

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**

HAWAII



**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: Hawaii		
Address: P.O. Box 2360 Honolulu, Hawaii 96804		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Peter Kawamura		
Telephone: (808) 586-5367		
Fax: (808) 586-5366		
e-mail: Peter_Kawamura@notes.k12.hi.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Peter Kawamura		
		_____ Signature
		_____ Friday, March 8, 2013, 1:57:24 PM

**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.

No Revisions or changes	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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	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

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.

No Revisions or changes	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	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.

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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	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

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.

No Revisions or changes	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	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.

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	no changes	no changes	no changes
Regular Assessments in High School	no changes	no changes	no changes
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	no changes	no changes	no changes
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	NA	NA	NA
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	NA	NA	NA

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

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)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: 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	94,840	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	556	98
Asian	S	73,528	>=99
Black or African American	S	2,303	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	5,395	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	13,058	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	9,999	96
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	7,101	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	50,295	>=99
Migratory students	S	1,083	>=99
Male	S	49,123	>=99
Female	S	45,717	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	5,455	54.56
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,150	41.50
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	394	3.94
Total	9,999	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	94,837	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	557	98
Asian	S	73,519	>=99
Black or African American	S	2,304	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	5,394	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	13,063	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	10,001	96
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	7,099	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	50,290	>=99
Migratory students	S	1,082	>=99
Male	S	49,124	>=99
Female	S	45,713	>=99

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

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	
--	--

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	5,538	55.37
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,076	40.76
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	387	3.87
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	10,001	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	39,055	96
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	208	96
Asian	S	14,399	98
Black or African American	S	937	95
Hispanic or Latino	S	2,143	95
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	13,055	95
White	S	5,441	95
Two or more races	S	2,872	96
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	4,001	92
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	2,688	94
Economically disadvantaged students	S	19,801	96
Migratory students	S	432	95
Male	S	20,216	96
Female	S	18,839	97

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

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,268	56.69
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,586	39.64
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	147	3.67
Total	4,001	

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

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	14,621	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	82	S	67
Asian	11,090	S	66
Black or African American	352	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	901	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	2,196	S	77
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,335	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	963	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	7,956	S	57
Migratory students	162	S	41
Male	7,604	S	65
Female	7,017	S	69
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii used the "Federal 5" race/ethnicity categories so "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students are rolled into "Asian."			

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	14,625	S	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	82	S	67
Asian	11,093	S	68
Black or African American	352	S	71
Hispanic or Latino	901	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	2,197	S	81
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,337	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	967	S	19
Economically disadvantaged students	7,956	S	60
Migratory students	162	S	41
Male	7,607	S	65
Female	7,018	S	75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii used the "Federal 5" race/ethnicity categories so "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students are rolled into "Asian."			

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. Hawaii does not administer an achievement test in science in Grade 3			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,295	S	63
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	S	63
Asian	10,908	S	62
Black or African American	347	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	911	S	57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	2,053	S	74
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,422	S	18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	891	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	7,884	S	53
Migratory students	183	S	46
Male	7,495	S	62
Female	6,800	S	65
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii used the "Federal 5" race/ethnicity categories so "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students are rolled into "Asian."			

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	14,298	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	77	S	74
Asian	10,910	S	70
Black or African American	347	S	76
Hispanic or Latino	911	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	2,053	S	84
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,421	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	890	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	7,887	S	62
Migratory students	183	S	52
Male	7,495	S	68
Female	6,803	S	76
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii used the "Federal 5" race/ethnicity categories so "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students are rolled into "Asian."			

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	14,484	S	44
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	S	47
Asian	4,828	S	52
Black or African American	372	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	930	S	42
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5,113	S	29
White	2,114	S	62
Two or more races	1,051	S	51
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,471	S	11
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	905	S	6
Economically disadvantaged students	7,903	S	32
Migratory students	187	S	25
Male	7,600	S	45
Female	6,884	S	43
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	13,548	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	70	S	64
Asian	10,494	S	62
Black or African American	337	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	792	S	57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	1,855	S	71
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,367	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	856	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	7,246	S	53
Migratory students	162	S	35
Male	6,842	S	62
Female	6,706	S	63
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii used the "Federal 5" race/ethnicity categories so "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students are rolled into "Asian."			

