

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**

PENNSYLVANIA



**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: Pennsylvania Department of Education</p>		
<p>Address: 333 Market Street Harrisburg, PA 17126</p>		
<p>Person to contact about this report:</p>		
<p>Name: Erin Oberdorf</p>		
<p>Telephone: 717-787-7135</p>		
<p>Fax: 717-787-8634</p>		
<p>e-mail: eoberdorf@pa.gov</p>		
<p>Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Mr. Ronald Tomalis</p>		
		<p>Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 9:17:52 AM</p>
<p>Signature _____</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.

	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	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	2012-2013, 2013-2014,2014-2015	2012-2013, 2013-2014,2014-2015	2012-2013

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

PA is moving to end of course standards in Algebra I, Literature, and Biology as the federal accountability measure in high school (Grade 11) beginning in 2012-2013. For grade levels below the high school, PA is phasing in changes. In 2013-2014 the changes will affect Grades 3,4,5. In 2014-2015 the changes will affect Grades 6,7,8. Part of the change involves moving from Reading standards to English Language Arts 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	2013-2014, 2014-2015	2013-2014, 2014-2015	not applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015

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

PA will apply the Academic Achievement Standards in Algebra I, Literature, and Biology for the end of course assessments used for federal accountability at the high school level in Grade 11 beginning in 2012-2013. For grade levels below the high school, PA is phasing in changes. In 2013-2014 academic achievement standards will change in Grades 3-5 for the new Math and English Language Arts assessments. In 2014-2015 the academic achievement standards will change in Grades 6-8 for the new Math and English Language Arts assessments. PA is a member of the NCSC developing the new alternate assessment with alternate achievement standards and will use the new achievement standards in 2014-2015 in Math and English Language Arts when the assessment is ready. PA will develop its own alternate Science assessment and academic achievement standards.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

State has revised or changed	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or 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	2013-2014, 2014-2015	2013-2014, 2014-2015	not applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015

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

PA will use assessments in Algebra I, Literature, and Biology for the end of course assessments used for federal accountability at the high school level in Grade 11 beginning in 2012-2013. For grade levels below the high school, PA is phasing in changes. In 2013-2014 the assessments will change in Grades 3-5 for Math and English Language Arts. In 2014-2015 the assessments will change in Grades 6-8 for Math and English Language Arts. PA is a member of the NCSC developing the new alternate assessment with alternate achievement standards and will use the new assessments in 2014-2015 in Math and English Language Arts when the assessment is ready. PA will develop its own alternate Science assessment.

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)	3.00
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	73.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The remaining 24% to equal 100% was carryover.	

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)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	932,832	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,427	>=99
Asian	S	30,818	>=99
Black or African American	S	140,088	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	79,569	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	591	>=99
White	S	664,511	>=99
Two or more races	S	15,491	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	154,647	>=99
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	S	24,639	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	387,596	>=99
Migratory students	S	1,570	91
Male	S	478,622	>=99
Female	S	453,947	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	45,912	29.69
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	69,854	45.17
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	24,226	15.67
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	14,655	9.48
Total	154,647	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Pennsylvania does not have an Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		

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	930,595	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,428	>=99
Asian	S	30,252	98
Black or African American	S	139,816	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	78,607	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	588	>=99
White	S	664,122	>=99
Two or more races	S	15,454	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	154,427	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	22,761	91
Economically disadvantaged students	S	386,091	>=99
Migratory students	S	1,391	81
Male	S	477,436	>=99
Female	S	452,902	>=99

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	46,356	30.02
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	66,955	43.36
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	26,461	17.13
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	14,655	9.49
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	154,427	////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Pennsylvania does not have an Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		

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	391,747	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	598	97
Asian	S	12,959	>=99
Black or African American	S	56,157	96
Hispanic or Latino	S	31,069	97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	230	>=98
White	S	284,688	>=99
Two or more races	S	5,817	98
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	63,096	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	9,321	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	152,473	97
Migratory students	S	642	89
Male	S	200,613	98
Female	S	190,939	98

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	24,282	38.48
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,554	40.50
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	7,420	11.76
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,840	9.26
Total	63,096	////////////////////////////////////

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	130,517	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	S	75
Asian	4,666	S	89
Black or African American	19,916	S	55
Hispanic or Latino	12,016	S	62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	71	S	89
White	90,510	S	86
Two or more races	3,081	S	73
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,022	S	53
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,595	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	58,368	S	66
Migratory students	240	S	48
Male	66,803	S	79
Female	63,663	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

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	130,142	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	S	72
Asian	4,568	S	82
Black or African American	19,879	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	11,859	S	54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	70	S	81
White	90,438	S	81
Two or more races	3,071	S	69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,003	S	43
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,276	S	29
Economically disadvantaged students	58,113	S	59
Migratory students	213	S	33
Male	66,592	S	70
Female	63,499	S	77
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. PA does not assess grades 3, 5, 6 and 7 in Science.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	129,569	S	81
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	S	78
Asian	4,538	S	90
Black or African American	19,894	S	59
Hispanic or Latino	11,816	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	83	S	86
White	90,453	S	88
Two or more races	2,539	S	75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,962	S	57
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,826	S	44
Economically disadvantaged students	57,865	S	69
Migratory students	239	S	43
Male	66,752	S	81
Female	62,784	S	81
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

