

**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

PENNSYLVANIA



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
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Pennsylvania Department of Education		
Address: 333 Market Street Harrisburg, PA 17126		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Erin Oberdorf		
Telephone: 717-783-9161		
Fax: 717-787-8634		
e-mail: eoberdorf@state.pa.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Mr. Ronald Tomalis		
		Friday, April 29, 2011, 1:34:35 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.

Pennsylvania has developed Assessment Anchor Content Standards for end of course exams in Algebra I, Biology, and Literature and plans to have exams developed and approved to use for the federal accountability requirements at the high school level for the school year 2012-2013.
Pennsylvania has adopted the Common Core Standards and, although there are not major changes required, the changes will be in place for the 2014-2015 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.

Pennsylvania administered an operational assessment for an alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards in Mathematics in 2009-2010 and will administer an alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards in Reading and Science in 2010-2011. Pennsylvania plans to have end of course exams in Algebra I, Biology, and Literature in place to be used for federal accountability purposes in school year 2012-2013 and replace the current Grade 11 PSSA used for accountability purposes. Pennsylvania is part of both the PAARC and the SBAC and will participate in a common assessment.

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)	10.0
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	60.0
Comments: The remaining 30% to equal 100% was carryover.	

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

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	943,096		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,404		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	28,984		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	144,032		>97
Hispanic	71,999		>97
White, non-Hispanic	684,482		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	157,746		>97
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	24,816		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	372,648		>97
Migratory students	738		>97
Male	483,979		>97
Female	457,207		>97
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	50,850	32.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	73,571	47.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	16,999	10.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	14,239	9.1
Total	155,659	
Comments:		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	942,642		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,404		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	28,983		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	143,925		>97
Hispanic	71,967		>97
White, non-Hispanic	684,279		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	157,300		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	24,805	23,104	93.1
Economically disadvantaged students	372,502		>97
Migratory students	737		>97
Male	483,739		>97
Female	457,092		>97
Comments:			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	55,161	35.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	85,876	55.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	14,239	9.2
Total	155,276	
Comments:		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	408,250		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	628		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,221		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	60,443	58,060	96.1
Hispanic	29,091		>97
White, non-Hispanic	301,013		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	67,471	65,401	96.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,434		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	150,698		>97
Migratory students	263		>97
Male	209,151		>97
Female	198,164		>97
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	28,056	42.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	31,401	48.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,944	9.1
Total	65,401	
Comments:		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	130,992	109,283	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	189	144	76.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,457	4,084	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	20,443	13,333	65.2
Hispanic	11,031	7,726	70.0
White, non-Hispanic	92,859	82,421	88.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,905	12,328	59.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,020	2,908	57.9
Economically disadvantaged students	56,702	41,761	73.6
Migratory students	127	69	54.3
Male	67,318	55,954	83.1
Female	63,511	53,216	83.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	130,638	97,035	74.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	190	122	64.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,352	3,618	83.1
Black, non-Hispanic	20,383	10,702	52.5
Hispanic	10,915	6,004	55.0
White, non-Hispanic	92,792	75,243	81.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,861	9,079	43.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,738	1,696	35.8
Economically disadvantaged students	56,492	34,183	60.5
Migratory students	124	41	33.1
Male	67,132	47,739	71.1
Female	63,344	49,208	77.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Pennsylvania does not do Science Assessments for Grade 3.			

