

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**



**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: Idaho State Board of Education	
Address: 650 W. State Street Boise, ID 83720-0037	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Scott Grothe	
Telephone: (208) 332-1572	
Fax: (208) 334-2632	
e-mail: scott.grothe@osbe.idaho.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Scott Grothe	
_____	Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 10:01:35 AM
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.

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

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

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Idaho signed an MOU in support of the new Common Core State Standards initiative in June of 2009 with full legislative approval in February of 2010. As a first step in implementation and with the help of Achieve, Inc., Idaho teachers and the Idaho Department of Education in summer of 2010 created a crosswalk between current Idaho Standards and the new Common Core Standards (CCSS). Idaho school districts will be required to implement the CCSS (Math and English Language Arts) in 2013-2014. Idaho will provide teachers with the tools to transition from one integrated system based on the current Idaho Standards to one informed by the common core.

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	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
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	2015-2016	2015-2016	2015-2016

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

Regular Assessment Grades 3-8: Idaho will administer the SBAC Summative test in Spring 2015

Class of 2017 High School Students will e required to pass one of two EOCs in science: Biology or Chemistry

In terms of the ALternate Assessment,Idaho has implemented an online profolio system which has passed final review and will be implemented in 2015-2016.

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	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
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	2015-2016	2015-2016	2015-2016

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>Regular Assessment Grades 3-8: Idaho will administer the SBAC Summative test in Spring 2015</p> <p>Class of 2017 High School Students will e required to pass one of two EOCs in science: Biology or Chemistry</p> <p>In terms of the ALternate Assessment,Idaho has implemented an online proffolio system which has passed final review and will be implemented in 2015-2016.</p>
--

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)	34.00
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	66.00
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)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	No
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	149,557	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,979	>=99
Asian	S	1,979	>=99
Black or African American	S	1,608	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	24,114	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	526	>=99
White	S	116,856	>=99
Two or more races	S	2,495	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	14,079	98
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	S	6,882	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	76,298	>=99
Migratory students	S	1,252	>=99
Male	S	76,671	>=99
Female	S	72,886	>=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	4,309	30.61
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,484	60.26
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,286	9.13
Total	14,079	
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	149,169	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,978	>=99
Asian	S	1,858	98
Black or African American	S	1,548	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	23,907	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	522	>=99
White	S	116,861	>=99
Two or more races	S	2,495	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	14,066	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	6,422	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	76,059	>=99
Migratory students	S	1,197	>=99
Male	S	76,462	>=99
Female	S	72,707	>=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	278
--	-----

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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	12,715	90.31
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	67	0.48
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,284	9.12
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	14	0.10
Total	14,080	////////////////////////////////////
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. According to the Data Key provided by ED, 1.2.3 Total is defined as "Sum where Disability Status (Only) = "Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)" and where Participation Status (RLA) = "REGPARTWOACC" or "REGPARTWACC" or "ALTPARTGRADELVL" or "ALTPARTMODACH" or "ALTPARTALTACH". Also, 1.2.4 Total is defined as "Sum where Disability Status (Only) = "Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)" and where Participation Status (RLA) = "REGPARTWOACC" or "REGPARTWACC" or "ALTPARTGRADELVL" or "ALTPARTMODACH", "ALTPARTALTACH" or "PARTLEP". Because the data sources that ED is using to calculate the total are different, the numbers will never be the same.</p>		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	63,364	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	853	>=99
Asian	S	861	>=99
Black or African American	S	700	>=98
Hispanic or Latino	S	10,007	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	245	>=98
White	S	49,683	>=99
Two or more races	S	1,015	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	5,771	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	2,656	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	31,175	>=99
Migratory students	S	505	98
Male	S	32,288	>=99
Female	S	31,076	>=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	1,823	31.59
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,387	58.69
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	561	9.72
Total	5,771	

