

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 EDFacts 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>	
<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</p>	
<p>Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Ohio Department of Education</p>	
<p>Address: 25 S. Front Street Columbus, OH 43215-4183</p>	
<p>Person to contact about this report:</p>	
<p>Name: Dr. Ardith M. Allen, Social Science Research Specialist, Office of Accountability</p>	
<p>Telephone: 614-728-8054</p>	
<p>Fax: 614-728-2627</p>	
<p>e-mail: ardith.allen@education.ohio.gov</p>	
<p>Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Richard A. Rogers, Superintendent of Public Instruction</p>	
<p>_____ Signature</p>	
<p>Monday, April 15, 2013, 2:46:36 PM</p>	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

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

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2010-2011	2010-2011	2010-2011

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

Ohio adopted the Common Core State Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics and for state-specific Science standards.

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

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

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

<p>State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ 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	2014-2015
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

A new alternate assessment is being implemented in 2012-2013 on new standards with extensions.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	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 GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ 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)	2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

A new alternate assessment is being implemented in 2012-2013 on new standards with extensions.

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)	80.00
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	20.00
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	No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	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	926,238	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,337	>=99
Asian	S	16,959	>=99
Black or African American	S	143,978	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	33,543	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	690,923	>=99
Two or more races	S	39,498	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	139,571	>=99
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	S	19,754	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	436,137	>=99
Migratory students	S	245	>=98
Male	S	474,335	>=99
Female	S	451,903	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In the Ohio Department of Education's Data Warehouse, the 2011-2012 school year data include one sixth grade student whose gender is coded as "Data not provided by Community School." We do have other demographic information for this student, as well as assessment participation and proficiency data. Therefore, this student is currently included in all applicable student subgroups, with the exception of the Male or Female student subgroups. However, ODE is in the process of revising its business rules so that students without complete information will not be included in state totals.			

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	39,761	28.49
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	83,719	59.98
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,091	11.53
Total	139,571	////////////////////////////////////
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	931,722	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,349	>=99
Asian	S	16,997	>=99
Black or African American	S	145,131	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	33,743	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	694,675	>=99
Two or more races	S	39,827	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	140,329	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	19,427	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	439,904	>=99
Migratory students	S	234	>=98
Male	S	477,255	>=99
Female	S	454,467	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were eleven students with disabilities who were also recently arrived LEP students. These students took an appropriate English Language Proficiency assessment instead of the State's Reading/Language Arts assessment. Hence, the total number of students with disabilities who took the State's Reading/Language Arts assessment is reported in Question 1.2.3 as 140,329, whereas the total number of students with disabilities who took the State's Reading/Language Arts assessment OR an English Language Proficiency assessment is reported in Question 1.2.4 as 140,340. $140,340 - 140,329 = 11$ students.

In the Ohio Department of Education's Data Warehouse, the 2011-2012 school year data include one sixth grade student whose gender is coded as "Data not provided by Community School." We do have other demographic information for this student, as well as assessment participation and proficiency data. Therefore, this student is currently included in all applicable student subgroups, with the exception of the Male or Female student subgroups. However, ODE is in the process of revising its business rules so that students without complete information will not be included in state totals.

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	415
--	-----

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	40,537	28.88
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	83,715	59.65
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,077	11.46
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	11	0.01
Total	140,340	////////////////////////////////////
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were eleven students with disabilities who were also recently arrived LEP students. These students took an appropriate English Language Proficiency assessment instead of the State's Reading/Language Arts assessment. Hence, the total number of students with disabilities who took the State's Reading/Language Arts assessment is reported in Question 1.2.3 as 140,329, whereas the total number of students with disabilities who took the State's Reading/Language Arts assessment OR an English Language Proficiency assessment is reported in Question 1.2.4 as 140,340. $140,340 - 140,329 = 11$ students.</p>		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	399,648	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	615	>=99
Asian	S	7,018	>=99
Black or African American	S	61,674	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	13,559	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	301,014	>=99
Two or more races	S	15,768	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	60,904	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	6,986	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	179,746	>=99
Migratory students	S	102	>=98
Male	S	204,000	>=99
Female	S	195,648	>=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	16,727	27.46
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	37,363	61.35
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,814	11.19
Total	60,904	////////////////////////////////////

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	129,293	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	166	S	76
Asian	2,688	S	91
Black or African American	20,288	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	5,423	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	94,387	S	86
Two or more races	6,341	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	18,250	S	55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,539	S	69
Economically disadvantaged students	65,153	S	70
Migratory students	36	S	58
Male	66,795	S	80
Female	62,498	S	81
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

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	134,604	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	177	S	72
Asian	2,749	S	88
Black or African American	21,561	S	60
Hispanic or Latino	5,721	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	97,739	S	85
Two or more races	6,657	S	77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19,041	S	57
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,642	S	65
Economically disadvantaged students	69,144	S	69
Migratory students	32	S	66
Male	69,531	S	77
Female	65,073	S	82
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

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	0	0	0.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.00
Asian	0	0	0.00
Black or African American	0	0	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	0.00
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	0	0	0.00
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.00
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.00
Migratory students	0	0	0.00
Male	0	0	0.00
Female	0	0	0.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement assessments are given only in grades 5, 8 and 10.			
Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

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	130,090	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	162	S	76
Asian	2,547	S	91
Black or African American	20,275	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	5,205	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	95,778	S	85
Two or more races	6,123	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19,694	S	51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,631	S	64
Economically disadvantaged students	64,903	S	68
Migratory students	38	S	58
Male	66,623	S	78
Female	63,467	S	80
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			
Differences between the previous year's data and the current year's data for the American Indian or Alaska Native student subgroup have been verified as correct. In particularly small student subgroups, small changes in numbers can lead to large percentage changes from one school year to the next.			