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	129,222	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	206	S	67
Asian	4,445	S	82
Black or African American	19,857	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	11,659	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	82	S	80
White	90,397	S	79
Two or more races	2,538	S	65
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,938	S	46
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,512	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	57,635	S	56
Migratory students	211	S	29
Male	66,574	S	68
Female	62,616	S	74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

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	129,026	S	81
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	S	84
Asian	4,535	S	86
Black or African American	19,691	S	55
Hispanic or Latino	11,737	S	63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	81	S	89
White	90,224	S	90
Two or more races	2,511	S	77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,737	S	60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,804	S	38
Economically disadvantaged students	57,400	S	69
Migratory students	237	S	40
Male	66,441	S	81
Female	62,538	S	82
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,025	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	S	67
Asian	4,547	S	85
Black or African American	20,287	S	46
Hispanic or Latino	12,028	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	87	S	72
White	93,636	S	79
Two or more races	2,219	S	64
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,945	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,652	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	57,975	S	56
Migratory students	249	S	33
Male	68,366	S	72
Female	64,629	S	71
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

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	132,724	S	64
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	S	57
Asian	4,462	S	76
Black or African American	20,265	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	11,877	S	43
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	88	S	69
White	93,595	S	72
Two or more races	2,215	S	56
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,921	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,359	S	14
Economically disadvantaged students	57,770	S	47
Migratory students	222	S	21
Male	68,212	S	61
Female	64,481	S	68
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. PA does not assess grades 3, 5, 6 and 7 in Science.			

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	134,962	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	S	65
Asian	4,380	S	89
Black or African American	20,472	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	11,504	S	57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	115	S	84
White	96,068	S	82
Two or more races	2,184	S	71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,943	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,342	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	57,503	S	61
Migratory students	228	S	40
Male	69,334	S	74
Female	65,609	S	77
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	134,687	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	S	61
Asian	4,298	S	80
Black or African American	20,446	S	43
Hispanic or Latino	11,391	S	45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	115	S	76
White	96,022	S	75
Two or more races	2,178	S	62
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,915	S	37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,083	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	57,325	S	51
Migratory students	203	S	21
Male	69,200	S	63
Female	65,469	S	72
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. PA does not assess grades 3, 5, 6 and 7 in Science.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	135,858	S	77
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	S	75
Asian	4,133	S	90
Black or African American	20,721	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	11,652	S	59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	83	S	88
White	96,967	S	84
Two or more races	2,051	S	71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,749	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,366	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	56,567	S	64
Migratory students	197	S	39
Male	69,948	S	76
Female	65,896	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

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	135,492	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	217	S	67
Asian	4,047	S	86
Black or African American	20,662	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	11,501	S	54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	81	S	80
White	96,910	S	81
Two or more races	2,038	S	71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,709	S	40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,086	S	21
Economically disadvantaged students	56,332	S	59
Migratory students	165	S	30
Male	69,750	S	70
Female	65,727	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. PA does not assess grades 3, 5, 6 and 7 in Science.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	134,948	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	S	69
Asian	4,200	S	89
Black or African American	20,137	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	11,347	S	55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	71	S	75
White	96,935	S	80
Two or more races	2,011	S	67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,565	S	38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,255	S	30
Economically disadvantaged students	54,367	S	59
Migratory students	226	S	40
Male	69,514	S	72
Female	65,393	S	76
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

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	134,635	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	S	74
Asian	4,131	S	87
Black or African American	20,098	S	60
Hispanic or Latino	11,209	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	71	S	80
White	96,879	S	83
Two or more races	2,006	S	75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,524	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,016	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	54,148	S	63
Migratory students	200	S	40
Male	69,345	S	73
Female	65,256	S	83
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

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	133,533	S	59
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	S	55
Asian	4,186	S	71
Black or African American	19,707	S	27
Hispanic or Latino	11,049	S	30
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	70	S	63
White	96,286	S	68
Two or more races	1,975	S	50
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,009	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,170	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	53,361	S	39
Migratory students	220	S	11
Male	68,723	S	61
Female	64,760	S	57
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,953	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	210	S	48
Asian	4,354	S	80
Black or African American	18,661	S	32
Hispanic or Latino	9,206	S	35
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	81	S	59
White	99,942	S	65
Two or more races	1,406	S	48
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,461	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,603	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	44,951	S	39
Migratory students	191	S	30
Male	67,905	S	59
Female	65,973	S	58
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

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	133,693	S	66
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	S	60
Asian	4,301	S	73
Black or African American	18,609	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	9,111	S	43
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	81	S	63
White	99,881	S	73
Two or more races	1,408	S	60
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,417	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,429	S	9
Economically disadvantaged students	44,768	S	47
Migratory students	177	S	19
Male	67,763	S	62
Female	65,854	S	70
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Errors resulting from genders that were not coded or multiple codes were listed.			

