

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**

IOWA



**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: Iowa Department of Education	
Address: 400 East 14th Street Des Moines, IA 50319.0146	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Janell Brandhorst	
Telephone: 515-281-3033	
Fax: 515-242-5988	
e-mail: janell.brandhorst@iowa.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jason Glass	
_____	Friday, March 8, 2013, 2:06:46 PM
Signature	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

State has revised or changed	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.

Academic Content Standards	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
	2009-10	2009-10	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

Two pieces of Iowa legislation, Senate File 245 (May 2005) and Senate File 588 (May 2007) established a voluntary Model Core Curriculum, which included essential concepts and skills in Reading, Mathematics, and Science. These were intended to serve as additional technical assistance to the Iowa Core Content Standards. In 2008, the legislature proposed that the Iowa Core Curriculum be fully implemented by all schools; the Governor signed this piece of legislation into law in May 2008. The essential concepts in literacy and mathematics were replaced with the Common Core State Standards and some Iowa-specific standards in July 2010 through State Board action. Thus, the Iowa Core Standards in Literacy and Mathematics are now our state-adopted standards. But we continue to identify the Science Content Standards as our state standards.

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

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

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

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

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

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12
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	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13

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

<p>Academic achievement standars for regular assessments in grades 3-8 and 11 have been changed to reflect the new Iowa Assessments. The standards are now based on National Standard Score and are variable by grade, test period, and subject. More information about the Iowa Assessments and cut scores can be found at: https://itp.education.uiowa.edu/ia/AYPInformation.aspx.</p>
<p>Academic achievement standards for alternate assessments in grades 3-8 and 11 are changed to reflect revised performance level descriptors and cut scores.</p>

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.

State has revised or changed	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	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12
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

Rather than using the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and the Iowa Tests of Educational Development, the State is now using the new Iowa Assessments. More information about the Iowa Assessments and cut scores can be found at: <https://itp.education.uiowa.edu/ia/AYPInformation.aspx>.

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)	37.00
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	63.00
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	Yes
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	Yes
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	Yes
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	243,989	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,110	>=99
Asian	S	5,198	>=99
Black or African American	S	12,305	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	21,296	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	376	>=99
White	S	197,719	>=99
Two or more races	S	5,985	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	33,137	>=99
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	S	11,188	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	97,504	>=99
Migratory students	S	341	>=99
Male	S	125,067	>=99
Female	S	118,922	>=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	4,521	13.64
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,762	80.76
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,854	5.59
Total	33,137	////////////////////
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	243,834	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,114	>=99
Asian	S	5,144	>=99
Black or African American	S	12,284	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	21,240	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	375	>=99
White	S	197,691	>=99
Two or more races	S	5,986	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	33,127	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	11,034	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	97,407	>=99
Migratory students	S	334	>=99
Male	S	124,977	>=99
Female	S	118,857	>=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	4,502	13.59
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,755	80.76
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,870	5.64
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	33,127	////////////////////
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	240,174	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,087	>=99
Asian	S	5,100	>=99
Black or African American	S	12,115	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	20,866	97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	368	>=99
White	S	194,747	>=99
Two or more races	S	5,891	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	31,626	94
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	10,940	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	95,538	97
Migratory students	S	341	>=99
Male	S	122,925	98
Female	S	117,249	>=99

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	4,496	14.22
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,383	83.42
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	747	2.36
Total	31,626	////////////////////

