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 2012-13

CONNECTICUT

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014

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) 2012-13 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 learnin
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high schoo

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 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, 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 mor 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 2012-13 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 2012-13 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

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
_X_ Part I, 2012-13 ___ Part II, 2012-13

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Connecticut

Address:
165 Capitol Ave
Hartford, CT

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Richard Cloud

Telephone: 860-713-6871

Fax: 860-713-7032

e-mail: richard.cloud@ct.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Richard Cloud

_____ Wednesday, April 16, 2014, 10:31:52 AM
Signature

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2012-13

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.

Response	Options
	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 "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2010-11	2010-11	N/A

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

In Summer 2010, the Connecticut State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards as the State's standards in Mathematics and Language Arts

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.

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

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2014-15	2014-15	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	N/A

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.

Following field testing in 2013-14 of the new Mathematics and English Language Arts assessments developed through the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, new achievement standards will be developed for Connecticut and other participating states. At the same time, new achievement standards will be developed for students who are eligible to take the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. Connecticut will participate in this work through the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC).

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.*

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

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2014-15	2014-15	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	N/A

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.

Connecticut will administer assessments developed through the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and the National Center and State Collaborative in 2014-15. Connecticut's science assessments approved through the peer review process will remain in place. The alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards will be discontinued in 2014-15. Students who were previously administered this alternate assessment will be expected to participate in the Smarter Balanced assessments.

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 2012-13, 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)	20.00
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	80.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2012-13 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	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (*IDEA*) 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.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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	281,796	98.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	832	98
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	13,039	98.2
Asian	S	12,836	98.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	203	98
Black or African American	S	36,441	98.3
Hispanic or Latino	S	55,012	97.4
White	S	170,473	99.3
Two or more races	S	5,999	98.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	36,309	98.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	12,753	90.1
Economically disadvantaged students	S	101,867	97.7
Migratory students			
Male	S	144,794	98.6
Female	S	137,002	98.9
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Program on June 30, 2007.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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 (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,515	9.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	18,913	52.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	10,020	27.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,861	10.6
Total	36,309	////////////

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	281,755	98.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	836	99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	13,049	98.1
Asian	S	12,845	98.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	204	98
Black or African American	S	36,443	98.29
Hispanic or Latino	S	54,990	97.3
White	S	170,438	99.3
Two or more races	S	5,999	98.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	36,193	97.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	12,750	89.0
Economically disadvantaged students	S	101,842	97.6
Migratory students			
Male	S	144,779	98.6
Female	S	136,976	98.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Program on June 30, 2007.			

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

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 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	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	180

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,517	9.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	17,045	47.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	11,763	32.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,861	10.7
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	7	S
Total	36,193	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut does not offer an Alternate Assessment based upon Grade Level.

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	121,332	98.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	348	97
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	5,346	98.5
Asian	S	5,272	98.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	74	≥90
Black or African American	S	15,938	97.2
Hispanic or Latino	S	22,839	96.6
White	S	74,500	99.0
Two or more races	S	2,361	98
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	15,676	96.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	4,860	90.4
Economically disadvantaged students	S	41,970	96.7
Migratory students			
Male	S	62,282	98.1
Female	S	59,050	98.4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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 (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,837	12
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,192	77.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,647	11
Total	15,676	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut does not offer an Alternate Assessment based upon grade-level or Modified Achievement Standards for Science Assessments.		

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.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for academic achievement data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months unless a state chooses to include these students. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students 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	39,234	S	81.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	112	S	68
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,974	S	91
Asian	1,942	S	91
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	32	S	88
Black or African American	5,045	S	61.7
Hispanic or Latino	8,238	S	66.1
White	22,936	S	90.6
Two or more races	929	S	83
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,559	S	56.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,477	S	52
Economically disadvantaged students	15,145	S	65.8
Migratory students			
Male	20,221	S	81.3
Female	19,013	S	81.7
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

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	39,154	S	70.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	112	S	58
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,972	S	82.0
Asian	1,940	S	82
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	32	S	69
Black or African American	5,031	S	50.3
Hispanic or Latino	8,209	S	48.7
White	22,900	S	81.8
Two or more races	930	S	73
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,529	S	37.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,454	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	15,094	S	49.9
Migratory students			
Male	20,163	S	67.8
Female	18,991	S	73.4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

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 or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement is only tested in grades 5, 8, and 10.			