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	129,188	S	41
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	S	31
Asian	4,238	S	50
Black or African American	16,759	S	12
Hispanic or Latino	8,283	S	17
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	79	S	38
White	98,178	S	48
Two or more races	1,331	S	32
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19,350	S	19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,347	S	2
Economically disadvantaged students	41,712	S	22
Migratory students	185	S	<=2
Male	65,449	S	45
Female	63,641	S	38
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	3,053	1,511	49.49
Districts	656	398	60.67

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	1,851	868	46.89
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	885	258	29.15
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	966	610	63.15

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
499	306	61.32

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	8
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	6
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	20
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	19
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	109
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	58
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were no districts that selected "Reopening the school as a charter school" or "Takeover the school by the state". The data validation parameters exclude zeros for the file that is used to complete this section.	

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.

There were 58 schools in 27 districts that chose other major restructuring of the school governance. These districts chose one or more of the following options:

- institute and fully implement a new curriculum,
- including providing appropriate professional development for relevant staff,
- significantly decrease management authority at the school level,
- extend the school year or school day for the school,
- restructure the internal organizational structure of the school.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) has implemented many programs and strategies for districts identified for improvement or corrective action.

- I. The Pennsylvania Standards Aligned System (SAS) is an online, collaborative product that identifies six distinct elements which, if utilized together, provide schools and districts a common framework for continuous school and district enhancement and improvement. SAS is accessible to administrators, educators, students, parents and the general public. The elements of the SAS are: Standards, Assessments, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources, and Safe & Supportive Schools.
 - Pennsylvania's Standards describe what students should know and be able to do and increase in complexity and sophistication as students' progress through school. There are sixteen sets of standards in SAS. Assessment Anchors were developed to clarify the standards assessed on the PSSA and the Keystone Exams, which are end of course exams at the high school level. Assessment Anchors are designed to hold together or "anchor" the state assessment system and the curriculum/ instructional practices in schools. Anchors are further defined with Eligible Content. Eligible Content helps teachers identify the range of the content they should teach to best prepare their students for the PSSA and Keystone Exams.

Pennsylvania developed PA Common Core Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics. The PA Common Core Standards incorporate the Common Core and the Pennsylvania Academic Standards. The Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies and Science/Technical Subjects will be appended to their respective PA Academic Standards.

- Assessment is a process used by teachers and students before, during, and after instruction to provide feedback and adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve student achievement. In Pennsylvania, the four types of assessment are summative, formative, benchmark, and diagnostic. Within the Assessment element, educators can locate information regarding Keystone Exams and graduation requirements. Educators can utilize the Assessment Creator and the appropriate Classroom Diagnostic Tool for use with their students.
 - The Curriculum Framework specifies what is to be taught for each subject in the curriculum. Curriculum Frameworks include Big Ideas, Concepts, Competencies, Essential Questions, Vocabulary, and Exemplars aligned to Standards, Assessment Anchors and, where appropriate, Eligible Content.
 - Instruction provides information on Teacher Effectiveness, the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching which includes Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction and Professional Responsibilities, instructional strategies, instructional resources and interventions. These resources focus on ensuring the right level of challenge, teaching based on the learning needs of each student, and implementing instructional strategies to increase student achievement.
 - Materials and Resources provide quality, standards aligned materials and resources such as lesson plans, units, content resources, online resources, learning progressions, Voluntary Model Curriculum, featured content and Keystone Exam content such as the Algebra 1 resource center.
 - The Safe and Supportive Schools element of SAS provides resources and exemplars to promote active student engagement in a safe and positive learning environment. Areas within the element include school engagement, school safety and school environment. In addition, Pennsylvania developed PK-12 Student Interpersonal Skills Standards.
- II. PDE has established a school improvement planning framework that guides schools through data and systems analyses, leading to the identification of systemic challenges that impede student achievement. Action plans are then developed to eliminate or ameliorate those challenges based on research-proven method and practices, curriculum resources and professional development. The school improvement planning framework incorporates current thinking and PDE's priorities regarding continuous school improvement and outlines the phases vital to developing a results-focused continuous school improvement plan.

- III. PDE established an ongoing technical assistance network in coordination with the 29 IUs for planning sessions with IU and school personnel to identify district needs, coordinate service delivery, etc. Professional development for school district staff from buildings is provided by IU staff. Each IU provides historical background of the district and school and assists in planning for the specific needs of each school in School Improvement or Corrective Action. Facilitation in areas such as data analysis/retreats, root cause analysis, customized data packet development, curriculum audits, on-going monitoring is provided.
- IV. PDE provides support services through several Bureaus including:
- (1) Bureau of Assessment & Accountability which provides direction and technical assistance to schools and districts with regard to assessment and accountability programs; evaluates school/student progress, deficiencies and school performance for compliance with the No Child Left Behind, and developments assessment anchors to better align curricula, instruction and assessment practices throughout the state; coordinate test development, administration, and reporting.
 - (2) Bureau of Special Education provides professional leadership and management in the provision of special education services and programs. The Bureau administers the special education contingency fund, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) funds. Staff provides technical assistance, consultation and advice to local education agencies to support them in meeting the requirements of state and federal special education requirements.
 - (3) Bureau of Teaching and Learning provides consultative and facilitative agency support in curriculum, instructional strategies and compensatory education. Major activities of the bureau include provision of curriculum and instructional materials and guidelines, provision and coordination of technical assistance and professional development to school districts, and administration of significant state and federal programs and projects such as Title 1 and No Child Left Behind. A primary responsibility of the Bureau is the administration of the online Standards Aligned System (SAS).