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	35,142	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	158	S	72
Asian	817	S	83
Black or African American	1,889	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	3,362	S	67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	55	S	58
White	27,928	S	82
Two or more races	933	S	73
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,455	S	51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,347	S	61
Economically disadvantaged students	15,216	S	68
Migratory students	59	S	59
Male	18,011	S	79
Female	17,131	S	78
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	35,110	S	76
American Indian or Alaska Native	158	S	61
Asian	811	S	78
Black or African American	1,879	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	3,354	S	59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	55	S	53
White	27,921	S	80
Two or more races	932	S	70
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,450	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,326	S	50
Economically disadvantaged students	15,189	S	64
Migratory students	58	S	47
Male	17,989	S	73
Female	17,121	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	33,314	S	83
American Indian or Alaska Native	146	S	72
Asian	763	S	82
Black or African American	1,809	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	3,190	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	51	S	55
White	26,470	S	87
Two or more races	885	S	78
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,024	S	64
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,255	S	63
Economically disadvantaged students	14,360	S	73
Migratory students			
Male	16,988	S	83
Female	16,326	S	83
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	34,707	S	77
American Indian or Alaska Native	158	S	62
Asian	775	S	79
Black or African American	1,813	S	47
Hispanic or Latino	3,322	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	46
White	27,597	S	81
Two or more races	983	S	68
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,815	S	47
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,164	S	58
Economically disadvantaged students	14,899	S	66
Migratory students	45	S	51
Male	17,858	S	78
Female	16,849	S	76
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	34,679	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	159	S	62
Asian	768	S	72
Black or African American	1,812	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	3,312	S	57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	42
White	27,585	S	78
Two or more races	984	S	65
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,809	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,142	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	14,881	S	61
Migratory students	45	S	40
Male	17,844	S	72
Female	16,835	S	75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	33,461	S	83
American Indian or Alaska Native	150	S	69
Asian	750	S	80
Black or African American	1,762	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	3,142	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	56	S	64
White	26,645	S	87
Two or more races	956	S	77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,389	S	62
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,069	S	62
Economically disadvantaged students	14,188	S	74
Migratory students			
Male	17,194	S	84
Female	16,267	S	83
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	34,897	S	77
American Indian or Alaska Native	156	S	56
Asian	703	S	78
Black or African American	1,800	S	50
Hispanic or Latino	3,191	S	63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	55	S	69
White	28,063	S	81
Two or more races	929	S	72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,055	S	43
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,885	S	53
Economically disadvantaged students	14,657	S	65
Migratory students	51	S	67
Male	17,825	S	78
Female	17,072	S	77
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	34,876	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	157	S	57
Asian	696	S	69
Black or African American	1,798	S	47
Hispanic or Latino	3,184	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	55	S	64
White	28,058	S	77
Two or more races	928	S	71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,051	S	34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,868	S	40
Economically disadvantaged students	14,645	S	61
Migratory students	50	S	42
Male	17,809	S	71
Female	17,067	S	76
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	34,871	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	155	S	55
Asian	703	S	68
Black or African American	1,795	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	3,188	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	55	S	64
White	28,047	S	80
Two or more races	928	S	69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,037	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,882	S	42
Economically disadvantaged students	14,645	S	63
Migratory students			
Male	17,803	S	76
Female	17,068	S	74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	35,261	S	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	154	S	53
Asian	810	S	75
Black or African American	1,841	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	3,203	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	46
White	28,314	S	74
Two or more races	880	S	66
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,043	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,582	S	34
Economically disadvantaged students	14,516	S	55
Migratory students	55	S	51
Male	18,143	S	71
Female	17,118	S	70
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	35,248	S	64
American Indian or Alaska Native	154	S	45
Asian	801	S	63
Black or African American	1,837	S	35
Hispanic or Latino	3,192	S	42
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	37
White	28,325	S	68
Two or more races	880	S	60
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,048	S	22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,559	S	19
Economically disadvantaged students	14,503	S	48
Migratory students	54	S	31
Male	18,136	S	62
Female	17,112	S	66
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	34,960	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	154	S	62
Asian	802	S	75
Black or African American	1,821	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	3,171	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	58	S	53
White	28,079	S	78
Two or more races	875	S	72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,753	S	40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,558	S	39
Economically disadvantaged students	14,344	S	61
Migratory students			
Male	17,955	S	76
Female	17,005	S	72
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	35,144	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	163	S	61
Asian	679	S	84
Black or African American	1,786	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	2,981	S	61
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	56	S	59
White	28,649	S	82
Two or more races	830	S	70
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,936	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,265	S	42
Economically disadvantaged students	14,025	S	64
Migratory students	48	S	60
Male	18,044	S	77
Female	17,100	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	35,110	S	66
American Indian or Alaska Native	163	S	46
Asian	667	S	68
Black or African American	1,781	S	39
Hispanic or Latino	2,972	S	46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	56	S	52
White	28,641	S	71
Two or more races	830	S	58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,933	S	22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,237	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	14,009	S	51
Migratory students	48	S	35
Male	18,029	S	64
Female	17,081	S	69
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	34,826	S	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	S	49
Asian	669	S	73
Black or African American	1,764	S	40
Hispanic or Latino	2,952	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	56	S	59
White	28,403	S	74
Two or more races	821	S	62
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,632	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,241	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	13,865	S	55
Migratory students			
Male	17,853	S	71
Female	16,973	S	69
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	35,108	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	158	S	53
Asian	722	S	79
Black or African American	1,763	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	2,888	S	54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	45	S	58
White	28,721	S	77
Two or more races	811	S	65
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,854	S	28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,147	S	33
Economically disadvantaged students	13,581	S	58
Migratory students	38	S	50
Male	18,003	S	73
Female	17,105	S	73
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	35,074	S	65
American Indian or Alaska Native	159	S	45
Asian	714	S	65
Black or African American	1,760	S	36
Hispanic or Latino	2,875	S	46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	45	S	47
White	28,709	S	69
Two or more races	812	S	58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,851	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,117	S	18
Economically disadvantaged students	13,561	S	49
Migratory students	36	S	33
Male	17,983	S	63
Female	17,091	S	67
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	35,073	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	158	S	55
Asian	722	S	74
Black or African American	1,761	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	2,883	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	45	S	56
White	28,694	S	79
Two or more races	810	S	65
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,827	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,146	S	34
Economically disadvantaged students	13,557	S	61
Migratory students			
Male	17,979	S	77
Female	17,094	S	73
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	33,730	S	81
American Indian or Alaska Native	163	S	68
Asian	692	S	80
Black or African American	1,413	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	2,349	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	47	S	51
White	28,447	S	85
Two or more races	619	S	72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,979	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	798	S	44
Economically disadvantaged students	10,610	S	68
Migratory students	45	S	47
Male	17,183	S	82
Female	16,547	S	81
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	33,737	S	83
American Indian or Alaska Native	164	S	71
Asian	687	S	74
Black or African American	1,417	S	60
Hispanic or Latino	2,351	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	46	S	65
White	28,452	S	85
Two or more races	620	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,985	S	38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	785	S	34
Economically disadvantaged students	10,619	S	70
Migratory students	43	S	42
Male	17,187	S	79
Female	16,550	S	86
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	33,669	S	84
American Indian or Alaska Native	163	S	74
Asian	691	S	78
Black or African American	1,403	S	60
Hispanic or Latino	2,340	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	47	S	72
White	28,409	S	87
Two or more races	616	S	77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,964	S	47
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	789	S	43
Economically disadvantaged students	10,579	S	72
Migratory students			
Male	17,153	S	83
Female	16,516	S	86
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. American Indian or Alaska Native data have been verified as accurate.			