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	132,622	110,798	83.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	206	165	80.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,368	4,052	92.8
Black, non-Hispanic	20,486	13,239	64.6
Hispanic	10,632	7,411	69.7
White, non-Hispanic	95,013	84,438	88.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,922	14,377	62.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,213	2,329	55.3
Economically disadvantaged students	56,181	41,318	73.5
Migratory students	124	72	58.1
Male	68,031	57,135	84.0
Female	64,409	53,536	83.1
Comments:			

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,308	95,683	72.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	143	69.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,283	3,648	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	20,441	10,173	49.8
Hispanic	10,518	5,596	53.2
White, non-Hispanic	94,958	74,867	78.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,876	9,363	40.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,944	1,257	31.9
Economically disadvantaged students	55,974	32,295	57.7
Migratory students	116	34	29.3
Male	67,851	46,864	69.1
Female	64,284	48,729	75.8
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,186	106,526	80.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	203	160	78.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,352	3,801	87.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,333	11,215	55.2
Hispanic	10,584	6,327	59.8
White, non-Hispanic	94,744	83,566	88.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,738	13,456	59.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,189	1,698	40.5
Economically disadvantaged students	55,864	37,710	67.5
Migratory students	121	46	38.0
Male	67,763	54,298	80.1
Female	64,197	52,082	81.1
Comments:			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,951	97,485	73.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	135	68.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,069	3,515	86.4
Black, non-Hispanic	20,818	10,773	51.7
Hispanic	10,705	5,944	55.5
White, non-Hispanic	95,335	75,929	79.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,027	10,788	46.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,681	1,307	35.5
Economically disadvantaged students	55,577	33,266	59.9
Migratory students	112	41	36.6
Male	68,340	50,266	73.6
Female	64,431	47,131	73.1
Comments:			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,674	84,324	63.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	114	57.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,977	3,035	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,778	8,592	41.4
Hispanic	10,620	4,517	42.5
White, non-Hispanic	95,296	67,028	70.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,001	6,615	28.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,438	551	16.0
Economically disadvantaged students	55,409	26,454	47.7
Migratory students	111	28	25.2
Male	68,205	40,817	59.8
Female	64,301	43,432	67.5
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
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: Pennsylvania does not do Science Assessments for grade 5.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,878	102,038	76.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	191	134	70.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,107	3,686	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	20,496	11,585	56.5
Hispanic	10,492	6,127	58.4
White, non-Hispanic	95,883	79,355	82.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,553	10,292	45.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,338	1,236	37.0
Economically disadvantaged students	54,275	34,696	63.9
Migratory students	128	71	55.5
Male	68,490	51,923	75.8
Female	64,211	50,026	77.9
Comments:			

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,597	90,500	68.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	191	119	62.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,008	3,265	81.5
Black, non-Hispanic	20,461	9,297	45.4
Hispanic	10,410	4,710	45.2
White, non-Hispanic	95,827	72,122	75.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,506	6,733	29.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,131	537	17.2
Economically disadvantaged students	54,105	27,938	51.6
Migratory students	126	32	25.4
Male	68,334	44,141	64.6
Female	64,089	46,288	72.2
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Pennsylvania does not do Science Assessments for Grade 6.			

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	134,583	102,691	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	184	138	75.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,080	3,657	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	20,611	11,536	56.0
Hispanic	10,307	5,881	57.1
White, non-Hispanic	97,841	80,472	82.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,393	9,365	41.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,207	1,224	38.2
Economically disadvantaged students	53,439	33,443	62.6
Migratory students	100	44	44.0
Male	68,777	51,693	75.2
Female	65,590	50,906	77.6
Comments:			

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	134,192	97,829	72.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	136	73.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,960	3,296	83.2
Black, non-Hispanic	20,542	11,065	53.9
Hispanic	10,199	5,107	50.1
White, non-Hispanic	97,772	77,261	79.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,338	7,486	33.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,948	611	20.7
Economically disadvantaged students	53,193	30,649	57.6
Migratory students	99	33	33.3
Male	68,572	46,763	68.2
Female	65,420	50,967	77.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
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: Pennsylvania does not do Science Assessments for Grade 7.			