In addition, the Bureau of Teaching and Learning oversees an array of programs and services to all 500 districts, schools, families and communities to enable students to develop resiliency, stay in school, reach their full potential and succeed in life after high school graduation. The Bureau administers critically needed funding, technical assistance and support to more than 20 different initiatives, including: homeless children's education; safe and drug free programs; alternative and corrections education; teen parent projects; after school programs; migrant and refugee education; dropout prevention and education mentoring.

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	50	17
Schools	157	44
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	08/22/12
---	----------

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*: 3.10%

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.

Pennsylvania provides evaluative data for all schools identified for improvement using several different methods. The first is the online PSSA school and district report cards. These report cards provide each school and district with evaluative information regarding their students performance on the PSSA. Secondary evaluative information is provided to each school and district through the use of the state's Performance Index and PVAAS (PA's Growth Model). Finally, each school and district is given reports from eMetrix. All of these data reports are then used to assist schools in determining root cause, finding solutions and implementing a comprehensive school improvement plan. Technical assistance to schools and districts begins when all of these data sources are available. Each Intermediate Unit in PA serves as a support center for the schools and districts within their service area. IUs provide support for data analysis, training to determine root cause, and expertise in carrying out improvement strategies. Funds are used to support the statewide network of IU support as well as to provide conferences on data driven decision-making and regional workshops throughout the year on plan implementation. Finally, funds are used to provide schools in improvement with distinguished educators, leadership training and curriculum frameworks and resources necessary for improvement.

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.

Section 1003(g) funds and several other federal grants are used to supplement many of the state-funded supports to schools and districts in improvement. State funds are used to provide capacity building funds to each IU in order to support schools in improvement, distinguished educators, distinguished school leaders, leadership training, curriculum frameworks, school improvement toolkits and plan frameworks, regional trainings and statewide conferences in support of improvement.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	145,552
Applied to transfer	2,053
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,131
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 576,952

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	64

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:
 - as 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*.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	2,179,680
Applied for supplemental educational services	196,156
Received supplemental educational services	139,631
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 770,733,328
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	325,520	318,983	97.99	631	0.19
All elementary classes	47,041	46,410	98.66	631	1.34
All secondary classes	278,479	272,573	97.88	5,906	2.12

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	Yes
---	-----

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Currently, PA counts full day self-contained elementary classes as one class. PA uses unique departmentalized course codes for each core academic subject at the sixth grade level. Consequently, departmentalized sixth grade courses are counted multiple times.

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.

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.00
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.20
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	3.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	96.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2011-12 HQT/NHQT data were collected via PA Information Management System (PIMS). LEA's continued to experience a number of data reporting errors, including but not limited to uploading incorrect staff identifiers; errors in entering staff identification numbers (PPID); incorrect mapping of local courses to state level courses; not understanding the differences between certification and staffing requirements and demonstration of content mastery for teachers of record in core academic content areas. The department continued to work with LEA's to correct these errors; however, not all LEA's submitted data corrections required to generate accurate HQT/NHQT percentages. Additionally, a number of elementary special education teachers' records and charter school teachers who are not certified are required to be manually changed to HQ as a result of data system limitations. PA simply cannot determine if the teachers are HQ or not. This is due to the fact that the LEAs are still experiencing difficulties reporting their teacher's assignments, not correcting their uploaded data as required, and mapping their assignments to correct state course id.

The data is correct giving the limitation of the system. School Districts and especially Charter Schools are not correcting their data before closing the collection to ensure that all of their core academic teachers are HQ.

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	66.40
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	19.70
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	13.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2011-12 HQT/NHQT data were collected via PA Information Management System (PIMS). LEA's continued to experience a number of data reporting errors, including but not limited to uploading incorrect staff identifiers; errors in entering staff identification numbers (PPID); incorrect mapping of local courses to state level courses; not understanding the differences between certification and staffing requirements and demonstration of content mastery for teachers of record in core academic content areas. The department continued to work with LEA's to correct these errors; however, not all LEA's submitted data corrections required to generate accurate HQT/NHQT percentages. Additionally, a number of elementary special education teachers' records and charter school teachers who are not certified are required to be manually changed to HQ as a result of data system limitations.

The percentages are reasonable because these percentages are for High and Low poverty quartiles are a subset of the total number of classes in PA. Thus, when dividing the number of HQT classes in High Poverty quartiles by the number of

classes in that quartile, the percentage ebbs up a bit because the denominator is smaller. The same goes for low poverty percentages

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	10,879	10,764	98.94
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	12,241	12,137	99.15
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	34,271	31,838	92.90
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	111,708	110,669	99.07

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	50.70	16.60
Poverty metric used	Poverty metric used for each location, the percent of students considered to be low income is based on the POVERTY CODE field in the Student Snapshot template (# poverty students/total number students). Separate quartiles are identified for elementary schools. Quartiles are numbered 1 through 4, with Quartile 1 being the "High Poverty" schools and Quartile 4 the "Low Poverty" schools. Adjustments were made to ensure schools with the same percentage of low income enrollments fall into a single quartile.	
Secondary schools	54.20	33.80
Poverty metric used	Poverty metric used for each location, the percent of students considered to be low income is based on the POVERTY CODE field in the Student Snapshot template (# poverty students/total number students). Separate quartiles are identified for secondary schools. Quartiles are numbered 1 through 4, with Quartile 1 being the "High Poverty" schools and Quartile 4 the "Low Poverty" schools. Adjustments were made to ensure schools with the same percentage of low income enrollments fall into a single quartile.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Push-in ESL, Tutoring, and Co-Teaching.