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	1,410	624	44.26
Districts	351	290	82.62
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	637	273	42.86
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	198	40	20.20
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	439	233	53.08
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
349	288	82.52
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	47
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All schools in Iowa under Corrective Action appoint an outside expert to advise the school. Zero counts are not required for file spec. C152 for the other corrective actions.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All schools in Iowa under Restructuring conduct a major restructuring of the school governance. Zero counts are not required for file spec. C153 for the other restructuring actions.	

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.

The establishment of smaller learning communities.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Iowa State Support Team continued to provide assistance to all districts that were identified for improvement and/or corrective action during the 2011-2012 school year. The assistance included the implementation of approved action plans or corrective action plans.

There are five phases in the Iowa Support System assistance for corrective action plans, they are:

- Audit Phase
- Diagnosis Phase
- Design Phase
- Implementation/Monitoring Phase
- Monitoring/Assessment Phase

The final plan outlines actions and timelines to be taken in the areas of reading and mathematics, parent engagement, assessing evaluability, needs of students, mentoring of staff and implementation of evidence-based research.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	4
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	0	0
Schools	8	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	8/31/12
---	---------

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*: 2.30%

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

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

For SY 2011-12 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 5% reserve helps to cover part of the cost for a facilitator and expert to the School Support team. The facilitator helps to design and deliver technical assistance to both State Support Team members and schools that have been identified as in need of assistance. The State Support Team assists schools in interpreting school data-student achievement, demographic, program, and perception- in order to identify trends. The training also assists schools in developing clear, measurable, attainable goals for improvement based on data and developing specific research-based strategies, timelines, and role assignment.