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	13,552	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	70	S	77
Asian	10,494	S	69
Black or African American	338	S	72
Hispanic or Latino	792	S	72
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	1,858	S	83
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,367	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	857	S	14
Economically disadvantaged students	7,247	S	61
Migratory students	162	S	49
Male	6,844	S	67
Female	6,708	S	74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii used the "Federal 5" race/ethnicity categories so "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students are rolled into "Asian."			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
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. Hawaii did not conduct a statewide assessment in science at the Grade 5 level			

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	13,859	S	59
American Indian or Alaska Native	104	S	56
Asian	10,742	S	58
Black or African American	354	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	797	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	1,862	S	67
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,540	S	11
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,163	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	7,581	S	49
Migratory students	146	S	45
Male	7,135	S	55
Female	6,724	S	62
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii used the "Federal 5" race/ethnicity categories so "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students are rolled into "Asian."			

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	13,846	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	104	S	78
Asian	10,733	S	71
Black or African American	354	S	76
Hispanic or Latino	796	S	72
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	1,859	S	84
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,534	S	22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,161	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	7,573	S	64
Migratory students	145	S	48
Male	7,132	S	68
Female	6,714	S	78
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii used the "Federal 5" race/ethnicity categories so "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students are rolled into "Asian."			

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. The State of Hawaii does not conduct an achievement test in science at the grade 6 level.			

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	13,127	S	56
American Indian or Alaska Native	91	S	49
Asian	10,256	S	55
Black or African American	342	S	50
Hispanic or Latino	754	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	1,684	S	68
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,563	S	12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,344	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	7,113	S	46
Migratory students	167	S	32
Male	6,944	S	54
Female	6,183	S	59
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii used the "Federal 5" race/ethnicity categories so "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students are rolled into "Asian."			

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	13,126	S	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	91	S	70
Asian	10,253	S	67
Black or African American	342	S	76
Hispanic or Latino	755	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	1,685	S	84
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,566	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,348	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	7,117	S	60
Migratory students	167	S	44
Male	6,946	S	65
Female	6,180	S	76
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii used the "Federal 5" race/ethnicity categories so "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students are rolled into "Asian."			

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.			

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	12,774	S	59
American Indian or Alaska Native	75	S	55
Asian	10,142	S	58
Black or African American	291	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	643	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	1,623	S	68
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,445	S	13
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,230	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	6,584	S	50
Migratory students	148	S	42
Male	6,641	S	57
Female	6,133	S	61
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	12,782	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	75	S	75
Asian	10,149	S	70
Black or African American	291	S	77
Hispanic or Latino	643	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	1,624	S	84
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,449	S	21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,231	S	25
Economically disadvantaged students	6,588	S	62
Migratory students	148	S	55
Male	6,645	S	66
Female	6,137	S	78
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	12,719	S	31
American Indian or Alaska Native	77	S	31
Asian	4,752	S	37
Black or African American	298	S	26
Hispanic or Latino	648	S	29
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4,334	S	17
White	1,641	S	48
Two or more races	969	S	35
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,418	S	5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,214	S	5
Economically disadvantaged students	6,507	S	22
Migratory students	142	S	20
Male	6,595	S	32
Female	6,124	S	30
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	12,616	S	46
American Indian or Alaska Native	58	S	40
Asian	9,896	S	45
Black or African American	280	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	597	S	38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	1,785	S	52
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,327	S	8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	654	S	14
Economically disadvantaged students	5,931	S	37
Migratory students	115	S	21
Male	6,462	S	43
Female	6,154	S	49
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	12,608	S	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	58	S	79
Asian	9,887	S	67
Black or African American	280	S	74
Hispanic or Latino	596	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	1,787	S	83
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,327	S	23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	645	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	5,922	S	60
Migratory students	115	S	48
Male	6,455	S	66
Female	6,153	S	74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	11,852	S	22
American Indian or Alaska Native	55	S	18
Asian	4,819	S	26
Black or African American	267	S	18
Hispanic or Latino	565	S	19
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3,608	S	10
White	1,686	S	35
Two or more races	852	S	23
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,112	S	2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	569	S	2
Economically disadvantaged students	5,391	S	15
Migratory students	103	S	5
Male	6,021	S	22
Female	5,831	S	22
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	286	139	48.60
Districts	1		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	219	95	43.38
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	201	88	43.78
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	18	7	38.89
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not applicable. Hawaii does not allocate to districts nor identifies districts as making AYP or not. # Districts = 1 # Districts that made AYP = 0 Percentage = 0%		

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	3
Extension of the school year or school day	2
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	4
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	3
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	5
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Hawaii does not identify districts for improvement or corrective action.