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	49,465
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	48,043
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	28,358
Uncoded languages	2,881
Chinese	1,994
Arabic	1,710
Nepali	1,608

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

All LEP Testing	#s
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	47,692
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,363
Total	49,055

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This number reflects demographic errors related to PAscoreID and attribution. These errors include invalid student PAscoreIDs, incorrect student attribution, and incorrect LEP student identifiers. Modifications to business rules for warehousing the test file within our statewide information management system (PIMS) in 2013, additional validation checks during the dedicated data collection in 2013, and increasing familiarity of LEAs with data collection/validation procedures will decrease these errors.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	15,156
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	31.75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	45,341
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,116
Total	46,457
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Section 1.6.2.2 comes from X116, which is a cumulative, year end count of Title III served LEP students. Section 1.6.3.2.1 comes from X138, which is an unduplicated count of students enrolled during the testing window. The year-end count will by definition be higher.	
This number reflects the quality of past demographic data. The warehousing of test files within our statewide information management system (PIMS) in 2012, a dedicated data collection since 2011, and development of validation reports in 2013 will ensure increased matches to prior year's test records and more accurate counts for students tested for the first time.	

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

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	13,261

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	15,602	48.63	18,286	57.00
Attained proficiency	13,928	30.72	9,975	22.00
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"/> Yes
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.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
261	22	283
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
282	S	76	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
282	S	65	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
109	S	50	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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	310
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	293
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	298
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	305
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	292
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	2
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	5
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	4
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	0

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The state counted consortia members individually in 1.6.4.1. In SY 2011-2012 PA implemented improvement planning for SY 2009-10 and 2010-2011.

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	Yes
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?	Y
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	3
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
13,864	7,110	51

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.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	10,183
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	348

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	78	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	51	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	84	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	48	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	43	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	22	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	82	16,669
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	88	5,113
PD provided to principals	67	1,996
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	68	2,282
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	45	2,276
PD provided to community based organization personnel	23	598
Total	373	28,934

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Educational Technology for English Language Learners, Special Education and English Language Learners, Total Participation Techniques, collaborative learning strategies, gradual release of responsibility instructional framework, Follow up Learning Focus Schools training, SMART software training, WIDA proficiency levels, legal aspects, immigration procedures and requirements, an overview of PA BEC's and regs, standards, "Can do" booklet, instructional strategies and discussion of ELL forms and functions, SIOP Training, professional development resources to increase engagement, Using SAS and the Overlays, Changing, Improving, and Creating ESL/EFL Curriculums, Integrating Academic Language, Literacy, and Thinking Skills, strategies to increase academic achievement, Appropriate accommodations for LEP students, First and Second Language - What's the Difference?, Current best practices for English language learners, ESL and Technology as a Tool for Content Comprehensibility, Understanding ACCESS scores to effect instruction, Rosetta Stone Training, Common Core State Standards, Keystone Exams, PSSA Accommodations, Understanding ELLs, AMAOs, Diverse Learners, RtII and ELLs, LETRS training for Elementary teachers, Skills for Bilingual Interpreters/ Translators, Working with the Mexican Education System, Culturally Responsive Services, Working with Nepalese/Bhutanese Refugees, Beyond the ESL Teacher: Building Capacity in Low Incidence Schools, Using data to make effective instructional decisions, Webb's depth of knowledge for problem solving and thinking, Writing as a daily literacy activity, Bilingual instruction, The enrollment process

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	07/01/11	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This process cannot be shortened to less than our current 0 days.

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	12
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	0	0
LEAs with subgrants	698	602
Total	698	602

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. McKinney Vento funds are distributed regionally and each region (8) serves all LEAs directly or indirectly served; therefore, all LEAs are counted as LEA with subgrantees. Those LEAs not counted in '# LEAs reporting data', reported 'no homeless students'. Below are the LEA breakdown and the percent where students were attributed. School Districts 93%, Charter Schools, 73%, Comprehensive Technical Centers 75%, IU operated schools 54%.

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)	0	465
K	0	1,562
1	0	1,875
2	0	1,664
3	0	1,780
4	0	1,571
5	0	1,556
6	0	1,592
7	0	1,370
8	0	1,322
9	1	1,323
10	0	1,178
11	0	1,125
12	2	1,503
Ungraded	0	16
Total	3	19,902

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	6,552
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1	11,811
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	1	267
Hotels/Motels	0	1,272
Total	3	19,902

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	482
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,362
K	1,505
1	1,761
2	1,587
3	1,561
4	1,377
5	1,355
6	1,379
7	1,213
8	1,164
9	1,248
10	1,128
11	998
12	1,452
Ungraded	16
Total	19,588
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	3,765
Migratory children/youth	694
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,774
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	984
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	1,377	645
4	1,188	561
5	1,186	431
6	1,197	474
7	1,029	503
8	946	524
High School	727	301

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	1,394	723
4	1,212	712
5	1,199	524
6	1,206	592
7	1,047	553
8	961	465
High School	735	244

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	1,210	687
5		
6		
7		
8	938	283
High School	669	118

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. PA does not assess grades 3, 5, 6 and 7 in Science.