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.

Area Educational Agencies (AEAs) provided consultants to serve as team members on the State Support Team and worked with Title I districts and schools identified as in need. AEAs voluntarily fund this effort.

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	60,223
Applied to transfer	458
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	366
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	\$ 201,664

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	32

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	27,345
Applied for supplemental educational services	2,743
Received supplemental educational services	2,595
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 4,911,588
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	124,018	123,999	99.98	19	0.02
All elementary classes	72,401	72,393	99.99	8	0.01
All secondary classes	51,617	51,606	99.98	11	0.02

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.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	0.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	100.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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	26,668	26,668	100.00
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	29,817	29,817	100.00
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	14,742	14,742	100.00
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	14,097	14,097	100.00

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	54.90	29.00
Poverty metric used	High/low poverty is based upon the top and bottom 25% of schools in terms of percent of their students that are eligible for free/reduced price lunch.	
Secondary schools	41.40	23.60
Poverty metric used	High/low poverty is based upon the top and bottom 25% of schools in terms of percent of their students that are eligible for free/reduced price lunch.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	22,425
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.	22,425
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	15,328
Vietnamese	839
Bosnian	781
Reserved for local use	610
Karen languages	437

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121 (a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	21,825
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	600
Total	22,425
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were 365 students not tested because of non-enrolled reasons (withdrew, dropped out, moved, died, graduated, etc.). There were 235 students not tested because of enrolled reasons (medical emergency, exited ELL, etc.).	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	4,448
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	20.38
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	21,825
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	600
Total	22,425
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

	#
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.	4,672

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

Title III Results	Results	Results	Targets	Targets
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	9,715	56.64	10,206	59.50
Attained proficiency	4,448	20.38	4,867	22.30
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).	___ No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	___ No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	___ No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
1,658	1,638	3,296

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
2,084	S	74	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
2,088	S	66	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
956	S	69	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	12
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	3
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	7
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	9
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	5
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	2
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	3
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	3
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	3

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. Of the 12 subgrantees, three are large school districts and 9 are intermediary education agencies, Area Education Agencies (AEAs).

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
4,334	3,135	9

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.	432
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,200

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee 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	12	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	12	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	12	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	12	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	12	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	12	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	12	5,628
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	12	1,768
PD provided to principals	12	352
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	12	333
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	12	1,169
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	100
Total	72	9,350

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be 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	07/01/11	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The state considers the date that funds are received to be the date that funds are obligated and available to subgrantees.		

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.

Not Applicable

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	339	339
LEAs with subgrants	12	12
Total	351	351
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	111	99
K	330	400
1	267	380
2	239	399
3	248	340
4	232	324
5	238	332
6	193	290
7	169	251
8	172	208
9	199	238
10	201	291
11	249	233
12	450	287
Ungraded		
Total	3,298	4,072

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Iowa does not have any ungraded students. All students are assigned a grade.

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	520	1,084
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,538	2,716
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	51	38
Hotels/Motels	189	234
Total	3,298	4,072

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	73
K	269
1	255
2	276
3	234
4	223
5	235
6	198
7	179
8	136
9	186
10	218
11	177
12	228
Ungraded	0
Total	2,887
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Iowa does not have any ungraded students. All students are assigned a grade.	

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	259
Migratory children/youth	38
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	653
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	249
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	335	163
4	318	128
5	306	155
6	296	116
7	236	89
8	195	77
High School	210	127

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

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	334	177
4	317	141
5	306	150
6	298	117
7	241	123
8	197	81
High School	211	115

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

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	296	179
4	287	165
5	306	153
6	290	127
7	236	101
8	194	94
High School	210	132

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

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)	194
K	59
1	116
2	111
3	103
4	100
5	93
6	87
7	91
8	97
9	71
10	109
11	86
12	83
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	31
Total	1,431
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Iowa does not have a grade of "Ungraded".	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 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)	51
K	45
1	34
2	36
3	30
4	35
5	27
6	32
7	28
8	23
9	24
10	31
11	22
12	9
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	11
Total	438
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Iowa uses MIS2000 to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for this reporting period. Iowa used this system for the 2012-13 reporting period. Iowa will continue to use MIS2000 to compile and generate child counts for 2012-13.

