

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2011-12**

DELAWARE



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Delaware Department of Education		
Address: 401 Federal St. Dover, DE 19901		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Jeff Fleming		
Telephone: 302-735-4140		
Fax: 302-739-4221		
e-mail: jfleming@doe.k12.de.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Mark Murphy		
_____ Signature		_____ Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 1:05:04 PM

Certified with Approval of Secretary Mark Murphy

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

State has revised or change	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2010-2011	2010-2011	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

NO changes were made the 2012 school year. DDOE adopted Common Core Standards in 2011 and continues to move forward with full implementation.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

<p>State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2010-2011	2010-2011	2010-2011
Regular Assessments in High School	2010-2011	2010-2011	2010-2011
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2011-2012	2011-2012	2011-2012

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Revisions were made this year only to DCAS Alternate Assessments for Reading and Mathematics with the development of new standard settings and performance levels for reading, mathematics and science. All other grades for reading and mathematics had already identified the acceptance moved to new scale and performance levels in 2011 school year.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

<p style="text-align: center;">State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2010-2011	2010-2011	2010-2011
Regular Assessments in High School	2010-2011	2010-2011	2010-2011
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2011-2012	2011-2012	2011-2012

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (DCAS) the student assessment for Delaware students will not change in any of its current configurations, but will be reducing the number of assessment for reading and mathematics from four to three.

A configuration change will be made to End-of-Course Assessments in the school year 2012-2013 for the following courses: Algebra I, Integrated Math I, English II, Biology will become optional. End-of-Course Assessments that are mandatory for the 2012-2013 school year will be Algebra II, Integrated Math III and US History.

Field Testing for DCAS and DCAS Alt1 will also be completed in the school year 2012-2013.

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 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	70.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	30.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	S	68,374	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	314	98
Asian	S	2,353	>=99
Black or African American	S	21,922	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	8,847	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	37	>=90
White	S	33,678	99
Two or more races	S	1,223	99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	9,738	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	2,623	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	38,365	98
Migratory students	S	15	>=80
Male	S	35,013	98
Female	S	33,361	99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments necessary.			

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	312	3.20
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,606	88.38
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	820	8.42
Total	9,738	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments necessary.		

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	S	67,871	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	312	98
Asian	S	2,294	>=99
Black or African American	S	21,767	97
Hispanic or Latino	S	8,674	97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	31	>=90
White	S	33,570	>=99
Two or more races	S	1,223	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	9,429	94
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	2,357	96
Economically disadvantaged students	S	37,964	97
Migratory students	S	15	>=80
Male	S	34,706	98
Female	S	33,165	98
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 8 students who were LEP < 12 months, took ELP is not included in the count of EDEA Students Participating in section 1.2.3. therefore, the totals in 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 differ by 8 students.			

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	217
--	-----

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.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

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	365	3.87
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,233	87.24
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	831	8.81
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	8	0.08
Total	9,437	////////////////////
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 8 students who were LEP < 12 months, took ELP is not included in the count of EDEA Students Participating in section 1.2.3. therefore, the totals in 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 differ by 8 students.</p>		

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	S	27,654	94
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	124	95
Asian	S	932	96
Black or African American	S	8,884	92
Hispanic or Latino	S	3,195	94
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	15	>=80
White	S	14,075	95
Two or more races	S	429	95
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	3,903	92
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	773	92
Economically disadvantaged students	S	14,719	94
Migratory students	S	9	N<
Male	S	14,078	94
Female	S	13,576	95
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to low participation of the science assessment in some district and charter schools for grade 8 and Grade 10, this has caused the participation numbers to dip below acceptable 95%. DOE has several monitoring plans and status updates in place this year, which will help increase numbers for this school year.			