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	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii does not identify district in corrective action.	

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.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	0
Schools	33	6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	08/24/12
---	----------

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. 4.0% of the FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocation was reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*.

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.

The major purpose of the evaluation was to monitor the America Recovery and Reinvestment Act School Improvement Grant (SIG) and 1003(g) School Improvement Grant program implementation at the six project schools in reference to the program goals and objectives and the degree to which the programs were able to raise student achievement. For the purposes of this evaluation the primary achievement indicator was student performance on the Hawaii State Assessment (HSA).

The project schools included: Naalehu Elementary, Keonepoko Elementary, Kau High and Pahala Elementary, Hawaii School for the Deaf and Blind, Haaula Elementary, and Kamaile Academy.

The evaluation team developed and implemented a quasi-experimental design consisting of the following features: 1) Selected group of comparison schools match to the SIG schools on demographic variables (i.e. geographic location, school size) with the goal of identifying causal conclusions about effects of the HSA scores in Total Reading and Total Math in grades 4, 8, and 10; 2) Identified a set of students within the comparison schools to create an appropriate matched comparison group.

The evaluation team consisted of a cadre of evaluators and data specialist from the Curriculum research and Development Group (CRDG) of the University of Hawaii. The evaluation team reviewed available reports (desk reviews, comprehensive needs assessment reports, comprehensive provider reports) about project implementation for descriptive evaluative information about the implementation of the SIG model.

The evaluation used school demographic data for 2011-2012 as the context for project implementation. HSA Total Reading and Total Math scores were to be used as outcome indicators at the SIG schools and matched comparison schools.

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.

School identified for improvement, corrective action, restructuring schools or school that just exited from NCLB status were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds. The State Legislature provided Biennium funds to support these school. In addition, SIG schools, the persistently low performing schools in Tier I and the Tier III schools received funds from American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	91,895
Applied to transfer	908
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	908
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*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 64,291

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

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

³ Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	48,893
Applied for supplemental educational services	11,431
Received supplemental educational services	8,600
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 11,431 Supplemental Educational Services applications were received. 8,600 parent/student completed the Supplemental Educational Services process and received free tutoring services.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 6,478,776
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Figures are accurate as reported.	

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	27,194	23,723	87.24	3,471	12.76
All elementary classes	5,442	5,295	97.30	147	2.70
All secondary classes	21,752	18,428	84.72	3,324	15.28

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.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	16.30
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	29.30
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	54.40
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

none

	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)	35.10
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	39.90
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

none

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	1,190	1,153	96.89
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	1,336	1,309	97.98
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	3,647	2,938	80.56
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	6,740	5,820	86.35

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	65.30	35.60
Poverty metric used	Free, reduced or certified lunch count.	
Secondary schools	63.00	37.80
Poverty metric used	Free, reduced or certified lunch count.	

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"/> No	Dual language	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Two-way immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Transitional bilingual programs	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Heritage language	
<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.

Content Area Tutoring is another type of program.

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	19,909
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 who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	19,848
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data include recently exited ELLs and students returned to ELL but excludes students where parents refused ELL services. Students received ELL and Title III Program support during school year 2011-12.	

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
Iloko	3,347
Chuukese	1,814
Marshallese	1,585
Tagalog	1,296
Spanish; Castilian	819

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The counts above are of active ELLs who are not being monitored.
--

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).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	18,368
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,480
Total	19,848
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not all LEP students served were tested because they arrived after the test window, were absent, or could not be tested during the test window.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	4,894
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	24.66
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.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	18,368
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,480
Total	19,848
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not all students who were served during the 201-12 school year (total number of Title III students--19848) were also tested because they arrived after the test window, were absent, or could not be tested during the test window.	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for 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).

