality control procedures at OMEC are in place to exclude these records from being entered into OMSIS2 (or, in a few cases, to allow the records to be entered with an 'N' in the funding flag field) so that non-funded services provided to these children will not inadvertently be counted as funded.

Every student has a unique OHID number that ensures the child is only counted once. As part of the quality control process at OMEC, "new" students are double checked to ensure that they have not already been assigned a different OHID number. Some of the quality-control criteria used to ensure the unique identity of a "new" child include surname, parent/guardian first names, alternate spellings of surnames, migratory histories of families with similar names, and date of birth.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count are generated using the same system, except for the particular differences previously described in Question 1.10.3.3.

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.

Ohio uses many quality control procedures to review and ensure the accuracy of written eligibility information. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE), the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC), and local migrant education projects assure accuracy at their levels. A standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) that conforms to Federal guidelines is used statewide in Ohio, and recruiters are trained on completion of the form at our annual recruitment conference. Quality control is assured at OMEC, where the Quality Control Specialist, the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator, and the State Transfer Record Coordinator again review the COE for correctness and completeness. The COE is entered into the database only after each of these people has approved it.

LEA recruiters, transfer record clerks, and project directors receive periodic updates on assistance, procedures, and guidelines for identification and recruitment. Annual recruitment trainings are held each spring to provide in-depth instruction on COE completion, and other meetings are called as needed. All recruiters receive a detailed handbook that provides them with eligibility criteria and COE completion guidance.

All state personnel are trained in interviewing migrant families and recording all eligibility data on a standard COE form. Recruiters receive extensive mandated training and a training manual on the completion of the COE in the following areas:

- 1) the eligibility criteria;
- 2) interview procedures;
- 3) monitoring for accountability; and
- 4) the role of the recruiter.

The COE is the primary tool for collecting the data that certify the children to qualify for migrant services. Once completed and checked for accuracy, information from the form is entered into the state database, OMSIS2, and becomes the basis for Category 1 identification. COEs are checked for accuracy by the Quality Control Specialist and by verifying birth dates and names against the OMSIS2 database. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator also signs a statement that quality control is finished on the COE before it is checked for complete accuracy and input into OMSIS2. If a discrepancy occurs when it is received by the Transfer Record Coordinator, the Transfer Record Coordinator will then ask the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator to contact the recruiter to revisit the family. COEs identified as having possible errors are placed in a pending file until further explanation, documentation, and/or completion is received.

Recruiters resolve issues encountered on the COE forms by consulting the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and the State Transfer Record Coordinator.

Ohio's Migrant Education Program (MEP) Director provides assistance with questions requiring interpretation of Federal and State laws, regulations, or policies.

The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator periodically evaluates the effectiveness of quality control procedures and revises them, if necessary, to assure effective systems operation. Information from the National Identification and Recruitment Conference and from sessions at the National Migrant Conference, as well as pertinent memos and regulations, are reviewed annually and used to update quality control procedures and other identification and recruitment issues.

The final quality control for all COEs is made at OMEC. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and the Transfer Record Coordinator review all data to ensure correctness of the written eligibility information. If there are any discrepancies on the student record, the LEA migrant staff will be contacted immediately. The recruiter will revisit the family to secure the proper legal information and return it to OMEC for final processing.

Once quality control procedures have been completed, as indicated above, the Transfer Record Coordinator enters the record into the database. This is the final step in the COE data acquisition process.

The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator is responsible for a yearly review and update of quality control and COE completion procedures. These procedures are documented in our Identification and Recruitment Manual. Personnel are provided training at our annual spring recruitment conference on how to review summer site records, input data, and run reports.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2009-2010 reporting year, Ohio conducted a prospective re-interview using an independent re-interviewer. All COEs were randomly selected from our state database, OMSIS2. The independent reviewer attempted 73 random re-interviews. In order to meet our minimum goal of 50 completed face-to-face interviews, 23 COE replacements were necessary. The results of the prospective re-interview were very positive. A total of 49 COEs were found to be eligible for the Migrant Education Program (MEP). Only one child was found to be ineligible, due to an incorrect date of birth the parent provided at the time of the initial interview with the recruiter. A birth certificate that was not

supplied during the initial interview later confirmed that the child was too old for the MEP, so the ineligible child was removed from OMSIS2 and is not part of the child count for this reporting year.