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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	165	4.23
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,372	86.40
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	366	9.38
Total	3,903	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments necessary		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	10,226	S	76
American Indian or Alaska Native	55	S	N<
Asian	379	S	91
Black or African American	3,169	S	64
Hispanic or Latino	1,620	S	67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	6	S	N<
White	4,809	S	86
Two or more races	188	S	84
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,337	S	43
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	801	S	56
Economically disadvantaged students	6,102	S	69
Migratory students	3	S	N<
Male	5,186	S	77
Female	5,040	S	76
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	10,129	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	54	S	N<
Asian	370	S	88
Black or African American	3,147	S	64
Hispanic or Latino	1,583	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4	S	N<
White	4,783	S	85
Two or more races	188	S	85
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,269	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	747	S	47
Economically disadvantaged students	6,014	S	67
Migratory students	3	S	N<
Male	5,125	S	73
Female	5,004	S	78
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including Alaska Native, Pacific Islander and Student who are classified as two or more races (parents are continuing to change or update their student's racial status).			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Students are not tested in Grade 3 Science			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,767	S	77
American Indian or Alaska Native	56	S	N<
Asian	385	S	91
Black or African American	3,100	S	64
Hispanic or Latino	1,424	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3	S	N<
White	4,606	S	87
Two or more races	193	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,442	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	480	S	48
Economically disadvantaged students	5,751	S	69
Migratory students	1	S	N<
Male	5,046	S	77
Female	4,721	S	77
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including Pacific Islander.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,667	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	56	S	N<
Asian	372	S	90
Black or African American	3,060	S	63
Hispanic or Latino	1,397	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3	S	N<
White	4,586	S	85
Two or more races	193	S	82
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,373	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	437	S	34
Economically disadvantaged students	5,676	S	66
Migratory students	1	S	N<
Male	4,988	S	71
Female	4,679	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including Female sub categories.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Students are not tested in Grade 4 Science			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,903	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	43	S	N<
Asian	343	S	93
Black or African American	3,220	S	60
Hispanic or Latino	1,281	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5	S	N<
White	4,791	S	84
Two or more races	220	S	82
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,556	S	40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	350	S	46
Economically disadvantaged students	5,709	S	66
Migratory students	2	S	N<
Male	5,069	S	75
Female	4,834	S	73
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including Alaska Native, Hispanic, Pacific Islander and Student who are classified as two or more races (parents are continuing to change or update their student's racial status).			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,840	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	42	S	N<
Asian	338	S	92
Black or African American	3,204	S	68
Hispanic or Latino	1,260	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5	S	N<
White	4,771	S	87
Two or more races	220	S	86
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,516	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	320	S	38
Economically disadvantaged students	5,664	S	70
Migratory students	2	S	N<
Male	5,031	S	77
Female	4,809	S	80
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including Alaska Native, African American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged Students and Males.			

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	9,880	S	52
American Indian or Alaska Native	43	S	N<
Asian	344	S	73
Black or African American	3,204	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	1,283	S	38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5	S	N<
White	4,781	S	67
Two or more races	220	S	58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,555	S	18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	353	S	18
Economically disadvantaged students	5,692	S	39
Migratory students	2	S	N<
Male	5,063	S	53
Female	4,817	S	50
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments necessary.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,935	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	40	S	73
Asian	329	S	91
Black or African American	3,221	S	50
Hispanic or Latino	1,280	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	S	40
White	4,825	S	80
Two or more races	230	S	72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,459	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	266	S	29
Economically disadvantaged students	5,768	S	56
Migratory students	2	S	N<
Male	5,147	S	67
Female	4,788	S	68
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including Alaska Native, and students who are classified as two or more races (parents are continuing to change or update their student's racial status).			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,868	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	40	S	N<
Asian	323	S	88
Black or African American	3,208	S	60
Hispanic or Latino	1,246	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	7	S	N<
White	4,814	S	85
Two or more races	230	S	78
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,422	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	230	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	5,710	S	65
Migratory students	2	S	N<
Male	5,107	S	71
Female	4,761	S	77
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including students who are classified as two or more races (parents are continuing to change or update their student's racial status).			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Students are not tested in Grade 6 Science			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,787	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	35	S	N<
Asian	301	S	86
Black or African American	3,122	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	1,209	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3	S	N<
White	4,948	S	82
Two or more races	169	S	73
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,437	S	28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	273	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	5,441	S	60
Migratory students	0		
Male	5,033	S	70
Female	4,754	S	71
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including Pacific Islander and students who are classified as two or more races (parents are continuing to change or update their student's racial status).			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,706	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	34	S	N<
Asian	292	S	88
Black or African American	3,093	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	1,187	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3	S	N<
White	4,928	S	82
Two or more races	169	S	66
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,393	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	229	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	5,380	S	61
Migratory students	0		
Male	4,983	S	68
Female	4,723	S	75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including Pacific Islander and students who are classified as two or more races (parents are continuing to change or update their student's racial status).			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Students are not tested in Grade 7 Science			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,576	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	46	S	N<
Asian	293	S	90
Black or African American	3,207	S	61
Hispanic or Latino	1,070	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	7	S	N<
White	4,807	S	84
Two or more races	146	S	75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,372	S	34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	259	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	5,233	S	64
Migratory students	4	S	N<
Male	4,947	S	74
Female	4,629	S	74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including Pacific Islander.			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,542	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	47	S	N<
Asian	283	S	87
Black or African American	3,199	S	61
Hispanic or Latino	1,054	S	63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	6	S	N<
White	4,807	S	84
Two or more races	146	S	79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,354	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	227	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	5,204	S	64
Migratory students	4	S	N<
Male	4,919	S	71
Female	4,623	S	77
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including Pacific Islander, migratory students and students who are classified as two or more races (parents are continuing to change or update their student's racial status).			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,343	S	50
American Indian or Alaska Native	46	S	N<
Asian	286	S	66
Black or African American	3,084	S	30
Hispanic or Latino	1,040	S	37
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	7	S	N<
White	4,737	S	65
Two or more races	143	S	55
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,324	S	16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	240	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	5,047	S	36
Migratory students	4		
Male	4,814	S	54
Female	4,529	S	46
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,180	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	39	S	N<
Asian	323	S	88
Black or African American	2,883	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	963	S	67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3	S	N<
White	4,892	S	81
Two or more races	77	S	69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,135	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	194	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	4,361	S	60
Migratory students	3	S	67
Male	4,585	S	70
Female	4,595	S	72

