

**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

OHIO



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~~4~~, 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 200~~5~~6, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 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 more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 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
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2012-13 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2012-13		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Ohio Department of Education		
Address: 25 S. Front Street Columbus, OH 43215-4183		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Dr. Ardith M. Allen, Social Science Research Specialist, Office of Accountability		
Telephone: 614-728-8054		
Fax: 614-728-2627		
e-mail: ardith.allen@education.ohio.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Richard A. Ross, Superintendent of Public Instruction		
Signature _____		Tuesday, April 15, 2014, 12:55:33 PM

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

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	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

A new alternate assessment was implemented during the 2012-2013 school year on new standards with extensions. Schools will implement the new standards fully in the 2013-2014 school year. The assessments for the 2013-2014 school year are dually aligned between the old standards and the new standards, with movement from the current assessments to the PARCC assessments to occur in the 2014-2015 school year, as described below in the response for Question 1.1.2.

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	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
Regular Assessments in High School	2015-2016	2015-2016	2015-2016
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2012-2013	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

A new alternate assessment was implemented during the 2012-2013 school year on new standards with extensions. Due to conflicts with state law, the new high school assessments will become fully operational in the 2015-2016 school year (these include PARCC assessments for Mathematics and English/Language Arts, and state End of Course exams for Science). The Ohio Graduation Tests will be extended for federal accountability purposes for the 2014-2015 school year, but will be aligned to the new standards through the addition of some new items. For grades 3-8, we will be moving from the current Ohio Achievement Assessments to the PARCC assessments for English/Language Arts and Mathematics, and to new state-developed computer-based tests in grades 5, 8, and high school for Science.

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)	80.00
To administer assessments required by Section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	20.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 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)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	No
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

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	922,464	99.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,258	≥99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	17,505	99.8
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	S	143,081	99.3
Hispanic or Latino	S	36,853	99.6
White	S	683,156	99.8
Two or more races	S	40,611	99.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	137,300	99.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	20,687	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	S	442,789	99.6
Migratory students	S	171	≥95
Male	S	473,832	99.7
Female	S	448,632	99.7

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1. Current business rules for the C185 Assessment Participation in Mathematics ED Facts file specifications permit students to be included at the SEA level but not at the LEA level. This business rule allows the possibility for differences in SEA- and LEA-level participation counts to occur. The same business rule also applies at the School level, so differences in SEA- and School-level participation counts can also occur.

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

1.2.2 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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	35,595	25.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	85,931	62.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	15,774	11.5
Total	137,300	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	928,503	99.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,273	≥99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	17,724	99.5
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	S	144,440	99.4
Hispanic or Latino	S	37,167	99.5
White	S	686,910	99.8
Two or more races	S	40,989	99.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	138,167	99.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	20,776	99.0
Economically disadvantaged students	S	446,849	99.6
Migratory students	S	169	≥95
Male	S	476,933	99.7
Female	S	451,570	99.7

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1. Current business rules for the C188 Assessment Participation in Reading/Language Arts ED Facts file specifications permit students to be included at the SEA level but not at the LEA level. This business rule allows the possibility for differences in SEA- and LEA-level participation counts to occur. The same business rule also applies at the School level, so differences in SEA- and School-level participation counts can also occur.

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

1.2.3.1 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	510

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	36,581	26.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	85,800	62.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	15,777	11.4
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	9	S
Total	138,167	

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

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	396,418	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	569	≥99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	7,219	99.8
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	S	60,646	98.9
Hispanic or Latino	S	14,838	99.3
White	S	296,959	99.6
Two or more races	S	16,187	99.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	59,473	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	6,924	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	S	182,304	99.3
Migratory students	S	60	≥90
Male	S	203,192	99.5
Female	S	193,226	99.5

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Current business rules for the C189 Assessment Participation in Science ED Facts file specifications permit students to be included at the SEA level but not at the LEA level. This business rule allows the possibility for differences in SEA- and LEA-level participation counts to occur. The same business rule also applies at the School level, so differences in SEA- and School-level participation counts can also occur.