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)	735
K	319
1	310
2	274
3	286
4	290
5	291
6	265
7	251
8	261
9	282
10	285
11	227
12	132
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	922
Total	5,130
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.

N/A

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)	560
K	224
1	223
2	181
3	202
4	196
5	211
6	197
7	173
8	185
9	205
10	204
11	163
12	16
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	339
Total	3,279
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.

N/A

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.

PDE MEP Category 1 and Category 2 counts were generated using MIS2000 in the same manner as has been done for many years and is anticipated for future years.

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.

Both counts were collected from the State MIS2000 Database. This is a consolidated database from the five regional MIS2000 systems. This data is assimilated daily into the state database. The system collects a variety of demographic and MEP eligibility enrollment data to be used for generating the childcounts. Much of this data is taken from the PA version of the National COE and those items required to be gathered to document eligibility. These COEs are completed with face-to-face interviews by trained recruiters. Annual Needs Assessments are completed each year to ensure the student is still resident. The data is collected and examined throughout the year and after the data is run through all automatic and manual edit and error checks (including several final checks for unduplication), the final reports are run in October and submitted to the CSPR via the EDEN C121 and C122 files for auto-populating this report.

In addition to the above, Category 2 counts are gathered by counting eligible students with summer enrollments. Claimed summer enrollments are compared to documentation of summer service. If an appropriately documented summer service is not identified, then the summer enrollment is removed prior to final counts. Summer enrollments may not start until the day after school ends in a district, and must end prior to school starting in a district. This includes summer enrollments for Preschool and Out-of-School Youth, even though they are not attending school.

The following are the data elements included on the PA COE. It includes all elements required on the National COE as well as several additional items utilized in PA:

Family Data

Current Male Parent/Guardian (First/Last)
Current Male Parent/Guardian Relationship
Current Female Parent/Guardian
(First/Last) Current Female
Parent/Guardian Relationship Legal Male
Parent (First/Last)
Legal Female Parent (First/Last)
Current Address (multiple sub-
fields) Current Telephone
Mailing Address (if different)
Homebase Address (multiple sub-
fields) Homebase Telephone
Homebase District
Home Language 1
Home Language 2
Child Data Residence
County Residence
School District
Residency Date
Residence Move from (District, City, State,
Country) Child Lastname1
Child Lastname2
Child Suffix
Child First
Name Child
Middle Name
Child Sex
Child BirthDate
Child Multiple Birth Flag
Child Birth Verification
Code Child Birth
City/State/Country School
Facility
Child Grade
Child EY/DO Grade (if an EY or DO, list the last grade completed)
Enroll Date
Ethnicity

Student ID
Qualifying Move & Work Data
From
District
From City
From State
From
Country To
District
To City
To State
MoveStatus (OnOwn/Worker/ToJoin/To
Precede) Worker Name
Worker Relation
(Parent/Spouse/Guardian) Worker Move
Date
Child Move Date
QAD
Move Comment
Economic Necessity (obtained work, prior history,
etc.) Did Not Obtain Reason
Did Not Obtain Comment
Qualifying Crop
Qualifying
Activity
Seasonal/Temp
Ag/Fishing
Personal Subsistence
Personal Subsistence Comment
Temp Nature (worker statement/employer statement/state
determination) Employer Name
Temp Nature Comment
Comments/Signatures/Other
General
Comment Parent
Signature Parent
Relationship
COE Sign Date
(Parent) Interviewer
Name Interviewer
Signature Interviewer
Sign Date Reviewer
Name Reviewer
Signature Reviewer
Sign Date
Entered into MIS2000 Date (Final
Approval) Entered into MIS2000
By COE Number

Under the terms of our sub-grant agreements and as specified in our quality control manual, all seasoned recruiters must attend a minimum of six trainings a year. This is in addition to the annual state migrant conference. All Recruiter Coordinators attend four quarterly meetings where the primary topic is almost always quality control. There are also four statewide recruiter trainings held during the year. Staff must then attend at least two local level trainings in addition to the four statewide trainings to meet the minimum required six, however most Project Areas hold at least five or six local sessions throughout the year to exceed this requirement. New Recruiters are required to complete additional trainings.

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.

Following a rigorous quality control process that includes both manual and electronic checks, COE's are entered electronically into the MIS2000 system in the field by trained recruiters via Tablet computers. They are then electronically reviewed by a state approved reviewer who leads a trained "COE quality control review panel" that provides group input into the eligibility. The panel must come to consensus that the child is eligible, before the reviewer will approve the COE. A final review, especially a check for duplication, is performed by a trained Data Specialist before the COE is given final approval

and students are eligible for services or being counted on any reports.