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to changes in instruction and students taking a more active role in the assessment achievement, we are seeing increases in many of our previously underperforming sub-groups, including Hispanic students.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,119	6,522	71.52
American Indian or Alaska Native	39	25	64.10
Asian	316	252	79.75
Black or African American	2,856	1,631	57.11
Hispanic or Latino	947	585	61.77
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3	1	33.33
White	4,881	3,972	81.38
Two or more races	77	56	72.73
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,102	336	30.49
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	167	33	19.76
Economically disadvantaged students	4,316	2,556	59.22
Migratory students	3	2	66.67
Male	4,553	3,123	68.59
Female	4,566	3,399	74.44

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. NO comments necessary.

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	8,431	3,483	41.31
American Indian or Alaska Native	35	13	37.14
Asian	302	191	63.25
Black or African American	2,596	630	24.27
Hispanic or Latino	872	268	30.73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3	0	0.00
White	4,557	2,356	51.70
Two or more races	66	25	37.88
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,024	118	11.52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	180	20	11.11
Economically disadvantaged students	3,980	1,108	27.84
Migratory students	3	1	33.33
Male	4,201	1,834	43.66
Female	4,230	1,649	38.98
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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 SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	249	179	71.89
Districts	44	32	72.73

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total number of accountability schools for 2011-12 was 213. Of that number, 184 made AYP (86.4%). The total number of districts is 37. Of that number, 32 made AYP (86.5%).

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 SY 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	135	116	85.93
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	132	113	85.61
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	3	3	100.00

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In 2011-12, the number of Title 1 schools increased by 5. In addition, many more schools made AYP compared to 2010-11.

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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
40	32	80.00

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of Title 1 districts in SY 2011-12 was 37. Of this number, 32 made AYP (86.5%).

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Delaware had six Title I schools that were required to implement corrective action in 2011-12 based on 2010-11 assessment data. Four of those schools chose to appoint an outside expert. The other two schools were also selected for the Partnership Zone based on 2010-11 assessment data under Delaware's Race to the Top plan. The Partnership Zone process required them to select one of the four SIG models for implementation beginning in 2011-12. Both chose Transformation. Since the requirements of implementing this model were more stringent than the corrective actions, the Transformation model implementation was considered to have met and exceeded the requirements of corrective action for these two schools.</p>	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were no schools that were required to implement restructuring in 2011-12.</p>	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.4.5.2 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.