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	137,088	100,800	73.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	147	71.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,018	3,526	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	20,481	10,770	52.6
Hispanic	10,074	5,441	54.0
White, non-Hispanic	100,772	80,085	79.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,873	9,029	39.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,025	1,044	34.5
Economically disadvantaged students	52,125	30,596	58.7
Migratory students	93	46	49.5
Male	70,735	51,419	72.7
Female	66,055	49,288	74.6
Comments:			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	136,783	111,023	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	208	159	76.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,924	3,504	89.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,430	13,659	66.9
Hispanic	9,982	6,303	63.1
White, non-Hispanic	100,723	86,346	85.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,819	10,033	44.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,817	991	35.2
Economically disadvantaged students	51,942	35,790	68.9
Migratory students	90	49	54.4
Male	70,578	54,314	77.0
Female	65,923	56,566	85.8
Comments:			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	136,103	77,216	56.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	206	110	53.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,015	2,800	69.7
Black, non-Hispanic	20,141	5,157	25.6
Hispanic	9,933	2,821	28.4
White, non-Hispanic	100,301	65,742	65.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,569	5,108	22.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,996	266	8.9
Economically disadvantaged students	51,437	18,523	36.0
Migratory students	93	15	16.1
Male	70,198	40,393	57.5
Female	65,655	36,750	56.0
Comments:			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	137,325	80,124	58.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	104	47.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,819	3,103	81.3
Black, non-Hispanic	19,317	6,307	32.6
Hispanic	8,306	2,889	34.8
White, non-Hispanic	104,344	67,292	64.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,986	5,098	24.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,202	544	24.7
Economically disadvantaged students	42,041	16,926	40.3
Migratory students	47	N<10	
Male	69,564	40,704	58.5
Female	67,265	39,314	58.4
Comments:			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	137,043	91,252	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	217	123	56.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,773	2,819	74.7
Black, non-Hispanic	19,287	8,167	42.3
Hispanic	8,249	3,641	44.1
White, non-Hispanic	104,212	75,933	72.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,875	5,480	26.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,088	255	12.2
Economically disadvantaged students	41,912	20,250	48.3
Migratory students	46	N<10	
Male	69,410	43,596	62.8
Female	67,149	47,495	70.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,420	52,700	39.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	210	65	31.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,718	1,920	51.6
Black, non-Hispanic	17,586	2,220	12.6
Hispanic	7,795	1,137	14.6
White, non-Hispanic	102,934	47,139	45.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,094	2,395	11.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,070	54	2.6
Economically disadvantaged students	39,742	8,093	20.4
Migratory students	43	N<10	
Male	67,653	27,695	40.9
Female	65,402	24,966	38.2
Comments:			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	3,099	2,566	82.8
Districts	540	508	94.1
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	1,857	1,494	80.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	728	493	67.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,129	1,001	88.7
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
499	478	95.8
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	25
Extension of the school year or school day	1
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	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	18
Comments: Replacement of staff members, significant decrease in management authority at the school level and replacement of the principal are all zeros.	

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)	2
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	97
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	120
Comments: Reopening of the school as a public charter school and takeover the school by the state are both zeros.	

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.

There are 120 schools that chose the restructuring action "other major restructuring of the school governance". Of those 98 combined that option with another restructuring action. From the 98, 80 chose to enter into a contract with private entity to operate the school in combination with establishing a standard aligned curriculum and professional development for all teachers. The remaining 18 chose to fully implement a new curriculum and provide professional development to all teachers.

There were 22 schools that chose only that option. Of those, 20 chose to fully implement a new curriculum and provide professional development to all teachers. The remaining 2 of those schools chose to fully implement a new curriculum, provide professional development to all teachers and to restructure the internal organization of the buildings.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) has implemented many programs and strategies for districts identified for improvement or corrective action.

I. The Pennsylvania Standards Aligned System (SAS) is a collaborative product that identifies six distinct elements which, if utilized together, will provide schools and districts a common framework for continuous school and district enhancement and improvement. They are: Clear Standards, Fair Assessments, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources, and Interventions.