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	130,080	S	84
American Indian or Alaska Native	162	S	83
Asian	2,531	S	90
Black or African American	20,274	S	64
Hispanic or Latino	5,185	S	75
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	95,811	S	89
Two or more races	6,117	S	82
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19,693	S	62
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,527	S	66
Economically disadvantaged students	64,853	S	75
Migratory students	35	S	80
Male	66,623	S	82
Female	63,457	S	86
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			
Differences between the previous year's data and the current year's data for the American Indian or Alaska Native and Migrant student subgroups have been verified as correct. In particularly small student subgroups, small changes in numbers can lead to large percentage changes from one school year to the next.			

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	0	0	0.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.00
Asian	0	0	0.00
Black or African American	0	0	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	0.00
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	0	0	0.00
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.00
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.00
Migratory students	0	0	0.00
Male	0	0	0.00
Female	0	0	0.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement assessments are given only in grades 5, 8 and 10.			
Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,605	S	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	197	S	70
Asian	2,393	S	87
Black or African American	20,779	S	39
Hispanic or Latino	5,012	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	98,188	S	75
Two or more races	6,036	S	62
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,489	S	38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,155	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	65,103	S	53
Migratory students	38	S	45
Male	68,012	S	69
Female	64,593	S	68
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,692	S	77
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	S	78
Asian	2,420	S	89
Black or African American	20,765	S	55
Hispanic or Latino	4,988	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	98,271	S	83
Two or more races	6,050	S	74
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,474	S	50
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,061	S	55
Economically disadvantaged students	65,083	S	66
Migratory students	35	S	43
Male	68,078	S	74
Female	64,614	S	81
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

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	132,723	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	S	72
Asian	2,445	S	85
Black or African American	20,763	S	40
Hispanic or Latino	5,003	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	98,271	S	79
Two or more races	6,042	S	67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,464	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,155	S	44
Economically disadvantaged students	65,059	S	57
Migratory students	38	S	47
Male	68,069	S	72
Female	64,654	S	71

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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	133,691	S	81
American Indian or Alaska Native	176	S	74
Asian	2,469	S	92
Black or African American	20,944	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	4,751	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	99,579	S	86
Two or more races	5,772	S	77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,316	S	51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,388	S	58
Economically disadvantaged students	64,146	S	69
Migratory students	33	S	55
Male	68,590	S	80
Female	65,101	S	81

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In the Ohio Department of Education's Data Warehouse, the 2011-2012 school year data include one sixth grade student whose gender is coded as "Data not provided by Community School." We do have other demographic information for this student, as well as assessment participation and proficiency data. Therefore, this student is currently included in all applicable student subgroups, with the exception of the Male or Female student subgroups. However, ODE is in the process of revising its business rules so that students without complete information will not be included in state totals.

Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - 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	133,857	S	87
American Indian or Alaska Native	176	S	84
Asian	2,450	S	93
Black or African American	20,930	S	72
Hispanic or Latino	4,753	S	82
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	99,772	S	91
Two or more races	5,776	S	87
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,312	S	63
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,297	S	67
Economically disadvantaged students	64,166	S	80
Migratory students	32	S	78
Male	68,682	S	85
Female	65,175	S	90

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In the Ohio Department of Education's Data Warehouse, the 2011-2012 school year data include one sixth grade student whose gender is coded as "Data not provided by Community School." We do have other demographic information for this student, as well as assessment participation and proficiency data. Therefore, this student is currently included in all applicable student subgroups, with the exception of the Male or Female student subgroups. However, ODE is in the process of revising its business rules so that students without complete information will not be included in state totals.

Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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	0	0	0.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.00
Asian	0	0	0.00
Black or African American	0	0	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	0.00
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	0	0	0.00
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.00
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.00
Migratory students	0	0	0.00
Male	0	0	0.00
Female	0	0	0.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement assessments are given only in grades 5, 8 and 10.			
Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

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	133,525	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	219	S	69
Asian	2,302	S	88
Black or African American	20,731	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	4,584	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,199	S	80
Two or more races	5,490	S	69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,279	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,209	S	46
Economically disadvantaged students	62,059	S	60
Migratory students	37	S	65
Male	68,381	S	73
Female	65,144	S	75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

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	133,670	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	220	S	75
Asian	2,308	S	88
Black or African American	20,741	S	59
Hispanic or Latino	4,567	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,337	S	85
Two or more races	5,497	S	79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,307	S	48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,146	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	62,041	S	69
Migratory students	37	S	65
Male	68,449	S	77
Female	65,221	S	84
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

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	0	0	0.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.00
Asian	0	0	0.00
Black or African American	0	0	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	0.00
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	0	0	0.00
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.00
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.00
Migratory students	0	0	0.00
Male	0	0	0.00
Female	0	0	0.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement assessments are given only in grades 5, 8 and 10.			
Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

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	133,543	S	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	S	77
Asian	2,323	S	90
Black or African American	20,697	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	4,527	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,620	S	85
Two or more races	5,180	S	77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,292	S	47
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,111	S	51
Economically disadvantaged students	60,275	S	68
Migratory students	35	S	51
Male	68,149	S	79
Female	65,394	S	81
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			
Differences between the previous year's data and the current year's data for the Migrant student subgroup have been verified as correct. In particularly small student subgroups, small changes in numbers can lead to large percentage changes from one school year to the next.			

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	133,581	S	84
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	S	87
Asian	2,306	S	89
Black or African American	20,711	S	67
Hispanic or Latino	4,514	S	75
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,669	S	87
Two or more races	5,186	S	82
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,294	S	50
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,043	S	52
Economically disadvantaged students	60,293	S	73
Migratory students	35	S	46
Male	68,224	S	80
Female	65,357	S	87
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

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	133,516	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	S	64
Asian	2,333	S	82
Black or African American	20,662	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	4,519	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,633	S	78
Two or more races	5,174	S	65
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,266	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,107	S	33
Economically disadvantaged students	60,224	S	54
Migratory students	36	S	47
Male	68,171	S	71
Female	65,345	S	70
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.			

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	133,491	S	83
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	S	75
Asian	2,237	S	92
Black or African American	20,264	S	62
Hispanic or Latino	4,041	S	74
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	102,172	S	88
Two or more races	4,556	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,251	S	48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,721	S	55
Economically disadvantaged students	54,498	S	72
Migratory students	28	S	75
Male	67,785	S	84
Female	65,706	S	83

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

Differences between the previous year's data and the current year's data for the Migrant student subgroup have been verified as correct. In particularly small student subgroups, small changes in numbers can lead to large percentage changes from one school year to the next.