As part of the LEA Support Program, the Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) coordinated four workshops for each county in October, December, February, and March. These workshops were attended by all 19 LEA's (including the 8 identified for improvement or corrective action). Each LEA sent their planning team to the workshop, including teacher and board representation. The focus of these workshops centered around discussion of the LEAs' progress to date, their vision and need for success, and the support DDOE will provide to LEAs. During the workshops DDOE assisted the LEA's with identifying performance strengths and challenges, and their causes, and setting ambitious, realistic targets. DDOE monitored the progress and expectations and refinement of LEA plans, by identifying activities to add or remove (based on LEAs' needs and lessons learned from initial implementation), prioritizing activities, discussing the activities' impact on student outcomes, and understanding effective practices occurring in other districts. LEA's identified for improvement received more intense planning support from their DDOE Liaison assigned to work closely with the LEA to ensure that their plan was both rigorous and ambitious. In addition to this support, three of the four LEA's identified for corrective action received intense planning support and rigorous monthly monitoring from the School Turnaround Unit as part of the Partnership Zone. The remaining LEA which was not selected for the Partnership Zone received intense monitoring and planning support from the DDOE School Improvement office through the Comprehensive Success Review program with assistance from the Delaware Academy for School Leadership (DASL) and Delaware Distinguished Educators.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
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	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Comments: There were four districts in corrective action. Each district was required to implement the following (at a minimum):</p> <p>District 1: Continue implementation of the Literacy Charter project, including the Peer Assisted Literacy (PALS) course. Train teachers in a common framework of lesson design, namely 'Learning Focus Strategies' (LFS). Replace principal as required by partnership zone model. Use an inclusion model of special education in all schools. District level staff have created data systems to more vigorously monitor the academic progress of students with disabilities.</p> <p>District 2: Implement a Data Driven Decision Making Curriculum Council/Cabinet process. Implement a 21st Century Learning Academy for Building Leadership Teams. Conduct weekly faculty meetings for Instructional Strategies. Implement Standards-based education. Monthly Professional Development will be held for all administrators in Standards and DPAS II. District organization has been restructured to offer Support to School Improvement Sites with Distinguished Educator Support.</p> <p>District 3: Expand the implementation of Professional Learning Communities in all schools by mandating 90 minutes of collaborative time each week, during which, teams of teachers will examine student achievement data and plan strategies/lessons to increase student success. Improve lesson design through the implementation of Learning Focused Solutions (grades 6-12) and Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) (grades K-5). Continued professional development in these models will be provided and monitoring will be maintained by building and district administrators. Hire a new Manager of School Improvement to oversee and coordinate implementation of curricular and instructional changes within the LEA Success Plan and all school success plans. Hire a new Superintendent whose primary goal will be to lead the efforts of the district to improve student achievement.</p> <p>District 4: Form a Curriculum and Professional Development Design Team. Create Teacher Positions focused on Curriculum Development - Curriculum Specialists. Use a Knowledge Management</p>	

~~System (KMS) accessible through a dedicated portal.~~

Design and Deliver school level transitions between Elementary/Middle and Middle/High Schools.

Provide College and Career Readiness through rigorous course work and career exploration in Middle School.

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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	15	3
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	10/24/12
---	----------

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: ____%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Delaware is in the process of scheduling Comprehensive Success Reviews (CSR) to evaluate the implementation of RTTT and 1003(g) plans. The CSR process provides research-based feedback on improving outcomes for all students through an on-site visit process and rubric. The Delaware Comprehensive Success Review improves outcomes for students through analysis and plan development based on a comprehensive review of school programming, student performance and processes. Delaware intends to use its administration funds to support this effort.

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 2011-12 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Delaware Department of Education has an annual general fund appropriation that is provided on a formula basis to all schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring. The funds are distributed to non-Title I schools under improvement, corrective action or restructuring based on the level of improvement of the school.

Title I schools under improvement, corrective action or restructuring are each provided a base level appropriation from the state allocation. The funds are used by all schools under improvement, corrective action or restructuring to address the achievement problems that caused the school to fall under improvement. The funds provided to Title I schools under improvement, corrective action or restructuring are provided to complement the activities funded through the 1003(a) school improvement grants.

Additionally, the six schools identified for participation in the Partnership Zone, also received an approximately \$160,000/year funded through Race to the Top (avg of funding for each of the six schools).

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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	24,092
Applied to transfer	461
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	461
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	10

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:
 - o 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
 - o 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
 - o 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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Delaware's response to item 1.4.9.1.3 regarding N164 PSC/SES 2011-12:

"Delaware recently transitioned to a new statewide financial system in July of 2010 (FY11). Currently, the new system does not allow us to disaggregate expenditures by LEA for School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services (SES). We are working to develop a new and accurate means to capture any required LEA Choice and SES expenditures and will report these data when available. "

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*.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	16,923
Applied for supplemental educational services	1,051
Received supplemental educational services	1,051
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Delaware's response to item 1.4.9.2.3 regarding N164 PSC/SES 2011-12: "Delaware recently transitioned to a new statewide financial system in July of 2010 (FY11). Currently, the new system does not allow us to disaggregate expenditures by LEA for School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services (SES). We are working to develop a new and accurate means to capture any required LEA Choice and SES expenditures and will report these data when available. "	

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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	20,876	19,981	95.71	66	0.32
All elementary classes	3,468	3,402	98.10	66	1.90
All secondary classes	17,408	16,579	95.24	829	4.76

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.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary 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.