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	40,229	S	82.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	128	S	80
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,032	S	93
Asian	2,001	S	93
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	S	≥90
Black or African American	4,985	S	62.0
Hispanic or Latino	8,189	S	67.5
White	23,925	S	90.9
Two or more races	970	S	82.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,185	S	56.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,101	S	49
Economically disadvantaged students	15,245	S	66.6
Migratory students			
Male	20,695	S	82.1
Female	19,534	S	82.7
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

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	40,176	S	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	129	S	75
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,030	S	87
Asian	1,999	S	87
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	S	≥90
Black or African American	4,981	S	55.5
Hispanic or Latino	8,160	S	56.0
White	23,912	S	86.6
Two or more races	964	S	79
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,150	S	50.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,072	S	27
Economically disadvantaged students	15,196	S	57.4
Migratory students			
Male	20,655	S	75.0
Female	19,521	S	77.7
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement is only tested in grades 5, 8, and 10.			

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	39,590	S	82.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	89	S	74
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,961	S	94
Asian	1,940	S	94
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	21	S	≥80
Black or African American	5,152	S	64.4
Hispanic or Latino	8,026	S	67.3
White	23,470	S	91.3
Two or more races	892	S	85
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,310	S	55.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,926	S	43
Economically disadvantaged students	14,870	S	67.3
Migratory students			
Male	20,403	S	82.5
Female	19,187	S	83.2
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement is only tested in grades 5, 8, and 10.			

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	39,570	S	77.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	90	S	70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,957	S	87
Asian	1,936	S	87
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	21	S	≥80
Black or African American	5,149	S	59.1
Hispanic or Latino	8,007	S	59.5
White	23,474	S	87.2
Two or more races	893	S	81
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,297	S	51.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,905	S	30
Economically disadvantaged students	14,849	S	60.2
Migratory students			
Male	20,384	S	75.3
Female	19,186	S	80.4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

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	39,591	S	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	90	S	76
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,957	S	91
Asian	1,936	S	91
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	21	S	≥80
Black or African American	5,156	S	59.5
Hispanic or Latino	8,026	S	64.5
White	23,469	S	91.4
Two or more races	893	S	85
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,311	S	48.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,918	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	14,868	S	64.3
Migratory students			
Male	20,411	S	81.2
Female	19,180	S	82.0

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.

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	40,364	S	84.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	129	S	76
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,799	S	94
Asian	1,757	S	94
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	42	S	76
Black or African American	5,174	S	66.9
Hispanic or Latino	7,946	S	68.1
White	24,430	S	92.1
Two or more races	886	S	85
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,521	S	55.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,748	S	43
Economically disadvantaged students	14,862	S	68.8
Migratory students			
Male	20,851	S	82.9
Female	19,513	S	85.1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

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	40,319	S	81.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	130	S	75
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,797	S	90
Asian	1,755	S	90
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	42	S	74
Black or African American	5,167	S	65.1
Hispanic or Latino	7,939	S	64.4
White	24,405	S	90.2
Two or more races	881	S	84
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,493	S	47.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,721	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	14,826	S	65.7
Migratory students			
Male	20,836	S	78.8
Female	19,483	S	84.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

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 or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement is only tested in grades 5, 8, and 10.			

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	40,734	S	82.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	S	77
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,890	S	94
Asian	1,865	S	94
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	25	S	76
Black or African American	5,340	S	63.5
Hispanic or Latino	7,829	S	64.5
White	24,703	S	91.1
Two or more races	855	S	81
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,444	S	46.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,590	S	33
Economically disadvantaged students	14,744	S	65.6
Migratory students			
Male	20,848	S	80.6
Female	19,886	S	84.0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its migrant education program on June 30, 2007.			

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	40,751	S	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	S	83
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,888	S	93
Asian	1,863	S	93
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	25	S	68
Black or African American	5,335	S	71.3
Hispanic or Latino	7,848	S	70.1
White	24,705	S	92.2
Two or more races	858	S	87
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,440	S	57.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,585	S	38
Economically disadvantaged students	14,763	S	71.4
Migratory students			
Male	20,872	S	81.9
Female	19,879	S	88.4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

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 or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement is only tested in grades 5, 8, and 10.			