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	133,238	S	87
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	S	82
Asian	2,233	S	88
Black or African American	20,149	S	70
Hispanic or Latino	4,015	S	79
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	102,076	S	90
Two or more races	4,544	S	85
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,208	S	55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,711	S	48
Economically disadvantaged students	54,324	S	77
Migratory students	28	S	54
Male	67,668	S	85
Female	65,570	S	89

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,409	S	76
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	S	69
Asian	2,240	S	85
Black or African American	20,249	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	4,037	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	102,110	S	82
Two or more races	4,552	S	72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,174	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,724	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	54,463	S	60
Migratory students	28	S	50
Male	67,760	S	76
Female	65,649	S	76

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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	3,714	2,057	55.39
Districts	1,079	245	22.71

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. During the 201-2012 school year, Ohio submitted an ESEA Flexibility Request to the United States Department of Education, and it was approved on May 29, 2012. One proposal in the State's request is to replace Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) with different measures targeted at closing achievement gaps in Reading and Mathematics. Because AYP is no longer being used as the primary measure of progress made by schools and districts, the "Total #" numbers in this table no longer represent the total numbers of all schools and all districts that received AYP determinations for the school year. Instead, they represent the total numbers of all schools and all districts that were operational during the school year. Therefore, they are significantly larger than the numbers we would previously have seen in this column. For example, if we had counted only those schools and districts that had received AYP determinations in the "Total #" column this year as we have in previous years, this table would show 2,057 / 3,584 schools and 245 / 613 districts meeting AYP.

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	2,243	1,177	52.47
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,487	618	41.56
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	756	559	73.94

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
610	243	39.84

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Ohio is a Differentiated Accountability state, so the above listed actions that are recommended for Corrective Action and Restructuring plans are implemented and measured differently from how they were prior to our Differentiated Accountability Model being approved and put into place in July 2008. Under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model, a district and all of its buildings are treated as one system to which appropriate improvement strategies are applied. The last school year for which building-level data on the implementation of Corrective Action and Restructuring strategies were collected is 2008-2009. Please see our response to Question 1.4.5.3 for additional detail.</p>	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Ohio is a Differentiated Accountability state, so the above listed actions that are recommended for Corrective Action and Restructuring plans are implemented and measured differently from how they were prior to our Differentiated Accountability Model being approved and put into place in July 2008. Under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model, a district and all of its buildings are treated as one system to which appropriate improvement strategies are applied. The last school year for which building-level data on the implementation of Corrective Action and Restructuring strategies were collected is 2008-2009. Please see our response to Question 1.4.5.3 for additional detail.</p>	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2011-2012, 306 public districts, 1,052 public district buildings, and 156 community (aka charter) schools were identified for support under Ohio's Differentiated Accountability Model and were required to implement the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) using the tools developed by the State. All 306 public districts (100%), 738 of the 1,052 public district buildings (70.2%), and 153 of the 156 community schools (98.1%) received Title I funds for the 2011-2012 school year. The OIP is Ohio's strategy for ensuring a systematic and coherent approach for building the capacity of all districts and schools to improve instructional practice and student performance on a district-wide basis, and is a strategy for assisting districts to enact the Ohio Leadership Development Framework (OLDF). The OIP requires the intentional use of the following four stage process, across which structures, tools, and people are connected, to help districts: 1) use data to identify areas of greatest need; 2) develop a plan to address areas of need built around a limited number of focused goals and strategies to improve instructional practice and student performance; 3) fully implement and monitor the degree of implementation of the plan; and 4) evaluate the effectiveness of the improvement process in changing instructional practice and impacting student performance. Selected districts also receive an on-site School Improvement Diagnostic Review (SIDR) from the State Diagnostic Team (SDT) to help them analyze their current practices against indicators of effective instructional practices.

The SIDR process is designed to gather qualitative data on behaviors and practices within the school setting that provide information beyond existing data. Current practices are measured against effective evidence- and research-based practices to identify areas of strength and areas needing improvement. The indicators of effective practice measured through the SIDR are organized around six Critical Areas of Performance: 1) Alignment with Standards; 2) Instructional Practice; 3) Environment and Climate; 4) System of Leadership; 5) Professional Development; and 6) Data Driven Decisions. The SIDR and SDT are part of a larger state system of support for low-performing schools. The State Support Team (SST) helps districts and buildings embed actionable SIDR findings into their improvement plans, and assists with implementing and monitoring changes in adult practices and student performance. Nine High Support districts, 39 traditional public buildings, and three community schools in School Improvement received the intensive SIDR during 2011-2012. An additional 33 traditional public buildings from six districts and another six community schools received the intensive Diagnostic Review during the 2011-2012 school year. These entities were selected based on past SIDR results and SST recommendations.

Technical Assistance: The technical assistance provided to districts identified for support included structured facilitation by personnel assigned from SSTs or Educational Service Centers (ESCs). These trained personnel work with districts and schools as follows:

Stage 0: Preparing district personnel to implement the OIP by supporting them to: 1) (re)establish a District Leadership Team (DLT), Building Leadership Teams (BLTs), and Teacher Based Teams (TBTs) in each school within the district, or a Community School Leadership Team (CSLT); 2) develop a common understanding of the role of leadership teams in implementing the OIP; and 3) measure their teams' level of practice against standards of effective practice as outlined in the OLDF using an electronic performance assessment.

Stage 1: Working with leadership teams using the OLDF tool to complete a needs assessment that identifies the most critical needs and probable causes based on data by supporting them to: 1) effectively summarize and analyze data sets; 2) understand/apply the Decision Framework (DF); 3) interpret key findings from the needs assessment; and 4) prioritize data-based critical problems in the creation of their needs assessment. A state-developed data warehouse makes relevant data needed for the DF process readily available to districts, buildings, and community schools.