Elementary School Classes	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	55.00
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	6.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	34.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	5.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ESOL classes

Secondary School Classes	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)	27.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	17.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	54.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	2.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ESL, Bilingual

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.

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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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	857	821	95.80
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	827	823	99.52
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	2,692	2,340	86.92
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	2,435	2,387	98.03

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	62.00	28.00
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	60.00	30.00
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ESL push-in services are also provided and in some districts a combination of pull-out and push-in programs are offered to the same students.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	7,007
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	6,741
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are a number of parent waivers for LEP services throughout the state.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	5,368
Creoles and pidgins (Other)	398
Chinese	143
Arabic	109
Gujarati	76

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' 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 (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,994
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	211
Total	7,205
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	1,383
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	19.79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,636
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	180
Total	6,816
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	
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 AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	2,329

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students 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%).

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	2,893	67.17	2,471	54.00
Attained proficiency	1,613	24.31	732	16.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total number of students tested and not tested in 1.6.3.2.1 is 6,816, which is larger than the number who received Title III services in 1.6.2.2 of 6,741 because of the 2012 students who are transitioned out of the ELL program and database with their LEP status changed to "No". Students are exited/transition out at Tier C, Level 5.0 on the Spring ACCESS test. Although the transition deadline for the 2012 school year was customarily completed on October 30, 2012, there are some LEAs that do not transition students in the data system until just before the next ACCESS test administration. The data for this report is queried in December.				

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).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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)
Spanish
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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)
None
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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)
Spanish
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
1,028	1,095	2,123

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,937	1,471	75.94	466

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,939	1,392	71.79	547
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP 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 MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
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
485	149	30.72	336
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science tests are given on to grades 5,8, and 10.			

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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	13
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	9
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	9
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	13
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	13
////////////////////////////////////	
# - 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 2010-11 and 2011-12)	1
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	0

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were no consortia funded in 201-2012. Delaware does not use a consortia subgrantee method for allocation of Title III funds.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u> </u> No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1)Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
1,859	0	0

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.

Delaware experienced a decrease of 117 immigrant students from last year's count of 1,976 immigrant students. Due to the overall decline in immigrant student enrollment, there were no subgrantees who qualified for the significant increase award as compared to the two preceding fiscal years.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational 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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	153
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	250

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of certified/licensed teachers working in the Title III language instruction programs is low because not all districts enter their information on the district page in the State's database.

The estimate for the additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for the Title III language instructional programs in the next 5 years is based upon Delaware' 249% growth rate in the ELL student population over the last 10-15 years. Our ELL student numbers continue to rise annually.

* 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 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 and 1.6.4.)
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	# Participants
Instructional strategies for LEP students	6	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	4	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	5	////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	3	////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	4	////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	7	////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	5	600
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	4	52
PD provided to principals	3	32
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	2	16
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	3	87
PD provided to community based organization personnel	2	76
Total	19	863

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Elementary ELL end of year meeting ELL updates - Elementary ELL updates - Secondary Secondary ELL end of year meeting RTI and ELL students Learning focused solutions Common Core Standards

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/01/11	8/15/11	45
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of days between the time funds are available to the Title III subgrantees and the number of days until distribution is affected by the window of review for Consolidated Applications. Districts are provided time to correct/amend their applications which may lead to delays in distributing the funds.		

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.

Delaware Department of Education's Consolidated Application requires simultaneous submission from local education agencies for multiple federal programs. The delay in the distribution process and date funds are available to subgrantees is a part of the quality control to ensure program fidelity. The numerous revisions and edits to the submissions are due to the scrutiny of SEA program directors who monitor budget and programmatic areas for federal compliance.

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	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	6	6
LEAs with subgrants	13	13
Total	19	19
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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)	10	28
K	68	276
1	77	281
2	57	250
3	63	289
4	44	215
5	46	238
6	62	217
7	55	211
8	56	225
9	47	284
10	25	177
11	36	136
12	48	208
Ungraded		
Total	694	3,035

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are NO ungraded schools.

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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	201	566
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	406	2,073
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	4	13
Hotels/Motels	83	383
Total	694	3,035

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 Birth Through 2	8
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	54
K	276
1	281
2	250
3	289
4	215
5	238
6	217
7	211
8	225
9	284
10	177
11	136
12	208
Ungraded	
Total	3,069
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are NO ungraded schools.	