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	21,762	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	286	S	75
Asian	293	S	91
Black or African American	206	S	72
Hispanic or Latino	3,581	S	80
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	70	S	86
White	16,928	S	90
Two or more races	398	S	87
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,177	S	58
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,274	S	65
Economically disadvantaged students	11,772	S	84
Migratory students	186	S	76
Male	11,223	S	88
Female	10,539	S	88
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Idaho has transitioned to using the ISEE (Idaho System for Educational Excellence) System as its source of information for student demographic information. Districts upload student information monthly into the ISEE database. The database is then uploaded into the accountability site where schools appeal any demographic information that is erroneous. Because this is the first year that we have used a single demographic data system (this is our baseline), it is reasonable that the numbers may be different from last year.			

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	21,701	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	285	S	78
Asian	279	S	90
Black or African American	195	S	81
Hispanic or Latino	3,560	S	78
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	70	S	87
White	16,917	S	91
Two or more races	395	S	89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,172	S	56
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,211	S	62
Economically disadvantaged students	11,732	S	84
Migratory students	184	S	70
Male	11,192	S	87
Female	10,509	S	90
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Idaho has transitioned to using the ISEE (Idaho System for Educational Excellence) System as its source of information for student demographic information. Districts upload student information monthly into the ISEE database. The database is then uploaded into the accountability site where schools appeal any demographic information that is erroneous. Because this is the first year that we have used a single demographic data system (this is our baseline), it is reasonable that the numbers may be different from last year.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Grade level 3 is not tested in Science			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	21,744	S	86
American Indian or Alaska Native	300	S	79
Asian	285	S	86
Black or African American	207	S	73
Hispanic or Latino	3,602	S	77
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	73	S	90
White	16,917	S	89
Two or more races	360	S	87
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,205	S	55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,168	S	57
Economically disadvantaged students	11,709	S	82
Migratory students	223	S	70
Male	11,077	S	86
Female	10,667	S	87
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	21,691	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	301	S	81
Asian	269	S	92
Black or African American	199	S	84
Hispanic or Latino	3,566	S	79
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	73	S	90
White	16,922	S	91
Two or more races	361	S	91
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,206	S	56
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,101	S	59
Economically disadvantaged students	11,675	S	84
Migratory students	211	S	72
Male	11,049	S	87
Female	10,642	S	91
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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Does not Test in Science			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	21,748	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	287	S	58
Asian	271	S	77
Black or African American	245	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	3,616	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	88	S	72
White	16,869	S	82
Two or more races	372	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,326	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,035	S	39
Economically disadvantaged students	11,585	S	71
Migratory students	195	S	52
Male	11,071	S	78
Female	10,677	S	79
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	21,698	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	287	S	76
Asian	257	S	84
Black or African American	237	S	77
Hispanic or Latino	3,590	S	76
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	87	S	82
White	16,867	S	90
Two or more races	373	S	87
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,325	S	51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	974	S	48
Economically disadvantaged students	11,554	S	83
Migratory students	190	S	62
Male	11,053	S	86
Female	10,645	S	90
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	21,755	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	287	S	48
Asian	271	S	64
Black or African American	245	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	3,614	S	48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	91	S	57
White	16,875	S	75
Two or more races	372	S	67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,324	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,037	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	11,592	S	60
Migratory students	196	S	35
Male	11,069	S	71
Female	10,686	S	68

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Idaho has transitioned to using the ISEE (Idaho System for Educational Excellence) System as its source of information for student demographic information. Districts upload student information monthly into the ISEE database. The database is then uploaded into the accountability site where schools appeal any demographic information that is erroneous. Because this is the first year that we have used a single demographic data system (this is our baseline), it is reasonable that the numbers may be different from last year.