	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	4,380

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:

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- 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.
- 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	8,527	60.96	10,345	74.00
Attained proficiency	4,894	26.64	2,580	13.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

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

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)
N/A
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A

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)
N/A
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A

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)
N/A
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A

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
5,663	2,923	8,586
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
5,347	S	68	S
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
5,347	S	77	S
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
2,055	S	29	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

////////////////////////////////////	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	1
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	1
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	0
////////////////////////////////////	
# - 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)	1

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

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	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
2,781	2,016	1

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction 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.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	252
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	237

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 LEA continues to desire to have more full-time equivalent, ELL licensed teachers. Currently, only a very small percentage of ELL teachers are TESOL/ESL licensed, but most have taken additional ESL course work. The state is working on developing a database system to assist in tracking teacher progress in meeting state ELL credit requirements. It also hopes to work the Hawaii teacher standards board in establishing ELL requirements around re-licensing or ELL certificate opportunities. Along this line the OCISS LEA is also working with institutions of higher education to ensure pre- service teachers have a more solid foundation on working with ELLs, or can even be dual licensed with ESL upon graduation.

* 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	////////////////////
Instructional strategies for LEP students	1	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students		////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	1	////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	1	////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers		////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	1	////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	1	723
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	1	279
PD provided to principals	1	28
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	1	31
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	1	189
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	23
Total	6	1,273

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following were additional examples of topics where PD was offered related to ELs: Parent involvement, ELLs with disabilities, Common Core State Standards--Implications for ELL students, etc.

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
07/01/11	12/15/11	167
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. HIDOE is a unitary system; both the SEA and LEA. Title III funds were allocated to the entity functioning as the "subgrantee" on December 15, 2011. The LEA Plan required multiple revisions to ensure funding could be provided.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The HIDOE is a unitary system. The HIDOE implemented a Title III reorganization on January 3, 2012. This HIDOE change provides, among other things, oversight by the office implementing the SEA functions to ensure funds are available and distributed to the entity responsible for implementing the LEA/Subgrantee functions in a timely manner.

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	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 Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	0	0
LEAs with subgrants	1	1
Total	1	1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii is a single SEA/LEA. Data is as accurate as reported.		

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)		41
K		357
1		295
2		223
3		209
4		205
5		203
6		195
7		171
8		156
9		160
10		107
11		72
12		69
Ungraded		2
Total		2,465

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii is a single SEA/LEA. Data is as accurate as reported.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care		888
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)		1,334
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)		226
Hotels/Motels		17
Total		2,465

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii is a single SEA/LEA. Data is as accurate as reported.

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	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	41
K	357
1	295
2	223
3	209
4	205
5	203
6	195
7	171
8	156
9	160
10	107
11	72
12	69
Ungraded	2
Total	2,465
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii is a single SEA/LEA. Data is as accurate as reported.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	18
Migratory children/youth	27
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	423
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	547
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii is a single SEA/LEA. Data is as accurate as reported.	

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	191	80
4	198	99
5	181	80
6	185	89
7	152	67
8	139	64
High School	89	35

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii is a single SEA/LEA. Data is as accurate as reported.

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	191	59
4	198	70
5	180	56
6	185	62
7	153	47
8	140	43
High School	90	21

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii is a single SEA/LEA. Data is as accurate as reported.

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	200	46
5		
6		
7		
8	139	14
High School	76	5

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Hawaii is a single SEA/LEA. Data is as accurate as reported.

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)	231
K	197
1	209
2	178
3	168
4	195
5	171
6	150
7	172
8	153
9	134
10	121
11	114
12	42
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	2,235

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. After the submittal of the Part I data for Section 1.10.1 we noticed that the figures for the Grade 7 was incorrect. Error was due to incorrect grade level that was noted for the student in our MIS2000 system. This was an oversight on our part. We then sent a request to the Office of Migrant Education (OME) requesting to change the figures in Grade 5, 7, and 8 to match the corrected data. Data to be changed when the Part I window reopens. Ed Monaghan from OME responded in an email on 1/29/13 that approval was given to change the data. Data to be changed:

Grade 5 from 172 students to 171

Grade 7 from 165 students to 172

Grade 8 from 159 students to 153

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.

Over the last five years, we have had an increase in the number of eligible students who qualified for the migrant education program. This increase is due in part to the intense emphasis we placed on our ID&R efforts. By being able to hire more recruiters for our school complexes and the efforts of the schools to send out migrant surveys, this has allowed us to reach out to more eligible families that we missed in the past. This is evident on the island of Kauai where we now have two migrant education recruiters who have been recruiting the island on a consistent basis when in the past we were very inconsistent with our recruiting efforts due to the numerous change over in recruiters. This consistency has played a factor in the recruiters developing a relationship with the schools and the families of the areas that they serve. This has helped to build on the relationship that was established by the state office with the administrators at each of these schools that are serviced. Another factor in the increase in our enrollment has been the down turn of our economy where we are finding more "local" families who are now turning to do the work of a migratory family just to make ends meet. This is evident in the fishing industry where a lot of the local families are now doing fishing type activities as part of their subsistence for living. This would not of been the case if jobs in our state were plentiful. Finally, an additional factor that helped with our increase in our count from the previous years was that the MEP staff was able to communicate with the community about the MEP program and the eligibility requirements of this program under NCLB.