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	15,348	25.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	37,498	63.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,627	11.1
Total	59,473	

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

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

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	129,090	S	78.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	144	S	71
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,705	S	89
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,278	S	54.9
Hispanic or Latino	5,922	S	68.6
White	93,467	S	84.7
Two or more races	6,574	S	75.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	18,073	S	52.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,906	S	64.8
Economically disadvantaged students	65,877	S	68.4
Migratory students	36	S	58
Male	66,407	S	78.9
Female	62,683	S	78.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	134,147	S	81.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	157	S	71
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,769	S	87
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	21,577	S	62
Hispanic or Latino	6,248	S	70.8
White	96,487	S	87.1
Two or more races	6,909	S	79.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	18,842	S	57.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,010	S	64.6
Economically disadvantaged students	69,698	S	72.6
Migratory students	36	S	67
Male	68,976	S	79.7
Female	65,171	S	84.2
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
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 (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement assessments are given only 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	129,269	S	78.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	166	S	72
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,710	S	90
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,154	S	52.3
Hispanic or Latino	5,778	S	67.8
White	94,242	S	84.3
Two or more races	6,219	S	73.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,081	S	48.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,088	S	62.1
Economically disadvantaged students	64,840	S	66.7
Migratory students	26	S	69
Male	66,778	S	77.8
Female	62,491	S	78.5
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	129,214	S	88.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	166	S	84
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,676	S	93
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,136	S	72.8
Hispanic or Latino	5,749	S	82.4
White	94,261	S	91.9
Two or more races	6,226	S	86.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,084	S	67.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,968	S	76.4
Economically disadvantaged students	64,796	S	81.4
Migratory students	25	S	≥80
Male	66,763	S	86.3
Female	62,451	S	90.3
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian 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 assessments are given only 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	130,294	S	69.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	151	S	58
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,581	S	84.0
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,175	S	40.1
Hispanic or Latino	5,525	S	55.1
White	95,868	S	75.9
Two or more races	5,994	S	63.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,927	S	37.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,258	S	43.6
Economically disadvantaged students	65,001	S	54.9
Migratory students	26	S	54
Male	66,761	S	68.3
Female	63,533	S	69.8

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences between the previous year's data and the current year's data for the American Indian or Alaska Native student subgroup have been verified as correct. In particularly small student subgroups, small changes in numbers can lead to large percentage changes from one school year to the next.

1.3.2.3 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	130,272	S	74.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	151	S	70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,554	S	84
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,175	S	49.5
Hispanic or Latino	5,494	S	62.4
White	95,910	S	80.6
Two or more races	5,988	S	71.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,934	S	44.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,133	S	46.4
Economically disadvantaged students	64,965	S	62.2
Migratory students	25	S	60
Male	66,757	S	71.9
Female	63,515	S	77.5

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences between the previous year's data and the current year's data for the American Indian or Alaska Native student subgroup have been verified as correct. In particularly small student subgroups, small changes in numbers can lead to large percentage changes from one school year to the next.