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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	169
Migratory children/youth	8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	733
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	122
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths 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	278	164
4	241	147
5	234	151
6	246	140
7	211	113
8	232	132
High School	171	88

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State 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	285	172
4	246	148
5	237	132
6	248	117
7	214	97
8	232	123
High School	173	82

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science 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		
4		
5	233	71
6		
7		
8	220	64
High School	143	32

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is only tested in grades 5, 8, and 10.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	14
K	10
1	11
2	11
3	4
4	6
5	5
6	6
7	5
8	4
9	10
10	7
11	2
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	40
Total	136

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Delaware's Category 1 Count for last year was 162 total students. The Category 1 Count for this year is a total of 136 students. Our Category 1 Count decreased by 26 students which is more than 10%.

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.

Delaware's Category 1 Count for last year was 162 total students. The Category 1 Count for this year is a total of 136 students. Our Category 1 Count decreased by 26 students which is more than 10% but less than 20%.

The factors that lead to the decreased student count are:

1. The mid-Atlantic and southern states had a mild winter and experienced an early spring last year which affected agricultural planting and production cycles. The migrant families who typically migrate north to Delaware each year from the Gulf Coast states were able to find employment easily in Georgia and the Carolinas or other more southern states and did not have to travel as far.

2. One of Delaware's migrant housing projects in the city of Bridgeville that workers have returned to for multiple years changed ownership last year. When migrant families from out of state arrived in the summer of 2012 expecting to stay there as usual, they were informed they had to provide additional documentation that the families could not supply on short notice. There were several families and out of school youth who left Delaware and returned south due to the lack of housing. The U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development office is doing a Civil Rights Compliance Review on the property.

Many of our migrant workers come to us from FL, TX, or southern states each spring/summer. This past summer, the workers and their families, many of whom arrived here after several days journey, had to turn around and go back due to the problems regarding housing. They were exhausted and their children did not get a chance to enroll in the migrant summer schools we provide.

Elizabeth Cornish Landing, the apartment complex in Bridgeville, DE had begun to require birth certificates, pay stubs, etc., in order to rent to workers. This had not been required in previous years, and many workers who had been returning to this complex year after year had no warning until they arrived. Although some of the families called ahead to ensure housing was available to them, no one in the apartment complex office bothered to let them know of the new requirements before the families initiated travel to Delaware. Upon arrival, one family with small children was forced to double up with another family inside a small travel trailer. The children were entered into summer school as quickly as possible to help alleviate the stressful situation, and that family eventually found housing - but many others were still coming to DE expecting housing in this location. When they arrived, they had no place to stay and simply left.

I spoke with the attendant on site at the complex and also phoned their corporate office. Each said that although the policy requiring the documents had been in place for many years, it had not been enforced until now. A second factor is that the complex received a federal subsidy for blocking off a percentage of the units for migrant workers and they said that money was no longer available to them. The families who had been able to secure a unit and were living at this complex reported that their rent had skyrocketed from years before, in some cases as much as \$1200/month was charged for very small apartments. The workers who came from out of state to work here did not make salaries that could afford this, so as word traveled, some families decided that it was not worth the travel expense to come to DE.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	9
K	6
1	12
2	9
3	3
4	3
5	2
6	3
7	0
8	0
9	4
10	0
11	1
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	5
Total	57

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Delaware's previous State Migrant Recruiter joined the Peace Corp in the spring of 2012 and moved to Ecuador. We were not able to fill her position and get a new employee started until June, which only allowed us one month to recruit, enroll, and register students for the summer term. Our new recruiter did not have prior knowledge of the migrant education program or identification and recruitment eligibility criteria. After she was trained, she only had a few short weeks to recruit and enroll students. The areas of our largest decrease are in the 3-5 age group and the OSY group. We dropped by a total of 13 students which is more than 10%.

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.

Delaware's Category 2 Count last year was 70 students. This year's Category 2 Count is 57 students, which is a decrease of 13 students and is more than 10%.