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)	12
K	37
1	39
2	24
3	27
4	30
5	12
6	5
7	4
8	2
9	14
10	16
11	15
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	238

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data is accurate as reported by the sites. Data is collected from the state At Risk Worksheet that each site completes annually. This year's summer break was for 8 weeks while in the past it was shortened to only 6 weeks due to furloughs and a modified school year calendar. By going to 8 weeks, the Department of Education was hoping that more students would take advantage of the additional summer weeks to attend summer school for credit recovery, credit accrual, or enrichment type activities. A challenge for our sites has been the high cost of bus transportation for the rural communities which most of our programs are located in. As the cost of fuel continues to rise with Hawaii having the highest or one of the highest cost per gallon for fuel, the cost for summer transportation rises as well. Especially if the student has to travel far to get to a summer program from their home.

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.

Prior to the summer of 2010, a significant factor that all of our schools in our state experienced was a shorter summer break due to Hawaii's movement to a single year calendar for all schools. The summer break was shortened to six weeks rather than the normal eight weeks. This did not leave much time for schools to run a summer program across the state. If a summer program was run, it was more for enrichment purposes rather than assisting with academics.

Since Summer 2010, the Hawaii Department of Education went back to an eight week summer break to give students more time to make up lost class time due to the teacher furlough days that were implemented during the 2009-2010 school year. The statewide school calendar was changed to accommodate this new summer calendar for the 2010-2011 and beyond. Some schools struggled with these changes in offering summer school classes because of the lack of staffing and facilities maintenance and repair schedules. Another issue is the rise in the fuel cost in our state has led to a higher cost in bus transportation. This is especially true in the rural areas where most of our sites are located.

Our 2011-12 data shows that 54% of our MEP schools had a summer sponsored program for that school year while in 2010-11 55% of the schools had a summer sponsored program.

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.

Hawaii utilizes appropriately coded historical data from the MIS2000 system to generate the 2011-12 child count report. The MIS2000 Snap report for table C-7 was used to compile the Category 1 and Category 2 child count. MIS2000 was also used to check for duplicates by matching data elements and adjustments were made. Over-age students and those turning 3 years of age were similarly flagged via the system. All two year-olds turning 3 years of age during the count dates were moved up and included in the 3-21 year age range for count purposes. Category 2 counts were verified through documentation provided through enrollment lists, attendance rosters, etc. from the schools. Periodic checks of status reports were conducted to determine accuracy of coded information. In addition, Hawaii's state-wide student enrollment system (SSES) and the Hawaii Department of Education's Longitudinal Data System (LDS) was used to verify enrollment, withdrawal, and demographic data. A special team of MEP hired personnel was trained in the identification and recruitment process in our state, and they verified residency during the count period and documented new qualifying moves by completing a new COE. In addition, Hawaii required recruiters to contact migrant families annually, at minimum, and to record contact information/status in the appropriate section of the COE. All changes and new information is entered into the MIS2000 system throughout the year prior to generating the child count reports. The LDS system is checked monthly to make sure that any movement of migrant students within the state is captured and changes made to the data in MIS2000. A thorough manual review of child count lists is conducted by program staff prior to submittal to this report.

Hawaii utilizes the MIS2000 system to manage the state's data and to generate its 2010-11 count report for last year. MIS2000 was used to check for duplicates and a total count. The SSES and the LDS information system in the Hawaii Department of Education was new at the time and were used as a verification of data. Hence, the same system was used for both reporting periods.

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 inputted in the MIS2000 database system reflects the information documented on the state approved Hawaii Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form. This COE form matches the requirements of the national COE form and was implemented beginning September 2009. The data collected included: Parent and Child Data (name, date of birth, gender, race, place of birth, parent's or guardian's names, physical and/or mailing address, student identification number); Eligibility Data (QAD, residency date, termination date, withdrawal date, qualifying activity, where the family moved to and from); School information (enrollment date, withdrawal date, enrollment type (regular/summer), grade, name of facility); Other (worker's name, whether the child moved with, to join, or on his or her own, type of work, i.e. seasonal, temporary, or fishing related, interviewer's name, who the information was obtained from, assurance that parents were informed of the Family Rights and Privacy Act, interviewer's signature, reviewer's initials, date interview was conducted, SEA certification).