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	21,599	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	271	S	59
Asian	279	S	84
Black or African American	233	S	50
Hispanic or Latino	3,578	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	64	S	75
White	16,790	S	83
Two or more races	384	S	75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,123	S	34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	933	S	37
Economically disadvantaged students	11,204	S	71
Migratory students	180	S	52
Male	11,162	S	78
Female	10,437	S	80
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	21,536	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	S	76
Asian	263	S	93
Black or African American	220	S	74
Hispanic or Latino	3,541	S	81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	64	S	86
White	16,794	S	92
Two or more races	384	S	91
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,115	S	52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	858	S	54
Economically disadvantaged students	11,162	S	84
Migratory students	169	S	64
Male	11,122	S	88
Female	10,414	S	91
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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Does not test in Science			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	21,607	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	306	S	57
Asian	291	S	82
Black or African American	202	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	3,450	S	60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	70	S	80
White	16,938	S	79
Two or more races	350	S	74
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,977	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	884	S	33
Economically disadvantaged students	10,896	S	67
Migratory students	175	S	45
Male	10,994	S	75
Female	10,613	S	76
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	21,551	S	91
American Indian or Alaska Native	308	S	79
Asian	274	S	93
Black or African American	194	S	74
Hispanic or Latino	3,420	S	83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	70	S	93
White	16,935	S	92
Two or more races	350	S	92
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,976	S	54
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	825	S	57
Economically disadvantaged students	10,859	S	86
Migratory students	172	S	73
Male	10,967	S	88
Female	10,584	S	93
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	21,569	S	59
American Indian or Alaska Native	306	S	35
Asian	287	S	69
Black or African American	202	S	32
Hispanic or Latino	3,444	S	36
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	70	S	59
White	16,910	S	65
Two or more races	350	S	58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,962	S	23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	877	S	11
Economically disadvantaged students	10,868	S	48
Migratory students	173	S	13
Male	10,966	S	61
Female	10,603	S	58
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	20,926	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	265	S	58
Asian	253	S	81
Black or African American	258	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	3,315	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	77	S	78
White	16,424	S	82
Two or more races	334	S	77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,770	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	834	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	10,348	S	70
Migratory students	156	S	52
Male	10,836	S	79
Female	10,090	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Idaho has transitioned to using the ISEE (Idaho System for Educational Excellence) System as its source of information for student demographic information. Districts upload student information monthly into the ISEE database. The database is then uploaded into the accountability site where schools appeal any demographic information that is erroneous. Because this is the first year that we have used a single demographic data system (this is our baseline), it is reasonable that the numbers may be different from last year.			

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	20,914	S	92
American Indian or Alaska Native	263	S	77
Asian	240	S	90
Black or African American	253	S	82
Hispanic or Latino	3,302	S	86
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	74	S	93
White	16,447	S	94
Two or more races	335	S	93
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,775	S	57
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	784	S	61
Economically disadvantaged students	10,349	S	88
Migratory students	147	S	76
Male	10,819	S	91
Female	10,095	S	94
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Idaho has transitioned to using the ISEE (Idaho System for Educational Excellence) System as its source of information for student demographic information. Districts upload student information monthly into the ISEE database. The database is then uploaded into the accountability site where schools appeal any demographic information that is erroneous. Because this is the first year that we have used a single demographic data system (this is our baseline), it is reasonable that the numbers may be different from last year.			

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

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	20,171	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	264	S	62
Asian	307	S	73
Black or African American	257	S	55
Hispanic or Latino	2,972	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	84	S	71
White	15,990	S	82
Two or more races	297	S	79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,501	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	754	S	31
Economically disadvantaged students	8,784	S	69
Migratory students	137	S	51
Male	10,308	S	79
Female	9,863	S	77

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Idaho has transitioned to using the ISEE (Idaho System for Educational Excellence) System as its source of information for student demographic information. Districts upload student information monthly into the ISEE database. The database is then uploaded into the accountability site where schools appeal any demographic information that is erroneous. Because this is the first year that we have used a single demographic data system (this is our baseline), it is reasonable that the numbers may be different from last year.