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 child count data is initially collected through parent/family interviews that are done face to face. The following data is collected during the initial face to face interview:

- Parent/guardian names, addresses, telephone numbers
- Child data
- Iowa Student ID # (if known)
- Last, first, middle names of each child in the family
- Race of each child in the family
- Sex of each child in the family
- Birth date of each child in the family
- Verification of multiple births
- Verification of birth dates of children
- Residency dates for children
- Grade levels and building placement for each child enrolled
- Eligibility data
- Qualifying work of parent/guardian
- QAD
- Clarifying comments to verify qualifying employment

The interviewer reviews the data collected, verifies spelling, birth dates, employment, etc. and enters the information on the COE. Only those district recruitment personnel who attend mandatory training that occurs twice a year are authorized to complete and sign a COE. Iowa uses the national COE form with the addition of race and facility number to the child data section. COEs are reviewed at the local level prior to being faxed to the state identification & recruitment (ID&R) specialist who reviews the COE for accuracy. After initial approval by the state ID&R specialist, the COE is then faxed to the State MEP office where it is reviewed for final approval by the state MEP director. If there are any errors or omissions, the COE is sent back to the state ID&R specialist to follow up with the district for correction. Typically, the district recruiter must re-interview the family in order to make the corrections. When the COE is approved, a letter is sent by fax to the district listing the eligible child(ren)'s name(s), birth date(s), grade level(s), QAD(s), and eligibility expiration date(s). The COE is entered into the MIS 2000 data base by the state ID&R specialist. Only students with verified eligibility are entered and counted. Districts must submit a completed COE for State review before a student can be verified as an eligible migrant.

All districts in Iowa must follow this procedure before identifying and counting any child as an eligible migrant. This requirement has led to a more accurate count of eligible migrant students statewide. Iowa districts must also use the Withdrawal Form when migrant students move out of the District or become ineligible for services. This form is sent to the state ID&R specialist to enter into the MIS 2000 database. These procedures must be followed for eligibility for regular term or summer term services. Summer sessions are held between June 1 and August 10.

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.

Child data are organized by several criteria such as facility, enrollment date, and grade level. Several reports can be generated through MIS 2000 based on these criteria in order to verify student enrollment/withdrawal status. These data can also be cross-checked against the State data collection process to ensure that Districts have not counted migrant students who do not have approved COEs and who are not in the MIS 2000 system. When a migrant child leaves a district, a withdrawal form is completed by the district and submitted to the State for use with MIS2000 to eliminate duplication of student count. Additionally, if a District has identified a student as migrant but there is no verification of this, the District must complete a COE for State approval or remove the student from the migrant count. Any student data that cannot be verified through an approved COE or MIS 2000 report is not included in the child counts for Categories 1 and 2

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.

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.

Iowa had an external prospective re-interview event and only those children determined eligible were maintained or entered into MIS 2000. Those no longer eligible were deleted. A unique student identification number is assigned by MIS2000 and with that number we know we have an unduplicated number. MIS2000 generates reports that calculate the number of eligible children between the ages of 3 and 21 based upon the COE data entered in the system between 9/1/11 and 8/31/12. The two reports used the following:

1. Identification of students enrolled for the first time during the 9/1/11-8/31/12 count period and,
2. Verification of enrollment and eligibility of migrant students for the previous two count periods.

The list of eligible migrant students was sent to the LOAs and the LOAs verified students served in the summer program.