- Pennsylvania Standards describe what students should know and be able to do; they increase in complexity and sophistication as students progress through school. The Assessment Anchors clarify the Standards assessed on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) and can be used by educators to help prepare students for the PSSA. The Assessment Anchors clarify the relationship between state Standards and our assessment system. Assessment Anchors are further elaborated with Eligible Content. Eligible Content identifies how deeply an Anchor should be covered and specifies the range of the content to best prepare students for the PSSA.
- Fair Assessment is a process used by teachers and students before, during, and after instruction to provide feedback and adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve student achievement. In Pennsylvania the four types of assessment are summative, formative, benchmark, and diagnostic.
- The Curriculum Framework specifies what is to be taught for each subject in the curriculum. Curriculum Frameworks include Big Ideas, Concepts, Competencies, Essential Questions, Vocabulary, and Exemplars aligned to Standards and Assessment Anchors and, where appropriate, Eligible Content.
- Aligned Instruction comprises the following activities: Teaching topics aligned with the Standards, Ensuring the right level of challenge, Focusing teaching based on the learning needs of each student, Implementing instructional strategies to increase student achievement.
- Materials and Resources includes Voluntary Model Curriculum incorporating learning progressions, units, lesson plans, and content resources aligned to the Pennsylvania Standards in curriculum frameworks for the four major content areas (mathematics, science, social studies, reading-writing-speaking-listening). Learning progressions span grades K-12 and include what all students should know and be able to do as a result of successfully moving through grades K-8 and by taking specific courses in grades 9-12.
- Interventions ensure students are provided with supports they need to meet/exceed grade level Standards. A comprehensive system of Interventions involves a graduated set of safety nets aligned to specific student needs and Standards.

II. PDE established GETTING RESULTS, the school improvement planning framework that builds on the experiences and recommendations of Pennsylvania schools, districts, and intermediate units (IUs). It incorporates current thinking and priorities of PDE regarding continuous school improvement and outlines the phases vital to developing a results-focused continuous school improvement plan. The phases of GETTING RESULTS process are

1. Effectively analyze multiple data sets.
2. Discover root cause.
3. Plan solution.
4. Implement the plan.
5. Analyze evidence of effectiveness.
6. Revise the plan after a status review and implement the revision.

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

IV. PDE established the Distinguished Educator (DE) Initiative to provide support and targeted assistance to struggling districts. PDE selected experts and assigns them as part of a team to support districts who demonstrate readiness to receive technical assistance. DEs provide their expertise to assist struggling districts in identifying instructional or systemic barriers and critical gaps to improving student achievement and then work alongside that district's staff to overcome those barriers and fill those gaps. The DE role is flexible in order to meet the unique needs of different districts, schools and students.

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

VI. PDE provides support services through several Bureaus including:

- (1) Bureau of Assessment & Accountability which provides direction and technical assistance to schools and districts with regard to assessment and accountability programs; evaluates school/student progress, deficiencies and school performance for compliance with the No Child Left Behind, and developments assessment anchors to better align curricula, instruction and assessment practices

throughout the state; coordinate test development, administration, and reporting.

(2) Bureau of Special Education provides professional leadership and management in the provision of special education services and programs. The Bureau administers the special education contingency fund, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) funds. Staff provides technical assistance, consultation and advice to local education agencies to support them in meeting the requirements of state and federal special education requirements.

(4) Bureau of Teaching and Learning functions as a consultative and facilitative agency in selected curriculum, instruction strategies and compensatory education. Major activities of the bureau include provision of curriculum and instructional materials and guidelines; provision and coordination of technical assistance and professional development to school districts in initiatives such as Project 720 (High School Reform), Science: It's Elementary, Classrooms for the Future, Dual Enrollment, Schools to Watch, NGA/ACT Course Rigor programs, and administration of significant state and federal programs and projects such as Title 1 and No Child Left Behind.