Stage 2: Working with leadership teams to develop a limited number of focused district goals, strategies, and action steps based on data, as well as a limited number of focused building actions aligned with district goals and strategies, by supporting them to: 1) develop focused SMART goals; 2) determine prioritized cause-and-effect relationships; 3) compose strategies for each goal; and 4) create actions that have the greatest likelihood of increasing student performance and improving instructional practices. These goals/strategies/actions form the basis of the district/building plan, which is formalized as part of each district's Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP).

Stage 3: Working with leadership teams to implement and monitor the degree of the focused plan's implementation by supporting them to: 1) establish and implement collaborative structures/processes/practices that support a culture of inquiry; 2) implement the plan systemically and systematically; and 3) monitor, using the Implementation Monitoring/Management (IMM) tool, the degree of implementation of the focused strategies and actions to gauge whether they are having the desired effects on changes in adult practice and student achievement, and make and report necessary corrections to the plan. The IMM, which is accessible through the CCIP, establishes expected levels of performance for

both adults and students, assigns persons responsible, and monitors and communicates progress.

Stage 4: Working with leadership teams to evaluate the improvement process and make necessary changes to continually improve instructional practice and student performance by supporting them to: 1) evaluate plan implementation, impact, and changes needed; 2) report summative plan progress; and 3) modify instructional practice. Ohio has established several structures to ensure consistency in the design and delivery of ongoing training and development of regional facilitators assigned to support districts and buildings identified for support, which include a State-level Design Team and a quadrant lead structure. In addition to implementation of the OIP as a required intervention, districts identified for support are required to implement additional consequences/interventions under the Differentiated Accountability Model that are dependent on their level of support (i.e., High, Medium, or Low). Because Ohio's DA Model has been in place for three years, LEAs identified for support in each of those three years are required to select additional interventions beyond what is minimally required. The process for deciding upon these intervention choices is collaborative, and stakeholders include members of an LEA's leadership, Single Points of Contact (SPoCs) leading the SSTs in the state's sixteen regions, other trained regional facilitators, and other ODE consultants.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Ohio's Differentiated Accountability Model, adopted in July 2008, allows the state to implement an intervention model that distinguishes between those districts that require intensive intervention and those that are closer to meeting their student achievement goals. Under the Differentiated Accountability Model, Ohio treats districts and buildings as a system and stratifies districts into three risk categories (High, Medium, and Low Support) based on the aggregate percentage of student groups not meeting AYP, rather than on the amount of time that the district has not met AYP. These identified districts are provided with different options for interventions in addition to those required by federal law. As such, Ohio's 99 Corrective Action districts are not the focus of the State's intervention model; instead, our attention has focused on the districts identified under the new Differentiated Accountability Model.

In the 2011-2012 school year, Ohio identified 306 school districts, which included all 99 Corrective Action districts, across the three risk categories. Of these 306 districts, 29 were identified as needing High Support (including 20 districts in Corrective Action) and received full intervention from the State System of Support. All 29 High Support districts, as well as 62 Medium Support districts (24 of which were in Corrective Action) and 215 Low Support districts (55 of which were in Corrective Action), implemented the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model. This implementation of the OIP included: development of District Leadership Teams (DLTs), Building Leadership Teams (BLTs), and Teacher Based Teams (TBTs; a necessary but not sufficient component of the BLTs); use of the State's Decision Framework (DF) tool to complete a deep review of district-level data and create district and building needs assessments; development of focused improvement plans based on the district- and building-level needs assessments; and, if selected by the State, a review by the State Diagnostic Team (SDT). Plans were developed at the district and building levels in 2011-2012 for implementation in the 2012-2013 school year.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

////////////////	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	3	0

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 12011-12 data was complete	IOB/09/12
---	-----------

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.

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.

Technical Assistance

- Developing, reviewing, and revising the Executive Principal Leadership Academy through a process of meeting with the Executive Committee at The Ohio State University. Stakeholder feedback is collected at each session and used to revise the curriculum of the Academy.
- Reviewing reports from identified SEA providers and reallocating resources as needed to assist schools with raising student achievement.
- Planning and developing the framework and protocols for the work of 13 Transformation Specialists as they provide technical assistance to the 85 identified schools buildings. The office serves as support to buildings implementing the components of each school's selected intervention model under the Title I School Improvement Grant 1003(g).
- Four technical assistance sessions with required attendance were conducted for all building principals of the 85 low-performing schools: 1) Orientation in September, differentiated for Cohort 1 principals in Year 2 and Cohort 2 principals in Year 1. 2) OAASFEP conference attendance in October for all principals and building leadership team members. 3) Regional trainings conducted in January that focused upon the individual needs of each school as it implements its selected intervention model. 4) A Best Practices conference held in June
- Principals of low-performing schools were required to attend the Executive Principal Leadership Academy, consisting of four two-day sessions followed by an additional session of individual coaching.
- Evaluation
- A diagnostic review was completed for each identified Cohort 2 building. Each school was then required to develop a work plan from the recommendations provided to it.
- Site visit reports prepared by the Transformation Specialists documented each low-performing building's progress toward increasing student achievement.
- Mid-year internal reviews were conducted to assess the implementation of recommendations from both the diagnostic review and the site visit reports.
- A fiscal survey was conducted for all identified low-performing schools receiving the Title I School Improvement 1003(g) grant.
- Quarterly review reports were prepared by the Transformation Specialists and reviewed with each building principal and building leadership team.
- Data on reporting metrics were received from each building principal and reviewed for quality and compliance.
- A comprehensive review process was conducted in May of 2012 seeking to determine the following: 1) whether the funds spent according to the funding application; 2) the progress of each school on the leading and lagging indicators; 3) the degree of implementation of the recommendations made during the three quarterly monitoring visits; and 4) how external providers were utilized.
- Renewal applications, guidelines, and rubrics were created and distributed to both Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 to receive continuation funding. The Title I School Improvement 1003(g) grant is guaranteed for a three year period of funding.
- A survey was developed and administered to all building principals seeking feedback and evaluation of external providers.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2011-12 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The core work of the State Support Teams (SSTs), as defined in Section 1.4.5.2, was primarily supported through State general revenue funds. Additionally, IDEA Part B discretionary dollars funded to SSTs supported facilitation, consultation, technical assistance, and professional development provided by the SST personnel working with districts and schools in improvement. These dollars supported more effective use of data, particularly subgroup data for students with disabilities, and the use of strategies to address district-identified needs as part of the OIP. IDEA Part D (State Personnel Development Grant [SPDG]) dollars were used to test the development of the process and related tools with selected cohorts of districts that were in improvement for not meeting AYP for students with disabilities. Additionally, Title III funds support English Language Learners through implementation of specific instructional strategies, technical assistance and professional development for staff.