1.3.3.3 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	130,339	S	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	150	S	59
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,598	S	81
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,187	S	36.1
Hispanic or Latino	5,517	S	51.6
White	95,902	S	75.7
Two or more races	5,985	S	62.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19,913	S	37.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,254	S	35.6
Economically disadvantaged students	64,988	S	53.0
Migratory students	26	S	69
Male	66,779	S	68.3
Female	63,560	S	67.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences between the previous year's data and the current year's data for the American Indian or Alaska Native student subgroup have been verified as correct. In particularly small student subgroups, small changes in numbers can lead to large percentage changes from one school year to the next.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,075	S	75.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	S	67
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,410	S	89
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,866	S	50.7
Hispanic or Latino	5,256	S	64.1
White	98,382	S	81.3
Two or more races	5,965	S	71.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,373	S	40.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,518	S	49
Economically disadvantaged students	65,238	S	62.8
Migratory students	23	S	61
Male	68,366	S	73.5
Female	64,709	S	77.6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,305	S	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	197	S	80
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,446	S	89
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,853	S	64.6
Hispanic or Latino	5,227	S	75.4
White	98,603	S	87.8
Two or more races	5,979	S	81.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,391	S	53.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,426	S	54
Economically disadvantaged students	65,221	S	74.0
Migratory students	23	S	74
Male	68,522	S	80.4
Female	64,783	S	86.5
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian 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 (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement assessments are given only 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	134,493	S	73.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	S	72
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,513	S	89
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	21,051	S	47.1
Hispanic or Latino	5,034	S	63.6
White	100,066	S	79.7
Two or more races	5,643	S	69.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,182	S	37.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,239	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	64,313	S	60.2
Migratory students	27	S	48
Male	68,991	S	72.7
Female	65,502	S	74.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	134,683	S	81.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	S	76
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,526	S	89
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	21,074	S	61.4
Hispanic or Latino	5,018	S	72.8
White	100,234	S	86.1
Two or more races	5,646	S	79.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,212	S	48.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,149	S	50
Economically disadvantaged students	64,373	S	71.3
Migratory students	27	S	63
Male	69,099	S	77.8
Female	65,584	S	85.4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
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 (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement assessments are given only 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	133,468	S	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	S	73
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,327	S	89
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,565	S	53.3
Hispanic or Latino	4,821	S	65.3
White	100,210	S	82.9
Two or more races	5,327	S	73.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,060	S	40.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,105	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	61,702	S	65.0
Migratory students	22	S	77
Male	68,268	S	75.8
Female	65,200	S	79.1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,590	S	86.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	S	82
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,340	S	90
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,553	S	69.7
Hispanic or Latino	4,796	S	78.5
White	100,343	S	89.9
Two or more races	5,337	S	85.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,070	S	55.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,023	S	55
Economically disadvantaged students	61,684	S	77.8
Migratory students	22	S	73
Male	68,303	S	83.4
Female	65,287	S	89.2
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,494	S	69.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	S	66
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,364	S	80
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	20,519	S	36.5
Hispanic or Latino	4,817	S	52.5
White	100,247	S	76.5
Two or more races	5,326	S	64.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,016	S	34.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,107	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	61,612	S	53.3
Migratory students	23	S	61
Male	68,266	S	70.1
Female	65,228	S	67.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,775	S	84.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	197	S	78
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,259	S	90.0
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	19,992	S	63.4
Hispanic or Latino	4,517	S	75.1
White	100,921	S	88.9
Two or more races	4,889	S	81.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,604	S	47.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,573	S	50
Economically disadvantaged students	55,818	S	73.5
Migratory students	11	S	≥50
Male	68,261	S	83.6
Female	64,514	S	85.1

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

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,782	S	88.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	S	84
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,254	S	88
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	19,994	S	74.5
Hispanic or Latino	4,510	S	82.0
White	100,932	S	91.1
Two or more races	4,896	S	86.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,625	S	56.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,557	S	50
Economically disadvantaged students	55,835	S	80.1
Migratory students	11	S	≥50
Male	68,260	S	85.7
Female	64,522	S	90.6

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences between the previous year's data and the current year's data for the Migratory student subgroup have been verified as correct. In particularly small student subgroups, small changes in numbers can lead to large percentage changes from one school year to the next.

1.3.3.7 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	132,585	S	77.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	S	77
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,257	S	83
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	19,940	S	50.5
Hispanic or Latino	4,504	S	65.1
White	100,810	S	83.8
Two or more races	4,876	S	73.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19,544	S	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,563	S	31
Economically disadvantaged students	55,704	S	63.5
Migratory students	11	S	<50
Male	68,147	S	77.7
Female	64,438	S	77.7
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.4 CHOL 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 indicator³ 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	3,535	676	19.12
Districts	610	17	2.79

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Ohio would like to describe why its data may appear to be incorrect to those unfamiliar with our new accountability system, as approved in our ESEA Flexibility Request by the USDOE on May 29, 2012 (<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/map/oh.html>). Please see, in particular, Section 2.B., "Set Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives" on pages 62-75 of our most current request for a detailed description of our AMO calculations.

In CSPR Questions 1.4.1, 1.4.2, and 1.4.3, the results for the AMO sub-questions beneath the AYP questions are calculated exactly the same way that AYP results were calculated for Ohio. In both cases, a 51-cell matrix is used: ten student subgroups (All Students, American Indian or Alaskan Native Students, Asian or Pacific Islander Students, Black, Non-Hispanic Students, Hispanic Students, Multiracial Students, White, Non-Hispanic Students, Economically Disadvantaged Students, Students with Disabilities, and Students with Limited English Proficiency) times five AYP indicators/AMO elements (Reading Percent Proficient, Reading Participation Rate, Mathematics Percent Proficient, Mathematics Participation Rate, and Graduation Rate) equals 50, plus one student subgroup (All Students) times one AYP indicator/AMO element (Attendance Rate) equals one, so there are 51 total cells that could possibly be evaluated for AYP/AMOs for any school/district. Out of all the cells that have a minimum number of students to be evaluated, it takes only one evaluation of "Not Met" for the entire matrix to receive an overall "Not Met" determination.