During the 2011-2012 count period, MEP staff and the MEP recruiters made telephone or personal face-to-face contact with families to verify information, determine continued eligibility, and to validate new qualifying moves. All data on new qualifying moves was documented on state-approved COE's. In addition, the MEP recruiters and the MEP staff verified residency dates, enrollment/withdrawal dates for the school year, summer enrollment/withdrawal dates, and supplemental services provided to students. Recruiters, MEP staff, and ID&R team also contacted school clerks and registrars for status updates on previously qualified students and to obtain lists of newly-arrived potential eligibles for follow-up. Churches, farms, agricultural businesses, co-ops, farm labor contractors, university extension personnel, applicable state agencies, human resources leaders and community organizations were also contacted for referrals.

Hawaii recruiters meet with the MEP Director and ID&R Coordinator monthly to review eligibility criteria and eligibility lists. Individual recruiters met with the ID&R coordinator on a monthly basis and in between meeting dates on an at needs basis. Data is updated into MIS2000 on a regular basis by the SEA MEP Data Coordinator who manages the data base. Each night the MIS2000 system uploads the data into the Hawaii Department of Education Longitudinal Data System (LDS) so that the eligible MEP students are accurately identified. Recruiters are provided with a list of all eligible students in the State to assist them in their recruitment efforts. Schools receive a monthly encrypted list from the State MEP Office so that they are made aware of any newly enrolled MEP students in their school or whose eligibility may have changed. All families with soon to expire QAD dates are contacted to determine if a new qualifying move has occurred. In addition, Hawaii added another field to the MIS2000 record system to include the name of the recruiter for each COE for quick and easy reference. This has significantly improved efficiency whenever questions have arisen that required recruiter verification or input.

The matching data elements that are used to search for duplicates include: Student ID number, data of birth, family and sibling names.

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.

All information was recorded on the state COE form where recruiters also noted questions and explanation regarding eligibility in the comment section. Recruiters signed the COEs and the original and triplicate NCR copies were forwarded to the SEA. Upon receipt, the SEA reviewed the COE, verified information contained by comparing it to the State SSSES system, and certified eligibility by signing them. The original white copy of the COE was retained by the SEA for their files and the triplicate NCR copies forwarded back to the recruiters for their files.

Throughout the year and before the end of the school year, recruiters made contact with their families and recorded status information in the appropriate section of the NCR copies of the COE, noting contact date, eligibility status and initialed them. They then forwarded the first NCR copy to the SEA with changes and status noted. This copy was added to the SEA original file. If a change in status required a new COE, this information was noted on the NCR copy and a new COE was completed and forwarded with it. The process was repeated each year throughout the three-year eligibility period until the original and three copies were on file at the SEA or until a new COE was generated for a new qualifying move

The SEA MEP Data Coordinator, who serves as the data records clerk, inputted all COE information and student participation in regular and summer term into the MIS2000 database system, enabling her to maintain the system and generate all

necessary reports. She also periodically checks the State LDS system to see if any new movement of students may have occurred between schools or islands.

The State Migrant Education Resource Teacher and the SEA MEP Secretary reviewed the COEs which are then forwarded to the State Director for final review and signature. This final signature certified eligibility. In the absence of the State Director, the State Identification and Recruitment Resource Teacher has authority to certify student for eligibility.

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.

Hawaii developed an Excel spreadsheet with drop down menus that is forwarded electronically to all schools to report MEP funded services students received during the regular school year and summer terms. These are returned to the SEA electronically and encrypted where a master spreadsheet is maintained for use in preparing child count an the Consolidated State Performance Reports as well as a basis for data collection for input into the MIS2000 system.

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.

The MIS2000 is a unique database system with built-in features that assure that a child is counted only once. To comply with those features, a meticulous effort is made to code each child appropriately as per the COE information, verifying enrollment, withdrawal and other demographic data with our Statewide Student Enrollment System (SSES) so that the system can generate accurate child count reports that meet the five (5) criteria mentioned above. The SEA migrant data coordinator is the only individual permitted to input data into the system ensuring that the data is inputted and coded accurately and consistently. Each student is coded in either the regular "R" or summer "S" enrollment type.