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	294,015
Applied to transfer	7,727
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	5,279
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 11,168,002

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	51

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	262,991
Applied for supplemental educational services	34,662
Received supplemental educational services	23,798
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 42,292,598
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	534,929	530,663	99.20	4,266	0.80
All elementary classes	267,012	265,840	99.56	1,172	0.44
All secondary classes	267,917	264,823	98.85	3,094	1.15

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.

The state uses departmentalized classrooms where each class is counted multiple times, once for each subject.

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	46.00
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	14.40
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	9.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	30.60
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other = Elementary school classes taught by teachers not properly certified

////////////////////////////////////	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)	32.50
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	35.80
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.40
Other (please explain in comment box below)	29.30
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other = Secondary school classes taught by teachers not properly certified

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	63,880	62,502	97.84
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	71,816	71,688	99.82
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	50,077	49,137	98.12
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	83,594	83,377	99.74

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	65.90	24.50
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantage	
Secondary schools	70.50	28.50
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantage	

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	Chinese, French, Russian, Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	French, Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Arabic, Chinese, French, Nepali, Russian, Somali, Swahili, Vietnamese
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Japanese, 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.

Other programs include: after school English language tutoring, bilingual aide support, ESL summer school, in-class tutoring, inclusion with tutor support, and computer-based English language learning during intervention periods.

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	42,824
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.	# 40,910
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	8,686
Somali	2,133
Arabic	1,810
Chinese	753
Japanese	592

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	37,602
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,695
Total	39,297

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1) The student count reported for Question 1.6.3.1.1 (i.e., 37,602 tested + 1,695 untested = 39,297 total) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled in Ohio schools during the ELP assessment window. The student count reported for Question 1.6.2.1 (42,824) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled at any time during the 2011-2012 school year. There are a significant number of enrolled LEP students who move out of state before the ELP testing window (e.g., children of migrant families), or who enroll after the ELP window.

2) Ohio reported 1,695 LEP students who were not tested on a State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment during the 2011-2012 school year. The reasons for these students not being tested are as follows:

A) Reason(s) "Test Score Not Reported" as Reported in the Statewide Education Management Information System (EMIS):

1. Medical Reason - 29 students
2. Parent Refusal - 87 students
3. Student Refusal - 25 students
4. Suspension/Expulsion - 7 students
5. Truancy - 77 students
6. Other (e.g., Excused Absence, Incarceration) - 520 students
7. Test Invalidated - 4 students
8. Student Moved into/out of District Before or During Test Administration - 299 students

B) Other Reason(s) Not Specific to "Test Score Not Reported" Reason(s) Reported in the Statewide Education Management Information System (EMIS):

1. Partial Test Reported (i.e., Missing One or More Subtests) - 26 students
2. OTELA Score and "Test Score Not Reported" Reason(s) Not Reported by District - 621 students

$29 + 87 + 25 + 7 + 77 + 520 + 4 + 299 + 26 + 621 = 1,695$ untested students.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	11,790
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	31.42
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	36,050
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,526
Total	37,576
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1) The student count reported for Question 1.6.3.2.1 (i.e., 36,050 tested + 1,526 untested = 37,576 total) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled in Ohio Title III schools during the ELP assessment window. The student count reported for Question 1.6.2.2 (40,910) represents the total number of Title III LEP students enrolled at any time during the 2010-2011 school year. There are a significant number of enrolled LEP students who move out of state before the ELP testing window (e.g., children of migrant families), or who enroll after the ELP window.</p> <p>2) Ohio reported 1,526 Title III LEP students who were not tested on a State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment during the 2011-2012 school year. The reasons for these students not being tested are as follows:</p> <p>A) Reason(s) "Test Score Not Reported" as Reported in the Statewide Education Management Information System (EMIS):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Medical Reason - 27 students 2. Parent Refusal - 77 students 3. Student Refusal - 16 students 4. Suspension/Expulsion - 7 students 5. Truancy - 77 students 6. Other (e.g., Excused Absence, Incarceration) - 481 students 7. Test Invalidated - 4 students 8. Student Moved into/out of District Before or During Test Administration - 282 students <p>B) Other Reason(s) Not Specific to "Test Score Not Reported" Reason(s) Reported in the Statewide Education Management Information System (EMIS):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partial Test Reported (i.e., Missing One or More Subtests) - 22 students 2. OTELA Score and "Test Score Not Reported" Reason(s) Not Reported by District - 533 students <p>$27 + 77 + 16 + 7 + 77 + 481 + 4 + 282 + 22 + 533 = 1,526$ untested students.</p>	

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.	9,880

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	17,568	67.13	20,731	81.00
Attained proficiency	11,305	31.36	10,153	28.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Ohio, there are no languages in which native language assessments are given for ESEA accountability determinations.	

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)
None
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are no languages in which native language assessments are given for ESEA accountability determinations for Mathematics.