Unfortunately, this method only takes into account one method of meeting a goal—meeting the state target for any particular AYP indicator/AMO element outright. But Ohio has always been at the forefront in designing its accountability system so that as many schools and districts as possible could benefit from showing progress even if a target was not met outright. Safe Harbor was prescribed under NCLB, and Ohio used two-year combined results calculations to allow schools and districts to meet AYP as well. We then built upon current trends in data analysis and designed a growth model that allowed projected results to benefit our schools and districts. These methods allowed far more schools and districts to meet AYP than would have with only one way of receiving an overall determination of "Met." (Comment continued under Question 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.

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 indicator⁴ 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	2,360	309	13.09
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,618	147	9.09
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	742	162	21.83

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The situation is similar for the AMO calculations currently in use in Ohio under our approved ESEA Flexibility Request, and so there are many more schools/districts that would show as meeting all of their targets if our entire formulas were used, rather than the simplistic meeting or not meeting of targets displayed in the CSPR. In our redesigned accountability system, we created a Gap Closing measure that has three AMOs: Reading Percent Proficient, Mathematics Percent Proficient, and Graduation Rate. There are also three AMO Demotion Criteria: Reading Participation Rate, Mathematics Participation Rate, and Attendance Rate. The three AMOs also have associated AMO Demotion Criteria, so there are six elements that can demote a school or district. Demotions are possible because instead of measuring a dichotomous end result as is done with AYP (i.e. "Met" versus "Not Met"), the Gap Closing measure result is a ratio-level variable: a traditional A-F letter grade scale. On this scale, a letter grade of "C" is defined in our ESEA Flexibility Request as being equivalent to an AYP determination of "Met."

- For each student subgroup of sufficient size to be evaluated, the percentage of students who achieve proficiency or who graduate is compared to a state target derived from the baseline mean state performance on each of the measures. Each subgroup earns a certain number of points based on its performance: 1) A subgroup can meet the target outright and earn 100 points; 2) it can improve its below-target percentage over the previous year's percentage by an amount larger than its current distance from the target and earn 100 points; 3) it can improve its below-target percentage over the previous year's percentage by an amount smaller than its current distance from the target and earn 0 - 100 points; or 4) it can be below the target and not make any improvement and earn 0 points.

- The points for all subgroups measured within a single AMO are added together and then divided by the number of subgroups to get the total number of points for that AMO. The points for the number of applicable AMOs within a school or district (i.e., one, two, or three) are then added together and divided by the number of applicable AMOs to get the total number of Preliminary AMO Points. These Preliminary AMO Points are translated to Preliminary Letter Grades of A, B, C, D, or F using the traditional 0% - 100% scale.

- Demotions are applied in the next step. Any school or district with a Preliminary Letter Grade of "A" will be demoted to a Final Letter Grade of "B" if it has any student subgroup performing below a threshold of 70% on any of the three AMOs. Demotions will also be applied to schools or districts that fall below the 95% target for participation or the 93% target for attendance. This set of demotions is applied to all districts and schools, regardless of Preliminary Letter Grade. Finally, while a school or district may earn more than one demotion, it will only be demoted one time, for the equivalent of one letter grade. (Comment continued under Question 1.4.3.)

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
---	---	---

609	16	2.63
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In summary, based on the way the AYP calculations of the past were "enhanced" in such a way that schools/districts could meet AYP with multiple methods, giving us the higher percentages we observe in CSPRs from previous years, so too the new AMO calculations used in Ohio give schools/districts more than one way to achieve required targets. The CSPR as it currently stands can only display a distortion of our true results, making it seem as if very few schools and districts in the State are performing as well as we expect them to, when nothing could be further from the truth. We welcome discussion of any aspect of our accountability system and hope that this explanation is suitable for your purposes.</p>		

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. Ohio is an <i>ESEA</i> Flexibility and a Differentiated Accountability state, so the above-listed actions that are recommended for Corrective Action and Restructuring plans are implemented and measured differently from how they were prior to our Differentiated Accountability Model being approved and put into place in July 2008 and our <i>ESEA</i> Flexibility Plan being implemented during the 2012-2013 school year. Under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model, a district and all of its buildings are treated as one system to which appropriate improvement strategies are applied. The last school year for which building-level data on the implementation of Corrective Action and Restructuring strategies were collected is 2008-2009. Please see our response to Question 1.4.5.3 for additional detail.	