In addition, the Bureau of Teaching and Learning oversees an array of programs and services to schools, families and communities to enable students to develop resiliency, stay in school, reach their full potential and succeed in life after high school graduation. The Bureau administers critically needed funding, technical assistance and other support to more than 20 different initiatives, including: homeless children's education; safe and drug free programs; alternative and corrections education; teen parent projects; after school programs; migrant and refugee education; dropout prevention and education mentoring.

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	11
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	3
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	2
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: There were a total of 11 districts. Five districts chose 2 options.	

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	18	3
Schools	89	29
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	08/31/10
---	----------

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	145,711	147,034
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	80,740	76,405
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	55.4	52.0
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	144,907	146,263
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	75,015	71,918
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	51.8	49.2
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	174
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	56

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:

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used	Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies) (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.

Comments: Pennsylvania does not collect this data.

Column 1 Response Options Box
1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement
D = Other

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Pennsylvania Standards Aligned System (SAS) is a collaborative product of research and good practice that identifies six distinct elements which, if utilized together, will provide schools and districts a common framework for continuous school and district enhancement and improvement. Much research has been conducted as to what makes a great school. Research supports the notion that great schools and school systems tend to have six common elements that ensure Student Achievement: Clear Standards, Fair Assessments, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources, and Interventions. The Standards Aligned System provides teachers with connected tools to provide these rich experiences that engage learners and prepare them for future learning. SAS provides lesson plans and web-based templates and many other resources for teachers and professional development.

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

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

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.

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

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

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.

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

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	199,543
Applied to transfer	1,419
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,038
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	\$ 2,259,421

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	109

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	122,517
Applied for supplemental educational services	10,291
Received supplemental educational services	7,866
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	\$ 10,144,171
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	366,283	355,129	97.0	11,154	3.0
All elementary classes	56,124	55,319	98.6	805	1.4
All secondary classes	310,159	299,810	96.7	10,349	3.3

In 2008-2009 the total number of classes (elementary and secondary combined) increased 8.8% and represents additional LEAs that submitted data that allowed HQT status of classes/teachers to be analyzed. As noted in the comment portion of the CSPR, PA used a new definition for "classifying" a school as elementary or secondary thus explaining the increase in the number of elementary classes.

The comment from the CSPR follows: PA schools were classified as elementary or secondary using a new procedure for 2008-2009 that results in more schools being classified and included as elementary and secondary schools. With the new procedure, no schools are excluded because they do not have an "elementary" or "secondary" grade level configuration designation included in the PA Department of Education's "Education Names and Addresses Application" file. Secondary schools include any high school with grade 10 &/or grade 11 &/or grade 12 and any middle school with grade 7 &/or grade 8 &/or grade 9 but no grade 10 &/or grade 11 &/or grade 12; and an elementary school is a school that is neither middle nor high school (any combination of grades PreK-6). Further refinements to PA's data collection and classification of data, resulted in an increase in the number of core academic classes at both elementary and secondary class levels.

In 2009-2010 the total number of classes (elementary and secondary combined) decreased by 4.4%. As noted in the comment portion of the CSPR, PA used a new definition for "classifying" a school as elementary or secondary thus explaining the increase in the number of elementary classes. The comment from the CSPR follows: PA schools were classified as elementary or secondary using a new procedure for 2008-2009 that results in more schools being classified and included as elementary and secondary schools. With the new procedure, no schools are excluded because they do not have an "elementary" or "secondary" grade level configuration designation included in the PA Department of Education's "Education Names and Addresses Application" file. Secondary schools include any high school with grade 10 &/or grade 11 &/or grade 12 and any middle school with grade 7 &/or grade 8 &/or grade 9 but no grade 10 &/or grade 11 &/or grade 12; and an elementary school is a school that is neither middle nor high school (any combination of grades PreK-6). At the end of 2008-2009 NHQT data cycle, the department discovered that some LEAs submitted too few or too many courses for teachers. One staff person devoted more than half of his time reviewing the number of courses that the LEAs submitted in conjunction with the 2009-2010 HQT data collection. Edit checks for the number of sections and courses built into the system. Consequently, they were individually reviewed and returned to the LEAs for correction. Staff will continue to closely scrutinize the number of sections and courses reported by the LEAs. As a result of restructuring and reconfiguration of schools in PA school district and following the above definition the number of schools who were designated as elementary had decreased. Thus, the differences in the number of classes in 2008-09 and 2009-10 can be attributed to continue refinement of staff's review of more than 360,000 core academic classes.