Delaware's previous State Migrant Recruiter joined the Peace Corp in the spring of 2012 and moved to Ecuador. We were not able to fill her position and get a new employee started until June, which only allowed us one month to recruit, enroll, and register students for the summer term. Our new recruiter did not have prior knowledge of the migrant education program or identification and recruitment eligibility criteria. After she was trained, she only had about two weeks to recruit and enroll students for summer school. We normally begin recruitment in April and May, but this year the time we had available to find the incoming families was shortened.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Delaware used the New Generation System data management program for Category 1 and 2 for the 2011-12 reporting period and for the previous reporting period in 2010-11.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data are collected through a practice standard in MEP programs. The recruiter conducts a face to face interview with every family or OSY individual to determine eligibility prior to enrollment in the MEP. If the family is eligible, a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is completed during the interview and all family data elements are collected. Upon review and approval by the SEA MEP Director, the COE is forwarded to the State MEP Data Specialist who enters the information into NGS. The information is cross-checked for accuracy through DELSIS, which is the Delaware Student Information System, MSIX, and e-School and any discrepancies are addressed before the data is entered. The Category 1 and Category 2 Counts are collected in similar manners, but summer school students are also cross-checked with the migrant summer school projects attendance rosters. The two migrant project directors maintain records on student attendance, and instructional and support supplemental services. At the end of the summer projects, the student files are submitted to the SEA and reviewed again before they are entered into NGS by the State Data Specialist.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT FOR CLARIFICATION: Delaware uses the National Certificate of Eligibility.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State MEP Recruiter, who is housed at the SEA office in Dover, conducts home visits with the family or individual to confirm they are present in the state of Delaware after September 1. Because of Delaware's small size and the relative proximity of the migrant camps and worksites to the state office, it is our practice to visit the migrant families in person. In some cases, a phone call may be made to confirm the student/family is still here. The State MEP Recruiter and the State MEP Data Specialist work closely together on this effort. The results of the face to face visits are documented on the supplemental form, which is attached to the COE and then entered into NGS. When families return to Delaware each year, the recruiter reinterviews them and a new COE is created. As an extra attempt to locate any students who are still in the state after September 1, the State MEP Data Specialist cross checks the state database, DELSIS, against the NGS migrant database for any students who may be attending Delaware schools. Any students who remain in the state after the close of the summer migrant program and are still present at September 1 are then entered into NGS with a new enrollment line and date for the present school year.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT FOR CLARIFICATION: Manual checks are done on individual students/family data to verify the names, dates of birth, parents' names, relatives' names on the National Certificate of Eligibility against what is listed in the New Generation System (NGS) in the last qualifying move list and also against physical hard copies of COE's within the Delaware Department of Education's migrant education program files. Electronic checks within NGS and MSIX are done to check for existing student records prior to entering a new student record. NGS reports are reviewed regularly to avoid duplication.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The process is the same for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts and they are collected and documented the same way.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Migrant students in K-12 who are enrolled in school districts are verified against DELSIS for district, student name, grade level, race, and date of birth. The State MEP Data Specialist compares all the data before entering the migrant Certificate of Eligibility/COE in the New Generation System. The State MEP Recruiter supplies the information when a student is of pre-school age and not currently attending school through face to face interviews and home visits with the family or out of school youth. Delaware maintains a last qualifying move list, which both the State MEP Data Specialist and State MEP Recruiter use to ensure only those migrant students who are currently eligible are counted. The NGS migrant data system only counts three year olds and out of school youth whose last qualifying move date falls in the 3-year eligibility window. Students who are resident only are confirmed by the State MEP Recruiter through home visits, work visits, or telephone calls to the family. After the verification process is completed, the count is pulled from NGS. Delaware had two migrant summer programs in 2011-12. Both summer projects/programs were conducted from July-August after the close of the regular school year. The child count for Category 2 is done by requesting a report from NGS for students enrolled for that time period and school codes for the two sites which conducted the migrant summer projects. The two migrant summer schools submit forms which include attendance, instruction and support supplemental services and parent involvement.

Only students for Category 2 who actually attend the summer migrant program are included in the Category 2 child count. To ensure that students are not previously enrolled under another name we perform a crosscheck using the birth date, parent's name, and place of birth. A check for possible duplicates is done at the initial entering of the student into NGS. When the State Recruiter turns in a COE, a check is done in NGS using the mother's last name and the father's last name, along with age and race. If a student has the same birth date and the parent's name, race, grade, and the school they are attending match, then the data is entered in NGS. If there are discrepancies, further follow-up is completed by the recruiter or the migrant data specialist, who calls the schools. The recruiter makes contact with the families when there is a discrepancy. The migrant data specialist makes calls to the schools to determine if the migrant student is attending their school and gets the information to confirm the data. The State MEP Director reviews the COEs for approval on an individual basis.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 and Category 2 Counts are collected and processed the same way.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The new State MEP Recruiter was trained by the State MEP Director in June 2012, and then shadowed during her initial recruitment in the field. The State MEP Director provided training that included the video modules and handouts produced by the Office of Migrant Education. In addition, the training included an overview of an ID&R manual written by the MEP Director, and also the Texas Education Agency ID&R manual. Copies of both manuals were given to the new recruiter and a copy of the 2003 Non-Regulatory Guidance and the 2008 revisions.