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. Ohio is an <i>ESEA</i> Flexibility and a Differentiated Accountability state, so the above-listed actions that are recommended for Corrective Action and Restructuring plans are implemented and measured differently from how they were prior to our Differentiated Accountability Model being approved and put into place in July 2008 and our <i>ESEA</i> Flexibility Plan being implemented during the 2012-2013 school year. Under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model, a district and all of its buildings are treated as one system to which appropriate improvement strategies are applied. The last school year for which building-level data on the implementation of Corrective Action and Restructuring strategies were collected is 2008-2009. Please see our response to Question 1.4.5.3 for additional detail.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2012-2013, 319 public districts, 1089 public district buildings, and 171 community (aka charter) schools were identified for support under Ohio's Differentiated Accountability Model and were required to implement the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) using the tools developed by the State. All 319 public districts (100%), 820 of the 1089 public district buildings (75%), and 164 of the 171 community schools (95.9%) received Title I funds for the 2012-2013 school year. The OIP is Ohio's strategy for ensuring a systematic and coherent approach for building the capacity of all districts and schools to improve instructional practice and student performance on a district-wide basis, and is a strategy for assisting districts to enact the Ohio Leadership Development Framework (OLDF). The OIP requires the intentional use of the following four stage process, across which structures, tools, and people are connected, to help districts: 1) use data to identify areas of greatest need; 2) develop a plan to address areas of need built around a limited number of focused goals and strategies to improve instructional practice and student performance; 3) fully implement and monitor the degree of implementation of the plan; and 4) evaluate the effectiveness of the improvement process in changing instructional practice and impacting student performance. Selected districts also receive an on-site School Improvement Diagnostic Review (SIDR) from the State Diagnostic Team (SDT) to help them analyze their current practices against indicators of effective instructional practices.

The SIDR process is designed to gather qualitative data on behaviors and practices within the school setting that provide information beyond existing data. Current practices are measured against effective evidence- and research-based practices to identify areas of strength and areas needing improvement. The indicators of effective practice measured through the SIDR are organized around six Critical Areas of Performance: 1) Alignment with Standards; 2) Instructional Practice; 3) Environment and Climate; 4) System of Leadership; 5) Professional Development; and 6) Data Driven Decisions. The SIDR and SDT are part of a larger state system of support for low-performing schools. The State Support Team (SST) helps districts and buildings embed actionable SIDR findings into their improvement plans, and assists with implementing and monitoring changes in adult practices and student performance. Four High Support districts (16 schools), 55 non-SIG Priority buildings, 52 SIG - funded Cohort 1 follow ups received the SIDR during 2012-2013 for a total of 123 buildings. These entities were selected based on past SIDR results, SST and Office of School Turnaround recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

Stage 4: Working with leadership teams to evaluate the improvement process and make necessary changes to continually improve instructional practice and student performance by supporting them to: 1) evaluate plan implementation, impact, and changes needed; 2) report summative plan progress; and 3) modify instructional practice. Ohio has established several structures to ensure consistency in the design and delivery of ongoing training and development of regional facilitators assigned to support districts and buildings identified for support, which include a State-level Design Team and a quadrant lead structure. In addition to implementation of the OIP as a required intervention, districts identified for support are required to implement additional consequences/interventions under the Differentiated Accountability Model that are dependent on their level of support (i.e., High, Medium, or Low). Because Ohio's DA Model has been in place for five years, LEAs identified for support in each of those three years are required to select additional interventions beyond what is minimally required. The process for deciding upon these intervention choices is collaborative, and stakeholders include members of an LEA's leadership, Single Points of Contact (SPoCs) leading the SSTs in the state's 16 regions, other trained regional facilitators and other ODE consultants.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 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. Ohio's Differentiated Accountability Model, adopted in July 2008, allows the state to implement an intervention model that distinguishes between those districts that require intensive intervention and those that are closer to meeting their student achievement goals. Under the Differentiated Accountability Model, Ohio treats districts and buildings as a system and stratifies districts into three risk categories (High, Medium, and Low Support) based on the aggregate percentage of student groups not meeting AYP, rather than on the amount of time that the district has not met AYP. These identified districts are provided with different options for interventions in addition to those required by federal law. As such, Ohio's 112 Corrective Action districts are not the focus of the State's intervention model; instead, our attention has focused on the districts identified under the new Differentiated Accountability Model.