Finally, some schools had no HQT data that could be analyzed. The reasons for this include: (1) the schools closed; (2) one or more of the three required templates were not submitted or were incomplete; (3) there were no students assigned to classes; and (4) some of PA's AVTSs or CTCs do not teach core academic subjects. Although the PA Department of Education made every attempt to collect data for HQT purposes, deadlines for submitting EdFacts reports required us to close the 2008-09 HQT data.

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

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

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

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	6.7
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	9.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	84.2
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2009-10 HQT/NHQT data are collected via PA Information Management System (PIMS). LEA's continued to experience a number of data reporting errors, including but not limited to uploading incorrect staff identifiers; errors in entering staff identification numbers (PPID); incorrect mapping of local courses to state level courses; not understanding the differences between certification and staffing requirements and demonstration of content mastery for teachers of record in core academic content areas. The department continued to work with LEA's to correct these errors; however, not all LEA's submitted data corrections required to generate accurate HQT/NHQT percentages. Additionally, a number of elementary special education teachers' records and charter school teachers who are not certified are required to be manually changed to HQ as a result of data system limitations.

	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)	49.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	25.2
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.4
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	13,449	13,125	97.6
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	13,281	13,104	98.7
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	43,167	39,098	90.6
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	116,237	114,455	98.5
1.5.3.1 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.			

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

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncele.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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Dual language	Spanish
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Structured English immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Content-based ESL	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Pull-out ESL	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Programs:
 Dual Language Immersion: One kindergarten class was implemented this year in which the curriculum is delivered via two languages from Kindergarten. Push-in ESOL/Co-teaching.

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	50,738
Comments: Data comes from two sources. This has been rectified.	

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.	29,520
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	29,265
Uncoded languages	3,223
Chinese	1,959
Vietnamese	1,546
Arabic	1,456

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

English (Barbados, Guayana, Jamaican, Trinidad) - 2,587
All LEP students in the State does not match Languages because this does not ask for all LEP students in the state.

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	45,111
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,545
Total	50,656
Comments: No collection period during the test window. This has been rectified.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	15,032
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	33.3
Comments: The First CSPR data (3845) was calculated from an unclean test file. PA submitted this data as a placeholder until accurate data could be submitted during the correction period. 15032 is accurate data based on validated test file and no snapshot. This has been rectified for 10-11.	

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	29,282
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	88
Total	29,370
Comments: No collection period during the test window. This has been rectified.	
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.	8,851

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	13,840	67.7	13,751	53.00
Attained proficiency	9,527	32.5	4,670	18.00
Comments: No collection period during the test window. This has been rectified.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
English
Spanish
Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
English
Comments:

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
English
Spanish
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
3,405	3,000	6,405
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
6,397	5,402	84.4	995
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
6,396	4,867	76.1	1,529
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
2,376	1,565	65.9	811
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	314
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	277
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	307
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	306
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	285
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	2
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	1

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: Consortia members are counted individually in the total number of subgrantees. AMAOs for consortia are calculated by combining data across LEAs in consortia.

In SY 2010-2011, PA implemented AMAO Improvement Plans for SY 06-07, 07-08, 08-09. PA is in the process of implementing 2 AMAO Improvement Plans for SY 2009-2010.