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	20,078	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	264	S	78
Asian	276	S	78
Black or African American	250	S	69
Hispanic or Latino	2,928	S	76
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	84	S	88
White	15,979	S	90
Two or more races	297	S	89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,497	S	43
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	669	S	41
Economically disadvantaged students	8,728	S	81
Migratory students	124	S	61
Male	10,260	S	86
Female	9,818	S	89

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Idaho has transitioned to using the ISEE (Idaho System for Educational Excellence) System as its source of information for student demographic information. Districts upload student information monthly into the ISEE database. The database is then uploaded into the accountability site where schools appeal any demographic information that is erroneous. Because this is the first year that we have used a single demographic data system (this is our baseline), it is reasonable that the numbers may be different from last year.

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	20,040	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	260	S	49
Asian	303	S	64
Black or African American	253	S	46
Hispanic or Latino	2,949	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	84	S	68
White	15,898	S	78
Two or more races	293	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,485	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	742	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	8,715	S	62
Migratory students	136	S	31
Male	10,253	S	74
Female	9,787	S	71

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Idaho has transitioned to using the ISEE (Idaho System for Educational Excellence) System as its source of information for student demographic information. Districts upload student information monthly into the ISEE database. The database is then uploaded into the accountability site where schools appeal any demographic information that is erroneous. Because this is the first year that we have used a single demographic data system (this is our baseline), it is reasonable that the numbers may be different from last year.

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	665	389	58.50
Districts	146	61	41.78

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	409	246	60.15
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	270	150	55.56
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	139	96	69.06

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
132	53	40.15

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	6
Extension of the school year or school day	49
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	7
Replacement of the principal	6
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	19
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	31
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No other major restructuring was implemented.

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.

Identification:

Based on the Spring 2011 ISAT results, a large number of schools and districts in Idaho were identified as on Alert status, Needs Improvement Year 1, Needs Improvement Year 2, Corrective Action, and Restructuring. Improvement plans were required, support was provided during the development process, and a review including feedback was conducted. All in improvement status, regardless of the level, were invited to participate in a series of technical assistance opportunities further described below.

Additional support was provided to those in Restructuring.

WISE Tool Regional Support Sessions:

*A series of District & School Improvement Planning Support Sessions were offered regionally throughout the state in the fall of 2011. Educators including superintendents, central office staff, principals, other building leadership, instructional coaches, and teachers participated in the sessions. Some came as individuals, and others brought teams to participate in the sessions which provided hands-on technical assistance related to the WISE Tool (Idaho's online District & School Improvement Planning Tool, created by the Center on Innovation and Improvement). These support sessions were presented by the State School Improvement Coordinator, and a team of 2-3 other exemplary educators in each region, including the Regional School Improvement Coordinators in partnership with Idaho Universities.

*WISE Tool Webinars:

In addition to the WISE Tool Regional Support Sessions, webinar sessions were presented for anyone needing assistance in transitioning to the WISE Tool for writing and submitting required school improvement plans. They participated in the webinar, either as a team of educators that logged in for the distance learning or as an individual. Additionally, the webinar sessions were archived and made available for later access.

*Training for Idaho Instructional Leaders:

Webinars were offered throughout the state in the 2011-2012 school year by our Regional and State School Improvement Centers. These trainings continued to build on the precious work with the Center on Innovation and Improvement and our work with the center as a Pacesetter State Cohort I. Numerous educators including superintendents, central office staff, principals, other building leadership, instructional coaches, and teachers participated in the sessions. The sessions were designed to drive the impact of school improvement efforts into the classroom through research-based strategies that focused on systematic implementation of standards-aligned instruction in a classroom culture supportive of individual mastery. Participating sites sent teams of 4-5 exemplary educational leaders (1 district administrator, the building principal, and 2 - 3 teacher leaders/coaches) to attend this series of trainings. Participants were committed to attending all four sessions in their region. These representative school groups worked as leadership teams during the four sessions to reflect on improving school practices, discuss the viability of employing suggested strategies within their school, and provide responses within the construct of the training. Back-at-school (between sessions) the teams continued this process to further explore opportunities for instructional improvement as they informed and guided implementation. Having a district support person participate with each team was a critical component to the success and sustainability of the professional development.