Reports are generated and reviewed by Student Support Specialists and Recruiters to make sure the students match their records. Verification is also performed to make sure that students recruited in previous years are still residing in the state. It is required that a Needs Assessment is completed annually on every student and this is a method of verifying that they are still here. If a child is found to no longer be here, that enrollment is totally removed from the system,(or is withdrawn from the line on the date they left) resulting in that child no longer being counted on the reports. Reports are run that uniquely count a child only once, and only in a single (highest) grade for reporting these counts. Various error-checking reports are run, including various reports to compare similar students for possible duplication. In addition, MSIX provides another method for duplicate checking. If MSIX indicates a duplication, it is verified and also un-duplicated within the MIS2000 system.

COE's are completed using face-to-face interviews by trained recruiters in accordance with the PA Dept of Education's Migrant Education Program Quality Control Procedures Manual. COE's are completed once upon initial recruitment or any time there is a new qualifying move. Recruiters or Student Support Specialists also annually complete a Needs Assessment on each child or youth as mentioned above as part of the annual verification that children or youth are still resident in the Commonwealth. These are also completed on a face-to-face basis. Recruiters, Student Support Specialists and Data Specialists are hired by our five Local Operation Agency subgrantees and all staff are required to attend four quarterly training sessions in their respective disciplines and our Annual State Conference as well as periodic webinars in order to maintain a consistent level of proficiency in skills aligned with current regulations and guidelines.

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.

This is the same as Category 1, except that students are only counted if they are marked as being enrolled in a MEP funded summer program. Strict guidelines have been issued as to what constitutes a summer service based on OME guidance and documentation that such service was provided using attendance lists or other methods documenting the service delivery are required for backup justification purposes. A detailed tracking of the level of summer services is done via the database to more fully describe these services. Student Support staff are responsible to enter this Service Delivery information on their computers. The information is reviewed by data staff as well as supervisors. If a student is listed with a summer enrollment and there is no documentation of summer service, that summer enrollment is removed from the system prior to final counts being generated.

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.

For many years, PDE MEP has been using the same comprehensive high quality algorithm to count the students. In addition, many edit reports are created to verify that students who show on the count are truly eligible. For the 2011-12 count, the first thing the system checks is to make sure the Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) is on or after 9/1/08 and that Residency and QAD are before 8/31/12. ONLY students who meet all of the criteria of being a migrant student, including having a qualifying activity are included in the MIS2000 system and eligible to be possibly counted. We also only count students who reached age 3 prior to 9/1/11 or if they reach age 3 between 9/1/11 and 8/31/12, they must still be residing in the state as of their third birthday. Reports are run on a regular basis and staff assigned to serve the children must verify that they are still resident. In addition, a Needs Assessment is required to be completed every year, and the child/youth must actually be encountered to complete this form. If a child turns age 22 prior 9/1/11 or before they are residing and in PA, they are excluded. If a child became a PA resident after 8/31/12 or left residency before 9/1/11 they are not counted. The general logic system of the reporting mechanism is designed to only count a student once per each child count category by assigning a single calculated grade per student and performing a distinct count by the unique student identifier, despite the number of enrollments a student may have.

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.

This is the same As Category 1, except only counting those enrolled as receiving a summer service as documented using our Service Delivery Tracking. This was also compared to the enrollment as being indicated as a summer enrollment with a 100% match. If a summer enrollment does not have corresponding documentation of summer service, that summer enrollment is deleted before final counts are generated. The summer enrollment must also have started prior to reaching 36 months past their qualifying move and before reaching age 22 or before graduating or receiving a GED. Even if a student meeting any of these criteria is accidentally entered into the system as receiving a summer enrollment, the system would exclude them from the count. For students who turn age 3 between 9/1/11 and 8/31/12, the delivery of summer service must be after turning age 3 to count on the Category 2 report.

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.

PDE MEP has developed an extensive ID&R quality control process that is documented via a manual distributed to staff and it is reviewed and updated on a regular basis as needed. Only those students recruited using this process including extensive verification and review are ever entered into the data system. The process starts by using the PA implementation of the National COE completed by a trained recruiter in a face-to-face interview. Recruiters attend quarterly state-wide recruitment training to refresh the basics of eligibility and to discuss nuances encountered with COE review. These trainings almost always include several case studies. Almost all COE's are completed via an electronic version of the National COE that includes various automatic checks for completeness and data integrity. COE's that start on paper are then entered electronically and also run through these same tests. Tests are run to make sure that the family made a move within the past 36 months across school district lines and that the move was the result of the intent to seek or obtain qualifying seasonal or temporary agricultural or fishing work that plays an important role in providing a living to the family, that any child has not reached age 22 or completed high school or equivalence. A series of questions and documentation of the results are recorded. This may include copies of pay stubs and contact with schools to verify the move in addition to the standard Certificate of Eligibility. Data is entered via an electronic COE that provides additional quality control but is not used as a substitute for review by a state approved reviewer. As mentioned in the previous section, all COEs are reviewed by a team review effort. If at any point in the process any problems are encountered, the COE is returned to the recruiter for correction or clarification. A student is not approved as a migrant student until all reviews have been completed and a member of the review team has signed off as approving the COE. If a student is ever later determined to be ineligible, they are completely removed from the system and will not be counted on any reports. 20% of the COE's including the verification documentation is reviewed monthly by the statewide recruitment coordinator. During annual regional site monitoring, the statewide recruitment coordinator also reviews a random sample of COEs. During these monitoring visits, another member of the state team also reviews another random sample of COEs with the Data Specialist.