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	Yes
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?	Yes
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	1
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
13,964	6,545	32

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.	10,531
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	454

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	65	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	57	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	55	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	50	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	40	
Other (Explain in comment box)	26	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	58	8,380
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	67	2,147
PD provided to principals	44	624
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	47	436
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	39	1,143
PD provided to community based organization personnel	14	455
Total	269	13,185

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other professional development activities addressed the following: data analysis, information management, identification and placement, cultural responsiveness, content and ESL teacher collaboration strategies, co-teaching, academic language, parental involvement, technology integration, ELLs with Special Needs, and training specific to RTII, READ 180, SAS, SIOP, Spanish, and LETRS.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<p>Pennsylvania has taken the following steps to shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees:</p> <p>-Pennsylvania moved the window for LEAs to report the number of LEP students from April to the previous October. This gives the state more time to confirm the numbers and determine allocations by July 1 when the funds are released. An improvement due to this change was seen in the 2010/11 application where we cut the time between availability of funds to release of funds down to 7 days from the 38 days for the 2009/10 application.</p> <p>-For the 2011/12 application, Pennsylvania plans to incorporate the Title III application into the Consolidated Federal Application. This is expected to result in earlier submissions of Title III applications as well as assure timely processing once the applications are submitted.</p>

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	124
Comments:	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	90.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	85.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	94.0
Black, non-Hispanic	80.0
Hispanic	76.0
White, non-Hispanic	93.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	84.3
Limited English proficient	73.9
Economically disadvantaged	81.6
Migratory students	71.7
Male	88.8
Female	91.7
Comments:	

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	<3
American Indian or Alaska Native	<3
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	3.3
Hispanic	4.0
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11.1
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	<3
Migratory students	<3
Male	<3
Female	<3
Comments: Pennsylvania does not collect the Limited English proficient dropout rate for 2008-09. We will be collecting this for the 2009-10 school year.	

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	0	0
LEAs with subgrants	500	500
Total	500	500
Comments: The program is a statewide program covering all 500 school districts, 29 intermediate units, 83 career and technology centers, and 135 charter schools. The program has 8 full-time regional coordinators and various satellite site coordinators to cover the state.		

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)	-	832
K	-	1,588
1	-	1,593
2	-	1,441
3	-	1,406
4	-	1,335
5	-	1,433
6	-	1,263
7	-	1,230
8	-	1,144
9	-	1,201
10	-	1,179
11	-	969
12	-	1,501
Ungraded	-	89
Total	-	18,204
Comments: The data submitted is for all LEAs in Pennsylvania.		

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	-	7,773
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	-	8,950
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	-	351
Hotels/Motels	-	1,130
Total	-	18,204
Comments: The data submitted is for all LEAs in Pennsylvania.		

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)	2,559
K	1,574
1	1,551
2	1,382
3	1,394
4	1,300
5	1,380
6	1,171
7	1,132
8	1,106
9	1,113
10	1,111
11	945
12	1,375
Ungraded	364
Total	19,457
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	801
Migratory children/youth	133
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,600
Limited English proficient students	644
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	6
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	8
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	8
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	7
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	8
Counseling	3
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	7
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	8
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
Other (optional – in comment box below)	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other (1) - Outreach to and services for unaccompanied youth - 2
 Other (2) - Outreach to families referred via "word of mouth" - 1
 Other (3) - Resources to cover senior fees/expenses - 1 AND Emergency assistance not listed above - 1

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	6
School Selection	8
Transportation	8
School records	5
Immunizations	5
Other medical records	2
Other Barriers – in comment box below	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Logistics of classroom placement for middle/high school students (1).
 Failure of parents/guardians/students/agencies/shelters to disclose homelessness to school personnel (2).
 Parents/guardians/unaccompanied youth providing false address or untruthful information about their living situation (1).
 Local attitudes toward poverty (1).
 Denial of homeless stigma and labeling (1).
 Fear of homeless stigma and labeling (1).
 School district staff who think there is a time limit on being homeless (1).
 Transportation as an unfunded mandate (1).