The SEA migrant data coordinator maintains direct communication with MIS2000 staff that created special reports assuring that only the students meeting the criteria for the child count reports are included.

A C7 12-Month List report generates lists of students between ages 3-21, who are within 3 years of their QAD, and who had a Residency, QAD, Withdraw date, Enroll date, or Term date during the date range requested of 9/1/2011 and 8/31/2012, and have a regular "R" enroll type.

A C7 Summer List report was also created that generates a list of students with the same criteria as the 12 month list but who were coded with summer "S" enroll type and who were coded with a supplemental count vice provided to them (e.g. summer school, preschool, etc.)

Families are contacted either by phone or through the school's MEP coordinator or designee. Letters are sent out to the families from the MEP office in cases where we are not able to make contact with the family via a phone or in person interview.

The recertification process happens through out the year. Hawaii MEP recruiters start off with those families whose COE is expiring in the current year and a meeting is conducted to see if a qualifying move has been made. Hawaii's COE form is an NCR form which has colored copies for each subsequent year of eligibility. The recruiter follows up with each family on the subsequent year's form and logs down whether or not a qualifying move was made that year. If a new move was made, then a new COE is initiated. Data is reviewed and compared in the MIS2000 system along with the migrant data that is in the Hawaii Department of Education's Longitudinal Data System to eliminate and ensure that there are no duplicate students. Additional data is provided through the MSIX data base when a question on student data is sent back to us from that system. Our data coordinator takes care of these duplicating errors if any.

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.

Hawaii developed an Excel spreadsheet with drop down menus that is forwarded electronically to all schools to report MEP funded services students received during the regular school year and summer terms. These are returned to the SEA electronically where a master spreadsheet is maintained for use in preparing child count and consolidated performance reports as well as a basis for data collection for input into the MIS2000 system.

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.

Hawaii has a state COE approval process to ensure that only eligible children are entered into the MIS2000 database system. A standard COE is used statewide that matches the national COE. The first quality control measure is to ensure that all recruiters participate in a comprehensive recruiter-training program. A recruiter must have at least 20 hours of training prior to being certified as a Hawaii migrant recruiter. Recruiters receive annual eight-hour review sessions before the start of the new school year to review basic eligibility criterion. The SEA also meet with recruiters monthly to allow recruiters to review eligibility criteria to strengthen their recruitment skills, and to network and share new information and ideas.

The State COE approval process has several steps to ensure the eligibility of migrant children identified and included in the annual count:

1. The recruiter completes and signs a state approved COE form after a face-to-face or telephone interview including all the information requested on the form; as well as any additional comments that may assist in determining eligibility.
2. The recruiter submits the original and triplicate NCR COE signed forms to the SEA ID&R coordinator who checks that all the necessary information is present.
3. If there are questionable areas or additional information needed to determine eligibility, the ID&R coordinator returns the COE to the recruiter.
4. The recruiter obtains the necessary information and re-submits the COE form.
5. The SEA Data Records Clerk verifies the demographic information through the Statewide Student Enrollment System (SSES) and then forwards the COE to the state resource teacher and program director for final approval and signatures.
6. The SEA Data Records Clerk enters the information in the MIS2000 database system.
7. Three signed copies of the COE are forwarded to the recruiter for his or her files.
8. The SEA Data Records Clerk works with the SEA MEP Secretary to file the original copy of the COE in the SEA file.
9. The same process is followed as new qualifying move dates are entered.
10. The SEA Director is the final authority for resolving eligibility issues at the local and state level.

Hawaii also incorporated a checklist targeting key eligibility criteria that must be completed by the recruiter and attached to each new COE. Recruiters review and update checklist information whenever parent contact is made throughout the year. Copies of checklists are forwarded to the SEA and placed in the COE file after review and verification by the SEA.

Even though these quality control procedures have several checks and balances and involve several different people, the SEA provides a final check by selecting a random sample of COEs to verify information and documentation.

Information received from the random sampling serves as a basis for future procedural revisions. For the 2011-12 school year, the random sample verification provided a zero defect rate on the COEs that were reviewed.

A record of all quality improvement actions are maintained at the SEA. Identification and recruitment practices of individual recruiters are monitored regularly and all inputted information is reviewed on a regular basis. Whenever questions or discrepancies are noted, the SEA follows up by contacting families for verification.