We rely on the MIS2000 reports and the Project Easier database to give accurate information for the number of children meeting eligibility criteria-- in Iowa for at least 1 day during the count period, receiving MEP-funded summer/intersession services. Children are counted once per grade/age/level in each child count category. When a migrant child leaves the district or becomes ineligible for services, the district submits a withdrawal form to the state. This withdrawal information is entered into MIS2000 so that the student count is not duplicated if a student moves from one district to another. Data from COEs cannot be entered if it does not contain the information required by the form. Therefore, we can be assured that when a child's information is accepted by the system, it is accurate.

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.

MIS2000 system was used to generate category 1 counts. A list of eligible students (generated by MIS 2000) was sent to each LOA to identified the category 2 count within each district.

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.

Prior to the determination of the count, the following reports generated by MIS2000 are sent to each MEP to verify that students listed on the report were in the District during the count period:

1. Students whose QAD occurred during the 9/1/11-8/31/12 period
2. Students previously enrolled in the district during the prior two count periods. Districts review each list and return any changes or corrections to the State MEP office. All reports generated by MIS2000 and/or Project Easier are cross-checked against local district data.

Personal interviews at the local level are conducted face-to-face with a parent or guardian to gather COE information. These interviews are conducted by those district staff who have been trained by state staff. Only district staff who attend the two mandatory trainings are allowed to complete COEs. Trainings focus on eligibility criteria, interviewing for accuracy, and proper completion of COEs. Iowa MEP uses the national Certificate of Eligibility (COE) statewide. All local recruiters are trained on basic eligibility requirements, including temporary versus seasonal, processing, and economic necessity. State MEP staff assists local MEP interviewers with procedural questions as well as accompanying interviewers during family interviews when needed.

Iowa has one ID&R specialist and at least one recruiter for each of the eight programs. The state ID&R specialist conducts on-site visits at each of the local programs at least twice yearly to assist, train, and provide custom technical assistance to the local level recruiters. The effectiveness of ID&R activities is evaluated through these technical assistance visits, on-site monitoring, and review of COEs. Eligibility issues are resolved through regular and frequent communication between the State MEP office and the local MEPs. All COEs are reviewed and approved two separate times at the State level. Any questions arising during this process are dealt with immediately.

Student eligibility is based on a personal interview with a parent, guardian, other responsible adult, or an OSY worker. Eligibility issues are resolved through regular communication between the State MEP office and the local MEPs. All COEs are reviewed and approved by both the state identification & recruitment specialist and director at the state level.

Prior to the determination of the child count for the year, two reports are generated by MIS2000 and sent to each MEP to verify that students listed on the report were in the district during the count period. These reports provide a list of students whose QAD occurred during the 9/1/11-8/31-12 count year as well as a list of students previously enrolled in the district during the two count periods. Districts are required to review each list and return any changes or corrections to the State MEP office. All reports generated by MIS2000 and Project Easier are cross-checked against district data.

The state uses annual random rolling re-interviews to verify the eligibility documentation of all current MEP children. This is described in the text box below.

The Iowa ID & R Manual was recently updated to reflect changes in guidance from OME. All Iowa MEPs have received the updated manual. State trained staff assist local MEP interviewers with questions regarding procedures or sit in on interviews to assist as needed.

The person who entered data into the MIS2000 system had done that job in NE for years and therefore well trained and could run reports.

Resolving Eligibility Questions

Recruiter will sometimes encounter eligibility questions for which they have no answer. The following procedure is to be used to resolve eligibility questions.

??Recruiter should consult with the MEP Program Coordinator in their district for assistance with eligibility questions that arise. Current OME and State ID&R policies and procedures can be researched.

??If necessary, MEP Program Coordinators may contact the State Director and or State ID&R Coordinator for assistance.

??If the eligibility question still remains unresolved MEP Coordinators should contact the State Director. Questions on eligibility should be presented in written form and include:

o Detailed explanation of case in question

o Summary of all information and documentation collected
o Actual question on the eligibility issue
o District MEP Coordinator's opinion concerning the eligibility question

??State Director will review policies and procedures that relate to the eligibility question. If necessary, OME will be

contacted in writing for interpretation and/or resolution of the question.

??Upon response from OME, a final eligibility determination will be made by the State Director who will notify the District MEP Coordinator in writing.

??The District MEP Coordinator and recruiter who interviewed the family/youth in question should review the final determination and inform the family or OSY of the final eligibility decision.