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	41,205	S	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	125	S	85
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,692	S	95
Asian	1,666	S	95
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	26	S	≥80
Black or African American	5,462	S	65.7
Hispanic or Latino	7,730	S	66.2
White	25,396	S	91.8
Two or more races	800	S	83
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,476	S	49.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,458	S	29
Economically disadvantaged students	14,455	S	66.8
Migratory students			
Male	21,244	S	81.8
Female	19,961	S	85.1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

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	41,200	S	84.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	125	S	86
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,692	S	92
Asian	1,665	S	93
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	27	S	78
Black or African American	5,465	S	70.0
Hispanic or Latino	7,724	S	67.2
White	25,392	S	91.6
Two or more races	802	S	84
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,457	S	56.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,445	S	27
Economically disadvantaged students	14,462	S	68.6
Migratory students			
Male	21,239	17,397	81.9
Female	19,961	17,231	86.3
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

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	41,257	S	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	125	S	74
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,694	S	90
Asian	1,667	S	90
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	27	S	70
Black or African American	5,472	S	51.7
Hispanic or Latino	7,752	S	53.5
White	25,413	S	87.6
Two or more races	801	S	77
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,502	S	39.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,461	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	14,507	S	54.8
Migratory students			
Male	21,287	S	75.2
Female	19,970	S	77.5

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.

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	40,440	S	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	132	S	74
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,691	S	87
Asian	1,665	S	88
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	26	S	54
Black or African American	5,283	S	49.0
Hispanic or Latino	7,054	S	53.7
White	25,613	S	87.6
Two or more races	667	S	71
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,814	S	37.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,453	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	12,546	S	52.9
Migratory students			
Male	20,532	S	76.3
Female	19,908	S	76.4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its migrant education program on June 30, 2007.			

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	40,405	S	79.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	133	S	76
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,679	S	88
Asian	1,654	S	89
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	25	S	48
Black or African American	5,301	S	57.6
Hispanic or Latino	7,001	S	60.9
White	25,623	S	89.1
Two or more races	668	S	77
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,820	S	51.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,388	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	12,540	S	59.9
Migratory students			
Male	20,529	S	75.0
Female	19,876	S	84.7
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.			

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	40,484	S	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	133	S	80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,695	S	88
Asian	1,669	S	89
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	26	S	50
Black or African American	5,310	S	57.3
Hispanic or Latino	7,061	S	60.1
White	25,618	S	91.6
Two or more races	667	S	79
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,863	S	44.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,481	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	12,595	S	59.8
Migratory students			
Male	20,584	S	80.2
Female	19,900	S	82.2

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.

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

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
Schools			
Districts			

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

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator [3] based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
Schools	949	99	10.43
Districts	193	6	3.11

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Sections 1.4.1, 1.4.2 and 1.4.3 of the CSPR do not accurately represent the number and percent of schools/districts meeting their AMOs pursuant to the methodology outlined in Connecticut approved ESEA Flexibility request. In many ways, the approach used in the CSPR is picking select pieces from Connecticut's overall system and then applying an AYP-type methodology to determine a simplistic Yes/No status for each school/district; this approach is not reflective of the spirit or the differentiated methodology that was expected by USED and outlined in Connecticut's approved ESEA flexibility.

Connecticut is certifying the CSPR Part I to meet the federal deadline but sincerely hopes that the USED will work with Connecticut and other Flexibility states to ensure that the data that are ultimately reported to Congress are not the CSPR data but are based more on the outcomes of the school performances resulting from ESEA flexibility. For a sampling of those results for Connecticut, please see http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/pressroom/2013_school_and_district_performance_reports.pdf.

The list below illustrates some ways in which the CSPR's approach is not consistent with the methodology used in ESEA Flexibility. It also includes areas where the CSPR approach seems to have changed from FY 2011-12 to FY 2012-13. In addition, it highlights instances where the ESEA flexibility made changes in minimum N sizes and expected achievement level that further make 2012-13 results incomparable to prior years.

• To facilitate differentiated accountability and support, Connecticut's new accountability model instituted a school classification system that classifies all schools into the following categories: Excelling, Progressing, Transitioning, Review, Focus, and Turnaround. There is no simplistic "Yes/No", determination of a school. Instead, schools are evaluated on a variety of indicators (including overall target attainment, subgroup gaps, participation rate, graduation rate, etc.) in order to assign a classification. This classification system (and not a simple overall Yes/No status) guides the different levels of support that are provided by of our Turnaround Office.

• Connecticut holds schools, districts and subgroups accountable for target attainment based on an overall school/district performance index that aggregates results from all subjects tested (reading, mathematics, writing and science) into one overall index score; CSPR however continues to judge school success based only on subject specific results. Connecticut ESEA Flexibility does not utilize subject specific index scores as part of its school accountability model. Moreover, in this revised federal method, science scores play no part while science is an integral component of the index score.