In the 2012-2013 school year, Ohio identified 319 school districts, which included all 112 Corrective Action districts, across the three risk categories. Of these 319 districts, 47 were identified as needing High Support (including 37 districts in Corrective Action) and received full intervention from the State System of Support. All 47 High Support districts, as well as 70 Medium Support districts (30 of which were in Corrective Action) and 202 Low Support districts (45 of which were in Corrective Action), implemented the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model. This implementation of the OIP included: development of District Leadership Teams (DLTs), Building Leadership Teams (BLTs), and Teacher Based Teams (TBTs; a necessary but not sufficient component of the BLTs); use of the State's Decision Framework (DF) tool to complete a deep review of district-level data and create district and building needs assessments; development of focused improvement plans based on the district- and building-level needs assessments; and, if selected by the State, a review by the State Diagnostic Team (SDT). Plans were developed at the district and building levels in 2012-2013 for implementation in the 2013-2014 school year.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 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. Under Ohio's ESEA Flexibility Request, approved in May 2012, the state is no longer required to make AYP determinations for buildings or districts. Therefore, no AYP, School Improvement, or District Improvement appeal process was conducted for the 2012-2013 school year.

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) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title 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) School Improvement Funds.

1A.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2012 (SY 2012-13) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.00 %

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

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

The data for this question are reported through ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the ED Facts Reporting System (ERS). The ED Facts 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(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

I. Technical Assistance:

- The Ohio State University's Fisher School of Business Executive Principal Leadership Academy program was reviewed and revised through a process of meeting with the Executive Committee at The Ohio State University. Participant feedback was collected at each session and used to revise the content and focus of the Academy. All SIG principals, and many of the SIG assistant principals, attended the Executive Principal Leadership Academy.
- Transformation Specialists' work in buildings was honed to reflect revised frameworks and site visit protocols based on data from monitoring, Transformation Specialist site visit reports, and School Improvement Diagnostic Reports (SIDRs) to assure that the technical assistance provided to each principal completely supports the intervention components of the selected intervention model for each school (i.e., Transformation, Turnaround, or Restart).
- Ohio adopted an evidence-based monitoring system that required schools and districts to supply high-quality evidence of intervention component implementation electronically. Initial technical assistance for this system was provided regionally in August and September of 2012, and regional follow-up training was provided as needed in January 2013.
- SIG orientation and technical assistance was provided on September 18, 2012 for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 school and district leaders. The framework of support, state and federal expectations, and monitoring systems and requirements were explained during this technical assistance event.
- The Ohio Statewide Educator Conference included all SIG principals and district leaders. A special strand of this conference was created where research-based best practices from high-poverty/high-performing schools were shared.
- After two quarters of monitoring data were analyzed to determine school and district needs, the Transformation Specialist team developed and deployed technical assistance designed to address any lagging areas of the intervention model components, and to support districts and buildings further with the high-quality evidence needed for evidence-based monitoring.
- In June 2013 all principals, Building Leadership Team (BLT) members, and district leaders attended the Best Practices one-day technical assistance conference. At this conference, national and local speakers provided best-practice examples of building and district strategies and actions that resulted in increased student achievement.
- In March 2013, all Cohort 2 schools were provided detailed technical assistance to support their application renewal or revision processes.

II. Evaluation:

- A diagnostic review follow-up was completed for all Cohort 1 buildings. 2012-2013 data from six critical areas (i.e., alignment with standards, instructional practices, environment and climate, systems of leadership, professional development, and data driven decisions) were compared with earlier 2010-2011 data to identify growth as a result of SIG.
- Daily site visit reports described implementation levels of each intervention model component. Transformation Specialists also gathered data about the implementation of intervention components each time they visited a building principal.
- Three quarterly monitoring reviews were conducted (September, December, and March) to evaluate each school's level of implementation of each component of their chosen intervention model. Subsequent recommendations and corrective actions were issued and re-evaluated at the next monitoring period. All monitoring was evidence- or interview-based.
- A comprehensive review of all Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 SIG schools was conducted in May 2013. Evidence from quarters 1, 2, and 3 was evaluated to determine increases or decreases in compliance with intervention model components. A fiscal review of each school was also included to determine allowable use of funds and alignment with the approved grant narrative. Districts reported the use of external providers and each provider's contribution to academic achievement and/or intervention model components. Buildings reported quarterly progress toward becoming up to date on lagging indicators.
- Ohio partnered with an evaluation firm to perform an external evaluation of the implementation of SIG in Ohio and the relationship between SIG and achievement areas. The findings of the evaluation will be used to tailor the program for the next funding year (2013-2014).
- Surveys to districts and buildings were deployed that measured the use of external providers and the contributions made by Transformation Specialists.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your state in SY 2012-13 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