School Improvement Tools:

Tools were developed to assist districts and schools in writing and implementation of their improvement plans: Idaho Improvement Planning & Implementation Workbook (<http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/schoolImprovement>) and Making Meaningful Connections in the WISE Tool (<http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/schoolImprovement>) were developed in addition to a series of webinars and onsite visits to support our Districts/Schools and especially our SIG schools.

Restructuring: The SSOS Director and team developed and delivered additional support provided to schools identified for restructuring. This support was a mixture of additional requirements, such as school turnaround plans based on indicators

of effective practice that were written by the school, reviewed by the LEA, and reviewed by the SEA. Additional webinars and support sessions were provided.

One-on-one Technical Assistance: Additional one-on-one technical assistance was provided on an individual basis as requested by schools and districts, or as identified by the State Department of Education.

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	10
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	12
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	2
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	7
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	8
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	48	39
Schools	181	152
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State of Idaho has transitioned to using the ISEE (Idaho System for Educational Excellence) System as its source of information for student demographic information. Districts upload student information monthly into the ISEE database. Because of this transition, there was an expected increase in the number of AYP appeals that the districts and schools had to make.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	8/24/12
---	---------

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Idaho reserved 4% of the Title I Allocation: Title I-A Allocation 2011-12 = \$54,016,992
1003(a) 4% of \$54,016,992 = \$2,160,680

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 1003g funds were used to support the Idaho Building Capacity project, a cornerstone of Idaho's statewide system of support. Through this project, schools and districts sites were served at an increased level that included up to 8 hours a week on-site technical assistance from an outside trained consultant (distinguished educator), professional development, and additional resources. 5% was utilized for administrative support, and part of the 95% that flowed through to districts was granted in the form of services provided directly to the district/school by one of Idaho's Regional School Improvement Centers, housed at Idaho Universities, recognized by the State as IBC providers. The State Department is currently working with both our Regional Comprehensive Center (ED Northwest), and one of the Content Centers (Center on Innovation and Improvement) to develop and implement an effective evaluation system for our statewide system of support including the Idaho Building Capacity project. 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds were combined to support the administrative costs of the Superintendents Network of Support and the Instructional Focus Visits. Districts utilized flow-through funds to purchase these services from the SDE.

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.

Idaho did not use any other funds to support the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

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	45,673
Applied to transfer	316
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	297
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The eligible student count was lower this year. We attribute the decrease to less Title I served schools because ARRA funds were no longer available, also less schools were identified as Yr. 2 of school improvement.	

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	\$ 261,404

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	0

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	28,619
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,057
Received supplemental educational services	2,481
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The eligible student count was lower this year. We attribute the decrease to less Title I served schools because ARRA funds were no longer available, also less schools were identified as Yr. 2 of school improvement.	

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	\$ 2,003,513
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The eligible student count was lower this year. We attribute the decrease to less Title I served schools because ARRA funds were no longer available, also less schools were identified as Yr. 2 of school improvement.	

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	57,043	54,125	94.88	2,918	5.12
All elementary classes	8,500	8,095	95.24	405	4.76
All secondary classes	48,543	46,030	94.82	2,513	5.18

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.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.

During the 2011-12 school year, the State counted elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

As noted last year, data collected from districts through Idaho's new data collection system resulted in inaccurate counts. In the process of adjusting for those districts uploading inaccurate data, we discovered that many HOUSSE rubrics were being applied for multiple/incorrect contents. Removing the legacy data regarding HOUSSE rubrics placed us in our current situation. We are in the process of providing technical assistance to districts on proper documentation. These current numbers are a more accurate reflection of what is happening in our state and will continue to improve as technical assistance continues with our 4 regional state coordinators assisting with data submissions.

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	72.00
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	16.70
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.30
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The % of elementary classes taught by teachers without a valid HOUSSE rubric increased as legacy data was removed. The adjustments resulted in gains in one area, losses in another to equal 100%.