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
3,617	3,383	7,000
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
4,705	S	91	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
4,705	S	95	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,156	S	85	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	310
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	79
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	108
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	199
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	287
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	18
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	67
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	26
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	33

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. In each of the figures in Table 1.6.4.1, consortia members are counted as individual grantees. Consortia members are considered individual grantees solely for the purpose of AMAO calculations.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	_____ N
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
11,374	3,229	43

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

////////////////////////////////////	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,083
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	550

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	232	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	164	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	107	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	56	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	119	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	48	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	217	11,168
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	205	1,108
PD provided to principals	144	965
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	140	585
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	95	905
PD provided to community based organization personnel	25	618
Total	826	15,349

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<p>Other professional development topics include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIOP-based methods for teaching language; • Legal Concerns and Implementation Strategies for Schools; • Cultural diversity issues and their impact on learning; • Response to Intervention approaches; • Use of technology and ELL software materials; • Formative assessments and implications for instruction • Needs of migrant students; and • Literacy best practices, including vocabulary development.
--

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	07/14/11	13
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Ohio SEA can shorten the process of distributing funds to subgrantees by continuing to provide ongoing technical assistance so that grantees submit their Consolidated Application for all programs funded under Title III by July 1 of each fiscal year. When an Ohio subgrantee submits a Superintendent-approved Consolidated Application to the Ohio SEA through an online allocation and application process, it is considered to be substantially approved, and as of that date legal obligations can be incurred for as long as the budget meets the requirements for use of funds. Cash disbursements to subgrantees become available within two weeks after the Consolidated Application is reviewed and then approved by a consultant and an administrator from the SEA.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	??????
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Ohio identified zero persistently dangerous schools for the 2011-2012 school year.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	1,002	1,002
LEAs with subgrants	77	77
Total	1,079	1,079
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The total includes operational public districts, educational service centers (ESCs), joint vocational school districts (JVSDs), charter school LEAs, and state agencies. The number of LEAs with subgrants includes 19 public district subgrantees, 3 ESC subgrantees, and 53 public districts and 2 JVSDs served by the 3 ESC subgrantees.		

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)	111	263
K	951	1,122
1	998	1,262
2	1,055	1,158
3	947	1,121
4	849	1,112
5	788	1,040
6	777	989
7	690	1,009
8	718	1,007
9	895	1,308
10	612	798
11	660	682
12	630	659
Ungraded	14	11
Total	10,695	13,541

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	1,131	4,016
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	8,577	8,993
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	223	86
Hotels/Motels	764	446
Total	10,695	13,541

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	1,211
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,193
K	1,261
1	1,422
2	1,348
3	1,292
4	1,219
5	1,198
6	1,162
7	1,155
8	1,136
9	1,433
10	1,013
11	756
12	785
Ungraded	76
Total	17,660
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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,742
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,154
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	177
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	1,638	946
4	1,395	886
5	1,317	697
6	1,260	888
7	1,152	656
8	1,185	740
High School	907	648

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	1,484	863
4	1,401	760
5	1,322	516
6	1,258	710
7	1,158	532
8	1,182	664
High School	904	577

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	1,321	561
6		
7		
8	1,179	457
High School	904	444

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)	362
K	157
1	149
2	116
3	114
4	98
5	103
6	85
7	81
8	85
9	84
10	84
11	57
12	38
Ungraded	3
Out-of-school	253
Total	1,869
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 Category 1 Count decreased by 6% from the previous year.

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)	169
K	106
1	93
2	80
3	79
4	70
5	69
6	43
7	49
8	41
9	34
10	39
11	20
12	7
Ungraded	3
Out-of-school	22
Total	924
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 Count increased by 7% from the previous year.

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 2011-2012 Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count were generated using the Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2). OMSIS2 is a client/server management information system utilizing the FileMaker suite of hosted database tools. OMSIS2 is developed and maintained by the Tri-Rivers Educational Computer Association (TRECA), a non-profit entity providing K-12 educational technology services through a consortium of Ohio public school districts.

Ohio also maintains partial membership in the New Generation System (NGS) consortium. Historically, Ohio used the NGS system to generate unique ID numbers. These historical numbers are maintained as a backup to the unique ID numbers generated by OMSIS2 and by the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system. During the Category 1 and Category 2 counts, NGS is sometimes used as a reference source.

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.

On the Certificate of Eligibility (COE), the following information is gathered:

SECTION I. Family Data - parent's/guardian's name, race, home language, current Ohio address, employer, residency date, school district arrival date, home base address, and home base school district;

SECTION II. Child Data - child's name, sex, birth date, birthplace, grade level, ID number, and multiple birth data;

SECTION III. Eligibility Data - former residence, new residence, qualifying arrival date (QAD), reason for moving, qualifying activity, and description/type of agricultural work in which household members are engaged; and

SECTION IV. Comments.

Eligibility data--specifically, residency date, QAD, and qualifying activity--are secured by recruiters at the time of face-to-face interviews and recorded on a COE. A temporary copy of the COE is given to the LEA. The original COE is then sent to the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC). Quality control procedures are conducted at OMEC to ensure the completion and correctness of the written eligibility information before data entry. Teachers provide our Records Clerk with student enrollment and participation data for our on-site and in-home summer-term programs. This information is then submitted to OMEC for data entry and record storage.

Recruiters are responsible for the completion of the Certificate of Eligibility through a personal interview with the child's family. Generally, these data are collected beginning in May and ending in November during the period for Ohio's seasonal qualifying work (i.e., work with a variety of vegetables, fruits, processing plants, greenhouses, etc.). Summer programs are held during the period of time between when a district ends school in the spring and when it starts school in the fall. Although the specific dates vary slightly from district to district, these programs usually run from June to August. Our year- round and fall programs are held in districts during the school year as appropriate for their migrant populations.

All LEA programs are required to fill out attendance forms and transfer documents for every eligible child that is served in their summer and fall programs. The information collected includes days enrolled, days present, and all education information (e.g., reading skills, math skills, and English language proficiency). Secondary credit information forms are also required for all 7th through 12th graders. The information gathered on these forms includes classes and credit hours in which a student participated. After these forms are completed, the Transfer Record Coordinator checks to make sure that the forms are complete, and the information is then entered into OMSIS2.

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 Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC) enters data into OMSIS2 from the original COE documents, comprehensive needs assessment forms, advocacy forms, verification forms, transfer documents, and secondary credit forms. COEs first go through an extensive quality control process in which the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator signs a statement that the COE is complete and accurate. The OMSIS2 interface provides fault tolerance during multiple-user access, and also provides extensive error checking at the time of input. Student information is updated as soon as the transfer records and secondary credit information are received from the LEA programs. Every year, verification forms are run for each

district to make sure that each student's current address, qualifying arrival date, parents' names, and residency dates are accurate. If any changes are necessary, the data entry staff at OMEC make the corrections in the student edit table in OMSIS2 to ensure accuracy.