1. All students currently enrolled in a 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. With the implementation of Ohio's ESEA Flexibility Waiver (approved in May 2012), the requirements for Local Education Agencies to offer Public School Choice and collect the corresponding data were waived in 2012-2013. There are no data to report for Public School Choice for 2012-2013.	

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. With the implementation of Ohio's ESEA Flexibility Waiver (approved in May 2012), the requirements for Local Education Agencies to offer Public School Choice and collect the corresponding data were waived in 2012-2013. There are no data to report for Public School Choice for 2012-2013.

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. With the implementation of Ohio's ESEA Flexibility Waiver (approved in May 2012), the requirements for Local Education Agencies to offer Supplemental Educational Services and collect the corresponding data were waived in 2012-2013. There are no data to report for Supplemental Educational Services for 2012-2013.	

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. With the implementation of Ohio's ESEA Flexibility Waiver (approved in May 2012), the requirements for Local Education Agencies to offer Supplemental Educational Services and collect the corresponding data were waived in 2012-2013. There are no data to report for Supplemental Educational Services for 2012-2013.	

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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	518,737	513,715	99.03	5,022	0.97
All elementary classes	257,257	255,287	99.23	1,970	0.77
All secondary classes	261,480	258,428	98.83	3,052	1.17

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.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

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

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

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	62.10
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	13.90
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	3.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	20.10
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary school classes taught by teachers not properly certified

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)	40.20
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	32.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.10
Other (please explain in comment box below)	26.70
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Secondary school classes taught by teachers not properly certified

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	58,790	57,061	97.06
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	71,211	70,993	99.69
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	47,913	46,580	97.22
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	82,123	81,843	99.66

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	72.60	24.50
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantage	
Secondary schools	72.90	30.50
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantage	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other programs include Push-In ESL, Full English Immersion, in-class support, individual tutoring, inclusion summer program, and bilingual 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	45,269
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students 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.	43,149
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	11,541
Somali	2,721
Arabic	2,291
Chinese	864
Japanese	778

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	39,964
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,848
Total	41,812
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1) The student count reported for Question 1.6.3.1.1 (i.e., 39,964 tested + 1,848 untested = 41,812 total) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled in Ohio schools during the ELP assessment window. The student count reported for Question 1.6.2.1 (45,269) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled at any time during the 2012-2013 school year. There are a significant number of enrolled LEP students who move out of state before the ELP testing window (e.g., children of migrant families), or who enroll after the ELP window.</p> <p>2) Ohio reported 1,848 LEP students who were not tested on a State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment during the 2012-2013 school year. The reasons for these students not being tested are as follows:</p> <p>A) Reason(s) "Test Score Not Reported" as Reported in the Statewide Education Management Information System (EMIS):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Medical Reason - 20 students 2. Parent Refusal - 95 students 3. Student Refusal - 24 students 4. Suspension/Expulsion - 7 students 5. Truancy - 54 students 6. Other (e.g., Excused Absence, Incarceration) - 662 students 7. Test Invalidated - 3 students 8. Student Moved into/out of District Before or During Test Administration - 356 students <p>B) Other Reason(s) Not Specific to "Test Score Not Reported" Reason(s) Reported in the Statewide Education Management Information System (EMIS):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partial Test Reported (i.e., Missing One or More Subtests) - 2 students 2. OTELA Score and "Test Score Not Reported" Reason(s) Not Reported by District - 625 students <p>20 + 95 + 24 + 7 + 54 + 662 + 3 + 356 + 2 + 625 = 1,848 untested students.</p>	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	11,807
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	29.62
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.</p>	