	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)	34.70
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	26.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	39.30
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certificated increased this year because we increased the number of teachers on a provisional authorization from 66 in 2010-11 to 91 in 2011-12. Gains in this area resulted in losses in another to equal 100%

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	2,156	2,005	93.00
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	1,858	1,790	96.34
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	10,015	9,265	92.51
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	14,312	13,428	93.82

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	68.40	41.50
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	60.80	34.60
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	//////////////////////////////////// ////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The other category includes full day or extended kindergarten, Pre-School, and summer school.

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	16,269
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.	15,201
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	10,598
Undetermined	2,168
Arabic	246
Nepali	198
Russian	170

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Karen language 131 students

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	14,386
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,883
Total	16,269

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of students not tested includes those students who either exited a LEP program before testing, or those who moved before the testing window. The total number of LEP students reflects the number of students who were enrolled for testing in December. Since the testing took place the following year in March, within those three months between the testing registration and the actual testing took place, students either left the school district, or were exited from the program.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	4,676
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	34.14
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	13,653
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,548
Total	15,201
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of students not tested includes students who were exited from an LEP program before testing, or those students who moved before the testing window.	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for 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.	1,190

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	4,525	36.31		28.00
Attained proficiency	4,427	32.43		15.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Idaho only has state targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency, rather than a fixed number. Idaho has calculated a growth/making progress result of 47%, not the 36.8% listed. This may be due to Idaho calculating growth from consecutive and non-consecutive years, per a requirement from the USDOE Title III office.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

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)
NA
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Idaho does not provide assessments in other languages.

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)
NA
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Idaho does not provide assessments in other languages.

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)
NA
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Idaho does not provide assessments in other languages.

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
2,392	1,959	4,351

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
2,175	S	76	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
2,178	S	89	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
851	S	41	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	39
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	9
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	39
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	39
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	9
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	15
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	15
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	10

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. Idaho had 2 Consortia grants in 201-2012, each made up of 2 districts. Therefore, the 4 districts are included individually in the numbers above. In other words, each consortia district had individual AMAO determinations made for their district.

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. The State did not make AMAO #3/AYP	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who only receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
1,713	33	1

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Idaho revised the Immigrant subgrant process and made it a competitive grant application. Therefore, only 1 district was selected by a committee to receive awards for the 2011-2012 school year.

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.	384
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	50

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	37	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	30	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	32	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	25	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	30	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	18	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	39	3,867
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	37	358
PD provided to principals	39	303
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	30	173
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	31	662
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	78
Total	188	5,441

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	08/01/11	30
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Idaho Title III program takes 30 days to review and approve LEP plans. Funding is released to districts that have approved plans within 30 days.		

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.

This 30 days for distribution allows the state to approve LEP plans. Therefore, no steps are being made to shorten this process.
--

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	140	134
LEAs with subgrants	5	5
Total	145	139
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14	17
K	313	235
1	335	286
2	283	281
3	297	225
4	264	250
5	240	252
6	251	206
7	213	195
8	202	172
9	161	210
10	150	181
11	180	164
12	234	265
Ungraded		
Total	3,137	2,939
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. we submitted zero counts for ungraded.		

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	199	227
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,734	2,365
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	87	261
Hotels/Motels	117	86
Total	3,137	2,939
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	23
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	107
K	244
1	293
2	276
3	218
4	245
5	263
6	208
7	184
8	163
9	200
10	179
11	163
12	282
Ungraded	6
Total	3,054
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	429
Migratory children/youth	73
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	356
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	185
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	410	325
4	397	313
5	397	292
6	370	292
7	331	261
8	291	236
High School	215	145

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	414	318
4	400	306
5	401	247
6	373	231
7	331	175
8	296	175
High School	219	120

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

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	402	200
6		
7	329	131
8		
High School	221	101

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)	621
K	252
1	294
2	287
3	243
4	281
5	268
6	239
7	224
8	195
9	215
10	190
11	165
12	126
Ungraded	89
Out-of-school	173
Total	3,862
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The migrant population in Idaho continues to slightly decrease as more and more families are becoming less mobile. Also, because of immigration concerns, some are choosing to move back to Mexico.