OMSIS2 incorporates a FileMaker Pro client interface and a backend database hosted by the latest version of FileMaker Server Advanced. This not only affords programmatic record locking control, it also reduces the possibility of a simple clerical error causing major data loss. Some mass update capabilities exist, such as the ability to include up to six siblings on a single COE update. Multiple assessment records can also be input simultaneously for a child, and a number of time-saving queries that are designed specifically around the data entry methods in use at OMEC are built into OMSIS2 and enhance OMEC's capability by allowing for point-and-click field population.

When a student is identified in Ohio for the first time, the OMSIS2 data system generates a unique ID for that student called the OHID. If a student has been identified previously, then his/her new records are always entered using the student's existing OHID to avoid duplication. This check of the OMSIS2 system is accomplished before any record is entered into the system as new. When eligible students are first identified and entered into the database, they are all Category 1 students. They are not counted in Category 2 unless they also are eligible for and receive funded summer services.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count only differs from the Category 1 count by which backend database tables are required to produce accurate and complete numbers. The Category 2 count references additional tables.

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.

A query is run against the Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2) database described in Questions 1.10.3.1 and 1.10.3.2 to calculate the Category 1 child count. It identifies those students between ages 3 and 21 (as shown by the Student Identification Table) who have made a qualifying move within the past 36 months (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table) and who have also had a third birthday before the end date of the program in which they participated (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table, the Student Identification Table, and the Supplemental Program Information Table) or before the end of their residency in Ohio (we may reference an older sibling's enrollment information to determine this third criterion). A similar query that includes all of the above information is run to calculate the Category 2 child count, but it also has a summer service indicator. The fields used to run this particular query are SID.OHID, SID.LastName, SID.FirstName, ENR.OHID, SID.DeceasedDate, SID.GraduationDate, SID.BirthDate, ENR.LastQualifyingMove, ENR.EnrollmentDate, ENR.WithdrawalDate, ENR.OhioArrivalDate, and several flag fields that serve to exclude specific instances (e.g., children who turn three during the school year, but for whom no Ohio residency can be guaranteed except at the age of two). The database administrator (or the administrator's representative) at the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC) executes these queries and updates a series of flags in a specific order. Each September, a home visit is made to each student for whom a valid COE exists to determine if the student is still a resident in the State. The verification data are added to our database, and it serves as an indication that the student is eligible to be included in Category 1 for the new program year. All students added through a new COE during the program year are also counted, as described in Question 1.10.3.2.

Summer program students are flagged in the Student Information Table. A query is run against these data to generate a list of all students served during the summer. These students are served in one or more of the following ways: district site-based summer programs, in-home instruction, ESL programs, and/or health fair participation. Recorded participation in a funding-eligible instructional service during the summer/intersession period is required and must be documented before an indicator can be updated in OMSIS2 that triggers the inclusion of a particular student in the child count. The timing of this participation is verified when the queries used for the child counts screen by the date of the service(s) provided. If the date shown for the service(s) does not fall during the designated summer period, then that child will not qualify to be counted. Each child who is counted always has at least one qualifying service for which a qualifying date has been documented. Services provided to children whose eligibility has just expired may be reported at the local level, but quality control procedures at OMEC are in place to exclude these records from being entered into OMSIS2 (or, in a few cases, to allow the records to be entered with an 'N' in the funding flag field) so that non-funded services provided to these children will not inadvertently be counted as funded.

Every student has a unique OHID number that ensures the child is only counted once. As part of the quality control process at OMEC, "new" students are double checked to ensure that they have not already been assigned a different OHID number. Some of the quality control criteria used to ensure the unique identity of a "new" child include surname, parent/guardian first names, alternate spellings of surnames, migratory histories of families with similar names, and date of birth.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count are generated using the same system, except for the particular differences previously described in Question 1.10.3.3.

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.

Ohio uses many quality control procedures to review and ensure the accuracy of written eligibility information. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE), the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC), and local migrant education projects assure accuracy at their levels. A standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) that conforms to Federal guidelines is used statewide in Ohio, and recruiters are trained on completion of the form at our annual recruitment conference. Quality control is assured at OMEC, where the Quality Control Specialist, the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator, and the Transfer Record Coordinator again review the COE for correctness and completeness. The COE is entered into the database only after each of these people has approved it.

LEA recruiters, transfer record clerks, and project directors receive periodic updates on assistance, procedures, and guidelines for identification and recruitment. Annual recruitment trainings are held each spring to provide in-depth instruction on COE completion, and other meetings are called as needed. All recruiters receive a detailed handbook that provides them with eligibility criteria and COE completion guidance.

The SEA reviews student attendance during the monitoring visits of the summer/intersession projects. The SEA provides written procedures to summer/intersession personnel in the form of a Clerk Manual on how to collect and report student enrollment and attendance data. The records/data entry personnel are trained to use the Clerk Manual at the Transfer Record Clerk training held in June of each year. At this training, the records/data entry personnel are also trained to review summer/intersession site records to confirm that all children enrolled in the program have a current COE on file and that all children are still eligible for the Title I, Part C - Migrant Education Program.

All state recruiters are trained in interviewing migrant families and recording all eligibility data on a standard COE form. Recruiters receive extensive mandated training and a training manual on the completion of the COE in the following areas:

- 1) eligibility criteria;
- 2) interview procedures;
- 3) monitoring for accountability; and
- 4) the role of the recruiter.

The COE is the primary tool for collecting the data that certify children to qualify for migrant services. Once completed and checked for accuracy, information from the form is entered into the state database, OMSIS2, and becomes the basis for Category 1 identification. COEs are checked for accuracy by the Quality Control Specialist and by verifying birth dates and names against the OMSIS2 database. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator also signs a statement that quality control is finished on the COE before it is checked for complete accuracy and input into OMSIS2. If a discrepancy occurs at any time during the quality control process, recruiters are contacted for clarification. COEs identified as having possible errors are placed in a pending file until further explanation, documentation, and/or completion is received or achieved.