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		38,296
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		1,700
Total		39,996
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1) The student count reported for Question 1.6.3.2.1 (i.e., 38,296 tested + 1,700 untested = 39,996 total) represents the total number of Title III LEP students enrolled in Ohio schools during the ELP assessment window. The student count reported for Question 1.6.2.2 (43,149) represents the total number of Title III LEP students enrolled at any time during the 2012-2013 school year. There are a significant number of enrolled Title III LEP students who move out of state before the ELP testing window (e.g., children of migrant families), or who enroll after the ELP window.</p> <p>2) Ohio reported 1,700 Title III LEP students who were not tested on a State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment during the 2012-2013 school year. The reasons for these students not being tested are as follows:</p> <p>A) Reason(s) "Test Score Not Reported" as Reported in the Statewide Education Management Information System (EMIS):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Medical Reason - 18 students 2. Parent Refusal - 85 students 3. Student Refusal - 8 students 4. Suspension/Expulsion - 7 students 5. Truancy - 51 students 6. Other (e.g., Excused Absence, Incarceration) - 635 students 7. Test Invalidated - 3 students 8. Student Moved into/out of District Before or During Test Administration - 322 students <p>B) Other Reason(s) Not Specific to "Test Score Not Reported" Reason(s) Reported in the Statewide Education Management Information System (EMIS):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partial Test Reported (i.e., Missing One or More Subtests) - 2 students 2. OTELA Score and "Test Score Not Reported" Reason(s) Not Reported by District - 569 students <p>18 + 85 + 8 + 7 + 51 + 635 + 3 + 322 + 2 + 569 = 1,700 untested students.</p>		

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

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.		9,984

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	18,783	66.34	23,782	84.00
Attained proficiency	11,340	29.61	11,106	29.00
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.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are no languages in which native language assessments are given for <i>ESEA</i> accountability determinations for Reading/Language Arts.

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2,903	2,888	5,791
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,210	S	90.2	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,215	S	95.0	S

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

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,016	S	78	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	307
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	49
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	78
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	185
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	219
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	36
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2011-12 and 2012-13)	91
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2012-13 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	91
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13)	44

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In each of the figures in Table 1.6.4.1, consortia members are counted as individual grantees. Consortia members are considered individual grantees solely for the purpose of AMAO calculations.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
11,801	3,638	27

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.	1,461
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	556

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	224
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	168
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	126
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	67
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	112
Other (Explain in comment box)	0

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	209	11,318
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	204	2,026
PD provided to principals	153	942
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	140	385
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	118	992
PD provided to community based organization personnel	31	533
Total	////////////////////////////////////	16,196

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other professional development topics include:

- Teacher orientation;
- Literacy Best Practices;
- SIOP-based methods for teaching language;
- Legal and Ethical Issues;
- Formative Instructional Practices; and
- Research Based Reading.

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	07/14/12	13
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafechoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and 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 automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	1,023	1,023
LEAs with subgrants	70	70
Total	1,093	1,093

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

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

The following questions collect data on homeless children and 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)	86	300
K	882	1,201
1	843	1,314
2	774	1,320
3	781	1,231
4	692	1,239
5	634	1,134
6	615	1,119
7	564	1,067
8	552	1,017
9	765	1,512
10	546	851
11	624	695
12	602	766
Ungraded	10	12
Total	8,970	14,778

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement assessments are given only in grades 5, 8, and 10.

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	851	3,798
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	7,350	10,324
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	179	146
Hotels/Motels	590	510
Total	8,970	14,778

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement assessments are given only in grades 5, 8, and 10.

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	705	764
Migratory children/youth	7	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,918	3,097
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	111	349

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and 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	1,446
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,291
K	1,673
1	1,628
2	1,572
3	1,421
4	1,432
5	1,363
6	1,330
7	1,304
8	1,235
9	1,658
10	1,095
11	905
12	948
Ungraded	236
Total	20,537

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,776
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,255
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	202

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

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and 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	591	443	1,020	604
4	528	410	1,010	651
5	488	299	935	434
6	468	340	898	510
7	418	300	858	445
8	403	316	787	493
High School	403	324	578	416

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	589	399	1,013	528
4	528	341	1,013	465
5	489	275	937	310
6	467	277	897	386
7	416	265	859	326
8	406	245	792	343
High School	403	273	571	338

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	488	256	934	289
6				
7				
8	405	201	789	226
High School	399	242	575	246

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science achievement assessments are given only in grades 5, 8, and 10.