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)	158
K	90
1	108
2	106
3	93
4	88
5	70
6	40
7	10
8	15
9	1
10	9
11	4
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	794
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There is no ungraded kids.	

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.

The Idaho State Migrant Student Information System has been in use for close to 9 years now. The system was built by contract and inhouse resources and is a secure web application using SQI 2008 to house data. The system generates and compiles reports using SQL queries on the Student level information. The system was used to compile and report Idaho's Category 1 and 2 Migrant counts for SY1112 , SY1011 and SY0910.

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.

Idaho utilizes the following people to collect and manage the child count data: 7 Migrant Regional Identification and Recruitment Coordinators, 1 Migrant data administrator and IT management (Federal Data Manager Programmer Project Manager) at the State level. The Migrant system collects details on student demographics, student enrollment, movement history, regular and summer services being provided, test scores, secondary grades/credits and immunization records on active students enrolled in the State's MEP program. Each year the system is rolled over and all students are re-qualified and re-certified by the Regional IDR Coordinators and districts for accurate counts. The rollover of the Migrant application for SY 11-12 occurred in September 2011 and in October 2010 for SY 10-11. Prior to the rollover, Regional IDR Coordinators are required to verify migrant student information and reconcile Migrant student counts with each district. District reports are populated through the system that the Regional IDR Coordinators and each MEP district use to verify student counts and student data.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Migrant data administrator is the only person who can add new students to the MSIS with a valid COE. Identity search functions in the system are used to insure that a new student does not already exist in the Migrant Student Information System. If the student does not exist in the system, the data administrator enters the new student using the information collected on the COE and adds an enrollment history record for the current location of the student. If the student exists, the data administrator manages the enrollment history record for that student and updates Student Demographic details and Student Enrollment details, as needed. If there is a duplicate, IT management is contacted with specific instructions for removing duplicate information. Regional Coordinators update all student information as needed, but do not have the ability to add new students. A request must be made to the Migrant data administrator for removal of duplicate information. Regional Coordinators and districts use the district reports to validate counts. IT management uses the same reports and queries to organize the child counts for all reporting purposes.

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.

NA

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.

Children are counted if they reach 3 years old by the end of the eligible period 8/31/2012 for SY 1112 and if they are not older than 21 at the start of the eligible period 9/1/2011 for SY 1112. This is done by queries when the reports are generated and compiled. Students are activated for the SY1112 by the Regional IDR Coordinators and Migrant data administrator if they are active as a resident or student for at least one day from 9/1/2011 to 8/31/2012 for the SY112. The District reports do not display children whose: QA date generates an eligibility date that does not fall into the range of 9/1/2011 to 8/31/2012 for SY1112 and the EOE data is out of range for SY1112. Summer students are marked on the same student record and cannot be included again in the regular school year count. The district reports include validation for Summer and Regular year students and their services. There is only one age/grade category for each student, and the State queries return counts based on this fact to insure that migrant student counts are compiled only once per grade.

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.

NA

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.

LEA recruiters are required to verify all information on the COE is accurate and true. The COE is then forwarded to the Regional ID&R Coordinator who is then responsible for verifying the accuracy and validity of the information on the COE. The Regional ID&R Coordinator must then sign the COE indicating this has been done and the eligibility is valid. The COE is then sent to the State. The IMEP administrative assistant reviews the COE for accuracy and validity. If corrections are necessary or the eligibility is invalid, the COE is returned to the Regional ID&R Coordinator for corrections and/or communication to LEA recruiter regarding eligibility. Before students are entered into the system or existing students' information is updated, the IMEP migrant data administrator reviews each new COE once more to ensure that all necessary information is provided by checking each qualifying activity to assure it is valid, time of year that the move was made and if the activity is done in the area that the move was made to. The data administrator then enters the data from the COE into the Idaho computerized data system. The Regional Coordinators update the existing student data for their assigned districts to maintain records and re-qualify eligible students. When a question or concern of possible duplication arises, Regional Coordinators contact the State Migrant data administrator for resolution. The State Migrant data administrator compares the COE data to what is in the computerized data system and makes any necessary changes or deletions so that the child count is accurate. This quality control process is outlined in the State MEP's Quality Control Policies and Procedures