For summer/intersession projects, the SEA reviews student attendance records and makes on-site visits to selected projects. The SEA also randomly selects a family for re-interview by telephone or personal visit for quality control.

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.

During the 2011-2012, the SEA conducted a prospective reinterview of eligible families with a goal of verifying 30 randomly selected COEs to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. The procedures used was as follows: Hawaii (DOE) Migrant Education Program completed the following process:

1. Informed administrators / MEP coordinators about the re-interviewing process in November, 2011
2. Informed MEP families regarding future contacting

3. Random sample list completed in collaboration with State Department of Education and MIS2000 in November 2011
4. An independent re-interviewer hired in November 2011. Weekly evaluations completed with the re-interviewer
5. Interview protocol completed documenting process through training that was completed in November 2011. Cluster student COE's within same family
6. Training of re-interviewer completed in November 2011 to reflect 20 hours of training workshop
7. Interview's ignited December 2011 with completion goal of mid February 2012
8. Final re-grouping with re-interviewer completed January 2012 unfolding the documentation / results / conclusion of the "Prospective" interviewing process
9. January 2012 discuss with MEP director complied results

After completing 20 hours of training the re-interviewer began communicating with families through a three process protocol:

1. Utilize two phone attempts, leave message to return call
2. After two attempts, forward letter of attempt to family
3. After two phone attempts and letter, compete face to face by leave a door message with school or home of student

Results of the prospective reinterviewing:

1. 150 names were provided to the reinterviewer through a random sampling process.
2. 30 families were contacted for the reinterviewing following the random sampling order.
3. All 30 families were found to be eligible for the migrant program.

Reasons for non-responses were two factors: 1) Change of residence; and 2) No response from family as the phone numbers have changed or a pre-paid cell phone was used when the original COE was conducted. If the reinterviewer was not able to contact the family after several tries, she contacted the next family on the random sampling list.

State Directors were told at an OME State Director's meeting that if you are a small state, you can use a minimum of 30 students instead of the 50. This was because of budgeting concerns and the sample size that small states have to work with.

Note: This was an annual (non-independent) prospective re-interview. Due to a limited budget as a small state, we did not have enough funds set aside to do an independent reinterview and to procure the services of an independent reviewer. Monies are now being set aside to have this independent reinterview done during the 2013-14 school year.

2.

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.

For accuracy of child count data, periodic status reports are generated from the MIS2000 system. SEA staff reviews the information to check for accuracy, verify QAD, and qualifying move dates by comparing the information with COE records on file. Additionally, SEA staff checks to determine if services students received were appropriately coded.

All necessary updates in family and student data were inputted into the MIS2000 system. The completed C7 Snap Report, incorporated by MIS2000, was used to generate the 2011-2012 child count reports for both the Category 1 and Category 2.

Quality checks provided the basis for auditing child count records and data for accuracy. In addition, the Hawaii COE includes a section requiring documentation of annual contacts with families to review eligibility status.

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.

SEA staff met with recruiters in July to review child count information and provide them with status reports that included anniversary dates of all children assigned to their complexes. Recruiters and MEP Staff contacted the families for another personal interview to verify student and eligibility information. If the child was not in school, the recruiter/MEP Staff/school office staff verified that the child was a resident and present in the State during the child count period. Updates were forwarded to the records clerk for system input. As a final check, the SEA does a thorough manual review of child count data prior to submittal of the child count report to OME to ensure that the data submitted is accurate.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Based on the recertification process that was done during the 2006-2007 school year, a ID&R training plan was developed for the 2007-2008 school year and modified each year there after based on the current needs. An integral piece of this plan was the hiring of more recruiters for those areas that had a high population of migrant families settling in that area. The need was to assign a recruiter to each complex of schools so that they became a contact point for our schools. Monthly meeting with these recruiters by the ID&R Coordinator has help to enhance their awareness of the migrant population in their community and provided them updates in the ID&R process. In addition to this, monthly meetings with the MEP staff and/or the principal at the school level has helped to facilitate an awareness of the ID&R process so that the school level personnel can assist the recruiters in identifying those families in need of migrant services. The implementation of this plan is evident by the increase in our migrant student count for the last five years, including the 2011-2012 school year.

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.

No concerns in the accuracy of the reported child count. The numbers reported are as accurate as stated.