• Subgroup gaps are a critical component of a school's classification. For instance, 54 percent of schools with high overall index scores that would have placed them in the Excelling category were dropped a classification to Progressing because a majority of the subgroups in those schools evidenced significant gaps when compared to the all students group. Again, gaps or subgroup performance alone do not result in a Yes/No determination. Instead the intent is to provide the right actionable signals to all stakeholders.

• The concept of "an additional academic indicator" is not something that is used within the accountability model. In the AYP system, Writing performance was an additional academic indicator for elementary/middle schools; in the new system per our approved ESEA flexibility, Writing is no longer viewed as an additional indicator because Writing results are incorporated into the overall index score. This is also reiterated in our Accountability workbook #34.

Comment continued in Comment Section for 1.4.2

[3] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. 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 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Continued from 1.4.1

• The AYP method in years prior to 2012-13 seems to have only evaluated the overall graduation rate while the 2012-13 CSPR appears to be evaluating subgroup graduation rates as well.

• Connecticut lowered the minimum number of students for a subgroup performance to be reportable from 40 to 20. As compared to AYP, this approach makes many more subgroups visible and accountable in many more schools. Please note that subgroup index scores and subgroup target attainment are reported in the school performance reports.

• The expected achievement level for students was raised from level 3 (Proficient) to level 4 (Goal) further making results incomparable to AYP.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator [4] based on data for SY 2012-13. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools	532	41	7.71
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	213	5	2.35
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	319	36	11.29

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

[4] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator [5] based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator
184	4	2.17
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Same comment as in Section 1.4.1 continued into Section 1.4.2		

[5] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2012-13
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in this section are not included in the CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system under ESEA Flexibility.	

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in this section are not included in the CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system under ESEA Flexibility.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data in this section are not included in the CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system under ESEA Flexibility.

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 data in this section are not included in the CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system under ESEA Flexibility.

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 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 2012-13
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2011-12 and beginning of SY 2012-13 as a corrective action)	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in this section are not included in the CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system under ESEA Flexibility.	

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 2012-13 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in this section are not included in the CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system under ESEA Flexibility.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete	

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) SchoolImprovement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Tille I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* .

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) SchoolImprovement Funds.

1A.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enler the percentage oflhe FY 2012 (SY 2012-13) Tille I, Part A allocalion lhallhe SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation offunds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA:* 4.00 %

!comments: The response is limited lo 4,000 characters.

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

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

1.4.8.5.3 **Use of Section 1003(gj(81 Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance**

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows Slates to reserve up lo five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and lo meellhe evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program.In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) and technical assistance activities that your Slate conducted during SY 2012-13.

This response is limited lo 8,000 characters.

The data in this section are not included in I he CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system under ESEA Flexibility.

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 stale in SY 2012-13 thaiwere supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data in this section are not included in I he CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support s stem under ESEA Flexibilil .

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 Title I school 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	
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in this section are not included in the CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system under ESEA Flexibility.	

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	$

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	

FAQs about public school choice:

a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in this section are not included in the CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system under ESEA Flexibility.

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*.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in this section are not included in the CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system under ESEA Flexibility.	

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	$
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data in this section are not included in the CSPR, in accordance with Connecticut's Approved ESEA Flexibility and as a part of its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system under ESEA Flexibility.	

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.

Classes	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 NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	129,707	128,917	99.39	790	0.61
All elementary classes	41,269	40,926	99.17	343	0.83
All secondary classes	88,438	87,991	99.49	447	0.51

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.

Full day self contained classes are counted as one class

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

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

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

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes

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	13.90
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	6.10
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	80.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes

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)	26.20
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	73.80
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	13,222	12,978	98.15
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	10,370	10,341	99.72
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	14,629	14,437	98.69
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	24,891	24,827	99.74

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	**Low-Poverty Schools** (less than what %)
Elementary schools	57.40	11.10
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Eligibility	
Secondary schools	57.50	11.10
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Eligibility	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *What is a "high-poverty schoof'?* 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 "/ow-poverty schoof'?* 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 quartUes detennined?* 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 !Tee 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 forthis purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
No	Two-way immersion	
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish, Portuguese, Creole-Haitain, Karen, Serbo-Croation, Polish, Arabic, Albanian
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	//
Yes	Structured English immersion	//
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	//
Yes	Content-based ESL	//
Yes	Pull-out ESL	//
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	//

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Language Transition Support Services provided after 30-months of bilingual programming is provided, New Arrival Centers, and tutoring.