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	670	346
4	654	323
5	595	269
6	514	239
7	517	261
8	494	313
High School	547	207
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	686	420
4	664	432
5	601	322
6	524	296
7	526	261
8	502	236
High School	550	154
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)	754
K	289
1	267
2	287
3	270
4	263
5	205
6	240
7	237
8	208
9	240
10	212
11	167
12	130
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	1,306
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.

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)	513
K	170
1	189
2	189
3	176
4	173
5	137
6	165
7	163
8	142
9	155
10	112
11	89
12	18
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	422
Total	
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.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Following a rigorous quality control process that includes both manual and electronic checks, COE's are entered electronically into the MIS2000 system in the field by trained recruiters via Tablet computers. They are then electronically reviewed by a state approved reviewer. A final review, especially a check for duplication, is performed by a trained Data Specialist before the COE is given final approval and students are eligible for services or being counted on any reports.

Reports are generated and reviewed by Student Support Specialists and Recruiters to make sure the students match their records. Verification is also performed to make sure that students recruited in previous years are still residing in the state. It is required that a Needs Assessment is completed annually on every student and this is a method of verifying that they are still here. If a child is found to not be here any longer, that enrollment is totally removed from the system, resulting in that child no longer being counted on the reports. Reports are run that uniquely count a child only once, and only in a single (highest) grade for reporting these counts.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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.

For approximately 15 years, PDE MEP has been using the same comprehensive high quality algorithm to count the students. In addition, many edit reports are created to verify that students who show on the count are truly eligible. For the 2009-10 count, the first thing the system checks is to make sure the Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) is on or after 9/1/06 and that Residency and QAD are before 8/31/10. ONLY students who meet all of the criteria of being a migrant student, including having a qualifying activity are included in the MIS2000 system and eligible to be possibly counted. We also only count students who reached age 3 prior to 9/1/09 or if they reach age 3 between 9/1/09 and 8/31/10, they must still be residing in the state as of their third birthday. Reports are run on a regular basis and staff assigned to serve the children must verify that they are still resident. In addition, a Needs Assessment is required to be completed every year, and the child/youth must actually be encountered to complete this form. If a child turns age 22 prior 9/1/09 or before they are residing and enrolled in PA, they are excluded. If a child became a PA resident after 8/31/10 or left residency before 9/1/09 they are not counted. The general logic system of the reporting mechanism is designed to only count a student once per each child count category by assigning a single calculated grade per student and performing a distinct count by student.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Same As Category 1, except only counting those enrolled as receiving a summer service as documented using our Service Delivery Tracking. This was also compared to the enrollment as being indicated as a summer enrollment with a 100% match. The summer enrollment must also have started prior to reaching three years past their qualifying move or before reaching age 22 or before graduating or receiving a GED. Even if a student meeting any of these criteria is accidentally entered into the system as receiving a summer enrollment, the system would exclude them from the count. For students who turn age 3 between 9/1/09 and 8/31/10, the delivery of summer service must be after turning age 3 to count on the Category 2 report.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

PDE MEP performed a formal prospective reinterview process in the fall of 2010 conducted by independent reviewers (ESCORT). Using a statistician, a random sampling of 77 COE's were reviewed and the defect rate was zero. In addition, our internal quality control process also reviews 100% of the COE's as mentioned in the previous question. Also, 20% of the COEs are re-verified by a state recruitment coordinator or auditor. In the past year absolutely none of those audited were found to be not eligible and only minor clerical issues were found. All questionable cases were determined ineligible during initial Quality Control and never reached approval in MIS2000. Of those 20% audited, NONE were determined to be ineligible.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There have been no indications of any major problems since the adoption of the new quality control process. When minor/borderline cases are encountered, they are addressed with the individual recruiter and also shared with all five regional recruitment staff and all recruiters who meet quarterly for training. While the final re-interview results are not yet known, no major issues are anticipated based on preliminary results.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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