If there are any questions of eligibility by the recruiter, there is a policy in place to contact their regional coordinator and/or regional project manager, and if necessary the statewide coordinator or state director. The review teams also routinely include participation by the state coordinator and any questionable eligibility issues are always raised to that level and even to OME as deemed necessary.

The PA MEP provides guidance to all staff on what constitutes a summer service. This is provided during regularly scheduled state and local training for these staff as well as webinars as needed. During site monitoring the state team closely reviews various student records, including summer attendance logs. Regional project managers meet monthly and are frequently reminded of the criteria for summer service. State and local policies are in place for properly documenting this service.

The Data Specialists meet on a quarterly basis to refresh data entry and data review processes. Regional as well as State data staff provide comprehensive reviews of the data, especially in preparation for generating final counts.

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.

No formal reinterview was conducted in 2011-12, as a formal prospective reinterview was performed in 2010. PDE MEP performed a formal prospective reinterview process in the fall of 2010 conducted by independent reviewers (ESCORT). ESCORT is experienced in conducting these type of re-interviews and used their standard and approved procedures. Using a statistician, a random sampling of 77 COE's were reviewed and the defect rate was zero. Re-interviews were conducted using a standard form and done face-to-face where possible, or by telephone if necessary. The original recruiters were excluded from being part of the process. Other staff members were used to introduce the re interviewers to the families.

In addition, our internal quality control process also reviews 100% of the COE's as mentioned in the previous question. Also, 20% of the COEs are re-verified by a state recruitment coordinator or auditor. In addition, the data team and State Director conducted another random review of COEs. In the past year, absolutely none of those audited were found to be not eligible and only minor clerical issues were found. All questionable cases were determined ineligible during initial Quality Control and never reached approval in MIS2000. Of those 20% audited, NONE were determined to be ineligible. During state monitoring of regional sites, several families are contacted to ensure eligibility and no issues have been found.

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.

Recruitment verification is monitored throughout the entire year. In addition, reports are generated throughout the year for support staff to compare that the children in the database are indeed those who they are serving/are resident. A state monitoring team annually visits each sub-grantee and makes random verification of eligibility as well. If at any time a student is determined not to be eligible, they are simply and totally deleted from the regional database, which in turn is deleted from the state database system. Regional and State staff also monitor summer programs via several methods, including attendance rosters and portfolio summary sheets. Written guidelines based on OME guidance are distributed to staff dealing with summer enrollments. These were reviewed at trainings and/or meetings held for staff involved (e.g. Project Managers, Summer Teachers, Data Specialists). Lists are generated throughout the year and sent to the student support specialists who see the children on a regular basis. These staff also have an electronic caseload on a laptop computer that they can monitor and where they can update Needs Assessment and Service Delivery data. Any discrepancies between the lists and students actually enrolled in the program are noted and returned to the Data Specialist to make changes in the data system (for quality control purposes, Student Support Specialists are unable to make enrollment changes on their electronic caseload). Any changes made to the local database automatically propagate to the state database system. Periodically reports are run at the state and regional level and compared. If there are any discrepancies, they are researched and corrected. State Office staff provides an annual monitoring audit to all sub-grantees. COE's and student records are randomly audited as part of this monitoring process. In addition, we continued with the process of recording specific summer services in the database. All students shown as having a summer enrollment were verified as having a documented summer service using this method as well. Throughout the enrollment process, trained Data Specialists ensure that students are not duplicated in the system at the regional or statewide level. If two enrolled students are determined to be the same student, they are merged into one single student. We also use MSIX's matching algorithm to make sure no students are duplicated. Reports are run periodically and especially immediately prior to the reporting of Category 1 and Category 2 counts that looks at students who have similar names and Birth Dates and then manually compared to see if they are in fact the same student. This is done regionally and statewide as well and if students are found to be the same, they are merged into one single student and as such only counted once on the final Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

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.

State staff thoroughly review all edit reports and compare Category 1 and 2 reports run from the state database with those run at the regional level. Any discrepancies are researched and resolved. On a monthly basis, trial numbers are shared with Regional Project Manager in comparison to previous year counts taking into account known factors such as changes in recruitment results and changes in summer programs. The State Director and staff review all of these results with Project Managers to research the counts and verify that the numbers are accurate and as expected.

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.

There have been no indications of any major eligibility problems since the adoption of the new quality control process. When minor/borderline cases are encountered, they are addressed with the individual recruiter and also shared with all five regional recruitment staff and all recruiters who meet quarterly for training. In addition to the previously mentioned quality control team, the state is developing a new standard quality control checklist that these teams will use, instead of individual region forms. These teams allow for multiple set of eyes with difference experiences to review each and every COE against a set of known potential eligibility tests.

Pennsylvania implemented the new quality control processes in 2008. In December 2010, review of all COEs by a Quality Control Team instead of by an individual was added.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The POE MEP has no concerns in reference to the accuracy of the non-duplicated Category 1 or Category 2 child counts we have presented or the eligibility of the students thus counted and reported. The presented numbers are complete and accurate to the best of our ability and our stringent quality recruitment and data controls and procedures.