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.

Verification forms are printed annually and submitted to LEAs in the fall of each year to verify whether students are still here for the new program year's Category 1 child count. Directors verifying the accuracy of demographic data use these same lists. The lists are returned to OMEC for database updates when they are completed. Individual files are pulled at random during the winter months to be reviewed for accuracy.

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 Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2) includes a number of companion fields to each date-type field accessed by the queries used for the annual report. These companion fields include a number of calculations and comparisons that help locate data that may require further review.

For example, each child record contains a birth date field and a current age field that are query-relevant. Each enrollment and service record contains a date of service or date of enrollment field, a residency date field, and a qualifying move date field that are also query-relevant. One example of a companion field that is used during reporting uses the aforementioned query-relevant fields to calculate the age a student was at the time of residency and service. This produces a flag that is used to exclude, for example, current three-year-olds who were three at the end of the reporting cycle, but not necessarily a resident in Ohio anymore when their third birthday arrived. Such a child can be excluded from the Category 1 count. All three-year-olds are examined using the companion calculation field in this way to separate those proven eligible from those who are not. Similar companion calculation fields exist that guard against incorrect date values being entered in the query-relevant fields.

Duplications are prevented through the use of a combination of FileMaker Pro 11 database features, including the extensive use of the "Go to Related Records" script command. Searches are initially performed in a related table while seeking funded services delivered during the current reporting period. From there the "Go to Related Records" script is run, resulting in a found set of students (not services). All counts for the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) are then generated from the Students table, where each student has only one grade level and one unique identifier, to ensure that no student can possibly be counted twice in any cell of any CSPR table.

Eligibility for Category 1 is first established for the majority of students using FileMaker Pro's "Constrain Found Set" tool repeatedly for each criterion that could possibly exclude a student from eligibility for the current reporting period. Students who definitely qualify based on this more rigorous screening compose the first group of students marked as qualifying. Students who also qualify, but whose eligibility for the current reporting period must be confirmed on a case-by-case basis, are excluded from this first group by the stringency of the initial queries. Instead, these students are individually marked as qualifying only after their record is carefully reviewed to confirm, for example, that their age definitely qualified them to be counted as eligible for the reporting period.

After all Category 1 eligibility has been marked, an export of data from the Student Table into an empty Reporting Table is executed. The Reporting Table contains many true-or-false fields that correspond to each category of the CSPR.

A database relationship links the Student Table to the Reporting Table on the key field OHID. By updating each of the Reporting Table's true-or-false fields directly from within the Student Table, and by doing so only after the Reporting Table already contains exclusively Category 1-eligible records, it is possible to know with great certainty that: 1) only eligible students are contained in any individual count; and 2) there is absolutely no duplication within counts.

Accuracy checks are finally performed, using the Reporting Table as a source and the Student Table as the destination for a "Go to Related Records" script. For example, this technique could be used to find instantly the exact group of students reported as being in the 7th Grade and also receiving Math instruction in the summer. The group can be scrolled to verify that each student did in fact receive Math instruction, is in fact a 7th grader, and when and where each student received Math instruction.

The Reporting data is then preserved without changes, directly within OMSIS2, every year. Over time this collection of annual tables serves as an ongoing longitudinal data (or panel data) reference tool for management information.

The State Migrant Education Program Director collects all data from the queries listed in this document and reviews them for accuracy, reasonableness, and completeness. OMEC additionally provides the State Director with numbers from the previous years for identification and recruitment and for services provided, broken out by counties as identified and served. The State Director is thereby able to compare data from previous years as the CSPR is completed.

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.

Based on the prospective re-interview results, one significant change will be implemented in next year's Identification and Recruitment training. Although recruiters are permitted to document a child's date of birth on a COE based on information a parent provides, they will be

strongly encouraged to seek a copy of the birth certificate to confirm the child's age.

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.

~~There are no concerns to report at this time.~~