Manual dated June 2011. The Idaho Migrant Education Program (IMEP) has a statewide COE. Regional recruiters and district family liaisons

determine student eligibility by interviewing the parents, guardians, or other responsible adult(s) of potential migrant students. In addition, regional recruiters and family liaisons interview the person directly if he or she is self eligible for the Migrant Education Program. Title I-C monitoring visits are also an assured process in evaluating quality control. Statewide re-interviewing was also completed during April/May of 2011 for SY 10-11. MERC provided family recruiters/liaisons with professional development in Identification and Recruitment during the regular and summer/intersession.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Idaho State Department of Education utilized the State's 7 Regional IDR Coordinators to conduct the re-interviews. The Idaho State Department of Education MEP secured the sampling methodology and followed a re-interview protocol that met the requirements of the United States Department of Education (ED) Office of Migrant Education's (OME) Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing. The purpose of the sample was to meet the requirement for conducting the annual re-interview to conform to OME regulations and guidance. The re-interviewers were fluent in English and Spanish and knowledgeable about migratory families and Out of School Youth (OSY). The re-interviewers had extensive experience in conducting personal interviews and understanding and applying MEP program eligibility requirements, including those requirements related to identification and recruitment issues or special circumstances. Emphasis was placed also on utilizing experienced re-interviewers who had excellent relationship and communication skills with people, particularly in this case with migratory families. The Idaho MEP trained reinterviewers on the applicable forms and the re-interviewing protocol, and understanding the Idaho State Migrant Education Program. Re-interviewers received all forms including the Idaho MEP Certificate of Eligibility weeks ahead of the actual reinterview activity. The Idaho MEP staff assisted in contacting the families but were not involved in the actual eligibility determination process. Parents were not allowed to consult with the family liaison while the re-interview was taking place. The goal was that the initial recruiter or district representative would introduce the re-interviewer to the family but would not be present during the re-interview. From a stratified random sample of 60 students were selected. Re-interviews on 45 of these students occurred face to face. 100% of these were found to be eligible for the migrant education program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The districts and Regional IDR Coordinators work together to re-certify and re-qualify students throughout the year. District reports (in real time) are accessible for both district staff and Regional IDR Coordinators to view. Updates to student information can only be updated by the Regional IDR Coordinators or the State Migrant administrators as needed. This allows for checks and balances that only eligible children are being served and counted for the State MEP Program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State Migrant Coordinator verifies with Regional IDR Coordinators that all child counts met the OME criteria for eligibility. The Migrant data administrator reports to the State Migrant Coordinator on the status of data entry of eligible COEs and any corrections and/or deletions of non-eligible students. The State Migrant Coordinator collaborates with the EDFacts Coordinator to review final child counts and all pertinent information so that accuracy is ensured.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Idaho Migrant Education Program (IMEP) has taken steps to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations. District personnel working with the Migrant Program and Regional ID&R Coordinators will continue to receive ongoing training at the State and local level in ID&R to ensure consistency across all programs. The State Migrant Coordinator will monitor identification and recruitment in districts to assure that Regional Coordinators and district personnel involved in eligibility determinations are following the OME criteria and guidelines for qualifying a student for the migrant program. COEs will be continually verified and collaboration with the EDFacts Coordinator will help maintain accuracy of student eligibility.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Idaho MEP feels confident in the accuracy of the reported child counts based on the systems and processes utilized to identify, qualify, and report eligible migrant students. The results of the prospective re-interview are an indication of that.