The new State MEP Recruiter attended the Solutions for Out of School Youth Dissemination Event in Florida during September 2012. During that conference, she attended a session related to identification and recruitment. The "Field-Based Recruiting 101" workshop was provided by Jessica Cantaneda of the Tennessee MEP, Ray Melecio of ESCORT, and Scott Wilhelm of the Illinois MEP.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT FOR CLARIFICATION: Delaware uses the National Certificate of Eligibility statewide. The state does not have a regional program model, all ID&R is completed at the SEA level. Training is ongoing as needed to review eligibility requirements, economic necessity, temporary/seasonal qualifying activities, processing, and other factors related to migrant eligibility. The SEA evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revises the ID&R plan and procedures on a continuing basis. All COEs are submitted and processed within the SEA, and the state director reviews and signs all COEs before they are processed electronically.

The ID&R training for the recruiter hired in 2012 included a review of the Non-Regulatory Guidance (NRG), the National Certificate of Eligibility, the Delaware Supplemental form, the Office of Migrant Education Training Modules, the Texas ID&R manual, the Colorado ID&R manual, and a review of previously completed COEs. The training was completed over the course of one-two weeks in June 2012. The State MEP Director visited migrant camps with the recruiter to model interviewing of families and to ensure accurate completion of the COEs. Training and clarification is provided as needed to the new recruiter.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The re-interviewing was conducted by the migrant summer school staff during the summer of 2012. The re-interviewing was scheduled to occur during the time of the summer project in order to be able to reach the families while they were still in the state. Due to our numbers, there is a 100% reinterview - not a sampling. The re-interview teams were trained on migrant eligibility and provided the re-interview forms for each family/OSY and given a timeline for completion. At the conclusion of the migrant summer schools, the re-interview forms were collected and the data reviewed to determine error rates. Although there were some families who were not reached because they did not stay until the end of the season, overall the results did not indicate a problem with inaccurate eligibility determinations.

The previous school year, Delaware contracted with an outside agency to complete the reinterviews as required for every 3rd year.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT FOR CLARIFICATION: The reinterviews were conducted face to face and by telephone using a State-designed reinterview form that contained the items used to make the original determination. The original COEs were not provided to the reinterviewers to guarantee the fidelity of the reinterview results. The interviewers who conducted the reinterviews were independent because they were not a part of Delaware's migrant education program team and were from another state.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The migrant student records are updated on a regular basis throughout the school year. The State MEP Data Specialist requests school reports during the year through the report generator of NGS and compares the data to ensure information is correct. The State MEP Recruiter, State MEP Data Specialist, and State MEP Director work in close communication to ensure all data is maintained accurately. The State MEP Director reviews the reports and maintains dialogue with the recruiter and data specialist regarding the collection and maintenance of migrant data and documentation procedures.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT FOR CLARIFICATION: Delaware uses the New Generation System guidelines as provided in the NGS manual to ensure that data are entered and updated accurately. The SEA also has an internal written checklist used by the State Director, State Data Specialist, and State Recruiter with each individual COE. The checklist is completed, signed, and dated at each required stage of the COE process.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At the end of the migrant summer school, the State MEP Data Specialist ensures accuracy by manually checking the data against hard copy files. The recruiter reviews all the COEs to verify that the students are remaining in the state and are still eligible. Some specific factors, such as 2-year-olds turning 3, and 21-year-olds turning 22, are reviewed to ensure accuracy. A combination of data systems are used to assist with the data reviews: DELSIS, NGS, MSIX, and information collected through home visits form a complete data picture from which our accuracy is determined.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT FOR CLARIFICATION: The State Director reviews child counts by comparing the overall count to that of the previous year and by analyzing the grade level increases/decreases in both Category 1 and Category 2. The State Director reviews the child counts in conjunction with the SEA Data Specialist and the SEA Recruiter.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The results of the MEP re-interviewing process did not demonstrate faulty eligibility determinations. The only improvement that we noted that needs to be made is to hire a Haitian-Creole speaking recruiter as a part-time employee in the summer of 2013.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Delaware has no concerns related to either the Category 1 or Category 2 counts.