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	31,698
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 in the State 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.	30,284
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	23,177
Portuguese	827
Chinese	808
Arabic	778
Creoles and pidgins, French-based (Other)	604

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	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	30,909
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	431
Total	31,340
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	8,238
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	26.65
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	29,600
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	369
Total	29,969
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not Tested, refused 100 Not Tested, absent 25 Not tested, expelled 5 Not Tested, outplaced 91 Not Tested, suspended 5 Not Tested, truant 80 Unable to Test 16 Not Tested, other 47	

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.	7,745

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	7,972	36.48	17,506	80.00
Attained proficiency	12,804	43.26	8,880	30.00
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).	_____No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	_____No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	_____No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
5,489	4,132	9,621
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
3,204	S	86.8	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
3,202	S	79.4	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
3,215	S	35.5	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	60
////////////

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
10,912	3,122	18

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) – The term ' Language instruction educational program ' means an instruction course – (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.	735
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	20

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.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	68
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	62
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	60
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	46
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0
Other (Explain in comment box)	31

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	71	11,203
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	59	1,155
PD provided to principals	50	639
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	49	1,286
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	59	900
PD provided to community based organization personnel	23	473
Total	//////////////////////////////////////	15,656

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Language Acquisition Levels, Second Language Acquisition Strategies, Differentiated Instruction, Data Teams, Culturally Responsive Education, School Improvement Plan Development, CCSS Alignment, Parent Training, School Climate, ELL Teacher Desk Cards - Stages of Language Acquisition, Math & Reading, Technology, C0-teaching, Technology, Rigorous Curriculum Design, SIOP, ExCel Training, Dual Language Training, Learning Disability and ELLs, Book Study, Peer Coaching, Consortia Roundtable Meetings, Video Reviews, State Personal Development Grant & ELLs, Readers/Writers Workshop, Effective Tier I Instruction, Academic Vocabulary, Understanding by Design, Krashen Strategies, (CALI) ESL Basic Training, Academic, Behavioral & Social-emotional well being for ELLs, Home School Connection, and Culturally Relevant Literacy Practices.

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 2012-13 funds July 1, 2012, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2012, for SY 2012-13 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/12	09/15/12	60
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.

For this year's grant, we had an unusual problem with private schools reporting incorrectly the number of identified ELLs in their schools. The numbers that were reported were incorrect for at least 50% of the private schools. The program manager and the data collection specialist had to work with districts and private schools to clean the data. Until the data was corrected, the grants management office could not produce the Title III grant allocation entitlement list. This delayed the process for grant approvals.
We now have two processes in place that will make a difference and will shorten the time when funds will be available and how the grant approval process will be expedited. First, we now include in our application guidance to districts in the summer that they may draw down 15% of their funds immediately. Secondly, we have provided more technical assistance to districts on how to communicate with the private schools in their area to ensure more accurate reporting of Ells to the state. We have sample template letters that these districts may send out to their private schools, and we also have sent to private schools from the state level a PowerPoint indicating how they can report information to the state on an on line application. Both of these measures will result in more accurate reporting and will eliminate the hold up of calculating the entitlement funds due to incorrect data.

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	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Connecticut, no schools have been identified as persistently dangerous.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOfo/ELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	**#LEAs Reporting Data**
LEAs without subgrants	189	189
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	199	199

Comments: The response 1s llm1ted to 4,000 characters.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	72	55
K	119	165
1	129	136
2	95	161
3	91	128
4	109	107
5	114	110
6	99	110
7	103	85
8	92	85
9	106	89
10	115	47
11	107	42
12	120	35
Ungraded		
Total	1,471	1,355
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut does not have an Ungraded grade designation.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	344	502
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	932	724
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	13	7
Hotels/Motels	182	122
Total	1,471	1,355
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	112	26
Migratory children/youth		
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	296	236
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	204	231
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30, 2007.		

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 Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	55
K	165
1	136
2	161
3	128
4	107
5	110
6	110
7	85
8	85
9	89
10	47
11	42
12	35
Ungraded	
Total	1,355
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut does not have an Ungraded grade designation.	

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	26
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	236
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	231
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Connecticut closed its Migrant Education Program on June 30 2007.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youth who were tested on the State 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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	84	38	117	38
4	99	48	92	38
5	97	55	95	48
6	88	46	95	50
7	77	48	85	52
8	81	48	72	40
High School	80	38	33	13
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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	85	52	116	62
4	101	54	95	46
5	99	56	96	53
6	89	48	95	50
7	79	49	82	33
8	81	53	72	38
High School	87	34	38	11
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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3				
4				
5	99	59	96	47
6				
7				
8	82	46	75	34
High School	88	39	39	15
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement is only tested in grades 5, 8, and 10.				