Recruiters resolve issues encountered on the COE forms by consulting the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and the Transfer Record Coordinator. The State Director of Ohio's Migrant Education Program (MEP) provides assistance with questions requiring interpretation of Federal and State laws, regulations, or policies. The final quality control for all COEs is made at OMEC. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and the Transfer Record Coordinator review all data to ensure correctness of the written eligibility information. If there are any discrepancies on the COE, revisions are made with red pen on the COE. Once quality control procedures have been completed as described above, the Transfer Record Coordinator enters the record into the database. This is the final step in the COE data acquisition process. When it has been completed, the MEP is provided with a carbon copy of the COE for its records.

The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator is responsible for a yearly review and update of quality control and COE completion procedures. These procedures are documented in our Identification and Recruitment Manual. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator also periodically evaluates the effectiveness of quality control and revises procedures, if necessary, to assure effective systems operation. Information from sessions at the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME) and Office of Migrant Education (OME) conferences, as well as pertinent memos and regulations, are reviewed annually and used to update quality control as well as other identification and recruitment issues.

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.

For the 2011-2012 reporting year, Ohio conducted an internal prospective re-interview. A total of 121 COEs were randomly selected from our state database, OMSIS2. The reviewers followed up on all 121 randomly selected COEs, resulting in 23 attempted re-interviews and 98 completed face-to-face re-interviews. This group was large enough to provide at least one COE sample from each migrant recruiter. All 98 complete re-interviews were found to be eligible for the Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program.

The SEA used a standard re-interview instrument that included all of the items in the original COE determination. 100% of the re-interviews that were completed (98 out of 121) were completed face-to-face. For the 2011-2012 reporting year, independent re-interviewers were not used. Instead, recruiters were trained in the re-interview process and assigned an area of the state that was not part of their regular recruiting assignment. However, an independent re-interviewer will be conducting the re-interviews for the 2012-2013 reporting year. States are required to conduct an independent re-interview once every three years, and the 2012-2013 school year is exactly three years since Ohio's last independent re-interviewing.

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.

Verification forms are printed annually and distributed to recruiters in the fall of each year to verify whether students are still here for the new program year's Category 1 child count. Recruiters verifying the accuracy of demographic data use these same lists. These lists are returned to OMEC for database updates when they are completed. Individual files are pulled at random during the winter months to be reviewed for accuracy.

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 Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2) includes a number of companion fields to each date-type field accessed by the queries used for the annual report. These companion fields include a number of calculations and comparisons that help locate data that may require further review.

For example, each child record contains a birth date field and a current age field that are query-relevant. Each enrollment and service record contains a date of service or date of enrollment field, a residency date field, and a qualifying move date field that are also query-relevant. One example of a companion field that is used during reporting uses the aforementioned query-relevant fields to calculate the age a student was at the time of residency and service. This produces a flag that is used to exclude, for example, current three year-olds who were three at the end of the reporting cycle, but not necessarily a resident in Ohio anymore when their third birthday arrived. Such a child can be excluded from the Category 1 count. All three year-olds are examined using the companion calculation field in this way to separate those proven eligible from those who are not. Similar companion calculation fields exist that guard against incorrect date values being entered in the query-relevant fields.

Duplications are prevented through the use of a combination of FileMaker Pro 11 database features, including the extensive use of the "Go to Related Records" script command. Searches are initially performed in a related table while seeking funded services delivered during the current reporting period. From there the "Go to Related Records" script is run, resulting in a found set of students (not services). All counts for the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) are then generated from the Students table, where each student has only one grade level and one unique identifier, to ensure that no student can possibly be counted twice in any cell of any CSPR table.

Eligibility for Category 1 is first established for the majority of students using FileMaker Pro's "Constrain Found Set" tool repeatedly for each criterion that could possibly exclude a student from eligibility for the current reporting period. Students who definitely qualify based on this more rigorous screening compose the first group of students marked as qualifying. Students who also qualify, but whose eligibility for the current reporting period must be confirmed on a case-by-case basis, are excluded from this first group by the stringency of the initial queries. Instead, these students are individually marked as qualifying only after their record is carefully reviewed to confirm, for example, that their age definitely qualified them to be counted as eligible for the reporting period.

After all Category 1 eligibility has been marked, an export of data from the Student Table into an empty Reporting Table is executed. The Reporting Table contains many true-or-false fields that correspond to each category of the CSPR.

A database relationship links the Student Table to the Reporting Table on the key field OHID. By updating each of the Reporting Table's true-or-false fields directly from within the Student Table, and by doing so only after the Reporting Table already contains exclusively Category 1-eligible records, it is possible to know with great certainty that: 1) only eligible students are contained in any individual count; and 2) there is absolutely no duplication within counts.

Accuracy checks are finally performed, using the Reporting Table as a source and the Student Table as the destination for a "Go to Related Records" script. For example, this technique could be used to find instantly the exact group of students reported as being in the 7th Grade and also receiving Math instruction in the summer. This group can be scrolled through to verify that each student did in fact receive Math instruction, is in fact a 7th grader, and when and where each student received Math instruction.

The Reporting data are then preserved, without changes, directly within OMSIS2 every year. Over time this collection of annual tables serves as an ongoing longitudinal data (i.e., panel data) reference tool for management information.

The State Migrant Education Program Director collects all data from the queries listed in this document and reviews them for accuracy, reasonableness, and completeness. OMEC additionally provides the State Director with numbers from the previous years for identification and recruitment and for services provided, broken out by counties as identified and served. The State Director is therefore able to compare data from previous years as the CSPR is completed.

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.

Sometimes there is more than one worker who can qualify a family for MEP services. If the worker documented on the COE is not the same worker who provides information during the re-interview process, it could raise concerns. If this were to happen, the re-interviewer would be trained the following year to list all of the qualifying workers related to the qualifying move in question.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns to report at this time.