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.

Internal Annual Interviews

This rolling type of re-interview occurs as soon as possible after the completion the COE and is a representative sample of determinations made in the current year. This type of re-interviewing highlights patterns of errors early so that problems can be identified and remediated with modified quality control procedures to ensure that eligibility determinations are accurate.

Independent Prospective Re-Interviewing

In 2011, Iowa joined a consortium whose sole purpose is to protect, improve, and maintain the integrity of state's Migrant Education Program (MEP). There was no evidence that suggested that a retrospective re-interview process was needed. The prospective re-interview process took place that was congruent with the needs of Iowa. The prospective re-interview took place in Iowa during the months of May and June of 2012. The purpose of the prospective re-interview process was to determine whether the children enumerated in the 2011-12 Iowa MEP State Database were properly identified, recruited, and enrolled for migrant services.

Four teams of ID&R experts, trained and proven recruiters and quality control staff from Kansas and Nebraska conducted the independent re-interview. Furthermore, to ensure high quality re-interviews, the prospective interviewers were independent of both the state and of the original eligibility determinations during the process.

The independent prospective re-interview sampled COEs of 52 migrant children enumerated in the 201-12 State MEP Database to be sufficient to check for possible errors or developing problems. The independent re-interviewing process was conducted in May and June when the greatest number of families was known to be in the area. As suggested in the Technical Assistance Guide (2010), each child in the current MEP Database was given a randomly generated identification number to be used as a marker for its file in the Iowa 2011-12 MEP database. A list of random numbers was created by an Excel spreadsheet. Due to the small size of the sampling universe in Iowa, 56 re-interviews were determined to be sufficient to generate information about the entire population.

The original sample of 52 names represented the current nine local projects in Iowa at the time. It was decided that the integrity of the original sample would be maintained and thus reflect the same distribution in the interviews completed. There was not sufficient data to determine the predicted rate of non-responders. Hence, the most efficient sample design in this case was a replacement sampling method using a clustering complex sample.

After the initial randomization of the entire sampling universe, the names were clustered by local project and assigned a second random number within the cluster. A second set of random numbers were identified through Excel Spreadsheet method for the database names within each local project, which represented a cluster. If a name from the original sample list had moved, could not be contacted, or refused to be interviewed, a replacement was chosen from the ordered randomized list in that cluster. Hence, the completed 56 interviews reflected the distribution of the original list of names selected from the entire sampling universe.

The interviewers in the 2011-12 Prospective Re-interview process in Iowa was conducted with ID&R experts, trained and proven recruiters and quality control staff from the Kansas and Nebraska. Hence, there was not a need for re-interviewer selection and training. These same individuals have participated in three-year prospective re-interviews in other states previous to Iowa and have proven performance. Each of the re-interviewers was able to:

- Demonstrate a strong background in Migrant Education in general and in current ID&R practices.
- Demonstrate skill in utilizing the re-interview questionnaire containing all data items used in making the original eligibility determinations.
- Communicate with the families in their native language.
- Develop rapport and use non-threatening tactics to obtain information;
- Serve as mentors in MEP recruiter training programs.

The re-interviewers followed the Iowa Re-interviewing Process guide for re-interviewing. The Prospective Re-interview was conducted utilizing the Child Eligibility Re-Interview Questionnaire adapted from materials produced by the ConQIR Consortium on Identification and Recruitment (2007). This protocol is also recommended in the Technical Assistance Guide (2010). The re-interviewers had been trained on both these instruments and had completed interviewing using these

instruments when conducting re-interviews in other states. The re-interviewers had also completed training to serve as trainers or mentors to other recruiters.

The independent re-interviewers conducted on-site, face-to-face re-interviews from the authorized sample of 52 names randomly selected utilizing an Excel Spreadsheet method. The Iowa target number of interviews completed was a minimum of 52 as suggested in the Technical Assistance Guide (2010) from the 1593 names listed in the 2011-12 Iowa MEP database. In total, 274 names were randomly selected including sample replacements. Re-interviewers attempted 72 families. 56 re-interviews were completed. If the individual or family was not home or unavailable, the re-interview team made three attempts before excluding them from the re-interview process. All re-interviews were from authorized samples. There were no unauthorized interviews replacements.

Re-interviewers used the Child Eligibility Re-Interview Questionnaire and the Iowa Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The data for the Independent Prospective Re-interview was collected in May and June 2012, by teams consisting of a Consortium trained, experienced re-interviewers. The re-interview involved no one that was involved in the original eligibility determination. When possible the Kansas MEP Staff Development Coordinator, spot-checked re-interviews. In order to facilitate a smooth and straightforward re-interview process, the re-interviewers assured participating families that this study was helping to improve the eligibility interview process as well as the MEP program.

When the re-interviews were completed, the Child Eligibility Re-Interview Questionnaire the re-interview COE, and the original COE was submitted to the two-person expert review team. These two Consortium members are nationally known ID&R experts and reviewed the eligibility determination of the re-interview team. The expert review team made the final eligibility decision. The expert team analyzed the data collection and determined that all data collected met the standards identified in the Technical Assistance Guide (2010).

Results

The results of all 56 re-interviews conducted in Iowa were reviewed by an expert panel consisting of Sue Henry, an ID&R Eligibility Specialist from Nebraska and John Farrell, an ID&R Specialist from Kansas. Both of these individuals are nationally known ID&R experts. The panel reviewed all of the results of Iowa's Prospective Re-interview and made the final eligibility rulings as a result. After reviewing the 56 COEs collected from the Iowa Prospective Re-interview, the ID&R Eligibility Specialists found four of the students to be ineligible. The Iowa target response rate for the 2011-12 Independent Prospective Response Rate was met and exceeded at 78%. The Iowa target response rate was 75% due to the documented highly mobile population.

There were four discrepancies between the original eligibility determination and re-interview determination. Three of the discrepancies were because there had not been a qualifying move in 36 months. One of the discrepancies was due a mis-identification of qualifying work. The discrepancy rate for the re-interview process was seven percent.

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.

Upon approval by the ID&R specialist and state director, all COEs are entered into MIS2000 by a contracted data entry person from NE. Built-in error checks in the MIS2000 system prevent data from being entered incorrectly or on an incomplete basis. If errors are flagged, the ID & R specialist does further review of the COE and follows up with the district if necessary. All corrected COEs must have initials and dates by the areas that were revised. Any COEs with revisions/corrections will be reviewed again before being entered into MIS2000. COEs with data that cannot be clarified or verified are not entered into the database. Each local program completes withdrawal forms when eligible migrant student moves from the district or becomes ineligible.

We explained how audits of COEs using random samples were conducted in the first response.

Our protocol includes a step that indicates that each COE will be entered into MIS2000. A student list was sent to the LOAs to check for accuracy and then changes were made as necessary.

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.

Data collected in the MIS 2000 system is cross-checked with the state database to ensure that all eligible migrant students are included in the count. Reports generated by MIS 2000 will be reviewed at both the local and state levels to ensure that all eligible students have been entered into the database.

The state director does review all COEs. Our COE protocol is below.

1. Program Recruiter completes COE

2. Program Recruiter faxes COE to State Recruiter at 319-347-6004
3. State Recruiter reviews and submits COE to the Iowa Department of Education (IDE)
4. IDE provides final approval of COE which includes monitoring for authorized signatures
5. IDE notifies districts of approval to provide services via e-mail (lunch letter)
6. IDE notifies State Recruiter of final approval of COE via e-mail
7. State Recruiter enters COE into MIS2000
8. State recruiter faxes final, approved copy of COE to district
9. IDE keeps an electronic copy of COE on file

If State Recruiter &/or IDE do not approve COE:

1. COE will be faxed to District Recruiter for correction or will be returned as DNQ (Do Not Qualify)
2. District Recruiter will make needed corrections and fax to State Recruiter at 319-347-6004

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.

1. The state is conducting statewide training, including general all-staff training and specific content for breakout groups. The training includes, but is not limited to Module 2, 3, and, 4 from the National ID&R Curriculum (2011).
2. The State of Iowa is reviewing the structure, content, timelines, and personnel responsible for the State MEP program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns about the reported counts or underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.