

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
Parts I and II**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2006-07**

**HAWAII**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (*NCLB*) 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*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers.*
- 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 *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

**PART I**

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

**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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report          For          State Formula Grant Programs          under the          Elementary And Secondary Education Act          as amended by the          No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Hawaii		
Address: P.O. Box 2360 Honolulu, Hawaii 96804		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Cara Tanimura		
Telephone: (808) 586-3283		
Fax: (808) 586-3440		
e-mail: cara_tanimura@notes.k12.hi.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Cara Tanimura		
		<u>Monday, March 3, 2008, 4:02:49 PM</u>
_____ Signature		_____ Date

The Hawaii Department of Education received approval to submit our achievement and accountability data in February 2008 due to a scanning error on our spring 2007 Hawaii State Assessment.

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2006-07**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* 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**

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Hawaii - No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (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*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments made or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As Hawaii proceeds through the peer review process with the United States Department of Education, it was realized modifications and revisions were necessary to the present Hawaii State Alternate Assessment (HSAA) to fulfill the necessary requirements. Hawaii has begun the process of developing a new alternate assessment for reading and mathematics. The following timeline outlines our proposed time frame for implementation of a new operational alternate assessment aligned to state standards during the spring of 2010.

-September 2007 - developed a Hawaii State Alternate Assessment (HSAA) Advisory Committee and focus groups of technical advisers and internal and external stakeholders in Hawaii that provided feedback on issues related to providing access to the general education curriculum and develop a more meaningful and useful alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- September 2007 - assembled committee to review current participation criteria for the alternate assessment and revise using advice for the HSAA Advisory Committee so guidelines were clear when determining when a student's disability justified implementing the Hawaii State Alternate Assessment to measure academic performance.

- October 2007 - using previous alignment studies for the Hawaii State Alternate Assessment, diverse stakeholders reviewed the currently approved alternate performance indicators (API) adopted by the State Board of Education in 2006 to improve the alignment with the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards II

- January/February 2008 - develop a Request for Professional Services proposal for a contractor to develop and administer a new alternate assessment based on recommendations from Advisory Committee.

- February 2008 - develop new alternate performance indicators (API) aligned with the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards III.

- March/April 2008 - award and negotiate contract with new contractor and begin implementation

- April 2008 - begin development of field test items for reading and mathematics for the new alternate assessment.

- September 2008 - develop item rubrics for field test items in reading and mathematics.

- October/November 2008 - implement all reviews of new items for reading and mathematics to ensure fairness and bias free.

- November 2008/January 2009 - continue development of new items and fairness reviews for reading and mathematics

- February 2009 - develop criteria for the administration, scoring, analysis and reporting components for the new alternate assessment.

- March/April 2009 - administer field test forms of new reading and mathematics items.

- June/July 2009 - score administered field test items for reading and mathematics using scoring rules

- July 2009 - alignment study for field test items in reading and mathematics

- July 2009 - develop plan to address gaps identified in the alignment study.

- August 2009 - conduct item data and bias reviews to assure fairness of items for all subgroups.



- August 2009 - develop Performance Level Descriptors (PLD) for reading and mathematics items

- Spring 2010 - implementation of operational alternate assessment for reading and mathematics

Hawaii State Assessment (HSA) and Hawaii Alignment Portfolio Assessment (HAPA) "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

**1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts**

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Hawaii - No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

#### Hawaii State Assessment

The Hawaii Department of Education has developed a comprehensive science assessment which was administered as a field test in 2005. The Hawaii State Assessment (HSA) in Science was administered as an operational test to students in grades 5, 7 and 11 in October 2007 and data will be available in spring 2008. The HSA Science is comprehensive and assesses content knowledge across all the content standards as well as critical thinking strategies and skills. The HSA science also assesses the ability to perform on a standards based performance task which aligned to the appropriate grade level and content the student should have mastered. The performance task will allow the students to show the application of the standards and their understanding of the core science concepts being assessed.

A Standard Setting workshop will be conducted February 11-15, 2008 with individuals that represent the demographics of Hawaii groups. The purpose of the Standard Setting workshop will be to develop the performance levels for each test. A general description of the steps involved in this procedure are presented below:

- Introduction of standard setting process
- Review of science standards being assessed
- Review and discuss current proficiency descriptors for each proficiency level
- Reach consensus on the definition of proficient as measured by test
- Round 1 - individuals independently place marks in test booklets to indicate proficiency cut score
- Round 2 - Table teams make consensus decision about marks for the proficient level of performance
- Round 3 - Table teams make final decisions about marks for each of the proficiency levels for science
- Review and revise, if necessary, the descriptions associated with each of the proficiency levels

After the proficiency levels have been established through the Standard Setting process, test results will be produced in March/April 2008 with reports distributed to students and school sites in May 2008.

#### Hawaii State Alternate Assessment

By law, Hawaii was required to administer the Hawaii State Alternate Assessment beginning in 2007. The alternate assessment was administered for the first time in October/November 2007 to students with significant cognitive disabilities and eligible under the criteria established by Hawaii. With Hawaii proceeding through the peer review process with the United States Department of Education it has been determined that modifications and revisions were necessary to meet requirements. Thus, Hawaii has begun the process of developing a new alternate assessment for science as well as reading, mathematics with implementation for science set for fall 2009. The following timeline outlines our proposed implementation.

- September 2007 - developed a Hawaii State Alternate Assessment Advisory Committee of technical advisers and internal and externals stakeholders that would provide guidance and feedback on issues related to providing access to the general education curriculum for students with most significant cognitive disabilities in content area of science
- January/February 2008 - develop a Request for Professional Services proposal for a contractor to develop and administer a new alternate assessment for the content areas of reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.
- March/April 2008 - award and negotiate contract with contractor
- May 2008 - begin development of science items for alternate assessment

- July/August 2008 - conduct necessary review of items to assure fairness in the development of items.
- November/December 2008 - field test science items
- February 2009 - develop criteria for the scoring, analysis, and reporting components for the new science alternate assessment.
- June/July 2009 - alignment study for field test items for science as well as reading and mathematics. Develop a plan to address the gaps identified in the alignment study.
- July 2009 - develop Performance Level Descriptors (PLD) for science.
- Fall 2009 - first administration of the new Hawaii State Alternate Assessment.

Hawaii Alignment Portfolio Assessment (HAPA) "No revisions planned."

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Hawaii has adopted challenging standards, called the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards III, in science that meet the requirements of section 1111 (b) (1). The Hawaii Board of Education first adopted content standards in science in 1996. Since then the standards were revised in 2000 and again in 2005 as part of a standards based comprehensive reform effort. The Science Standards address all areas of science and correlate to the National Standards for Science and the American Academy for the Advancement of Science Project 2061. The Hawaii Content and Performance Standards in Science set forth minimum learning standards for all students at every grade level, kindergarten through eight, and for high school science courses. The Standards set reasonable targets and expectations for what teachers need to teach and what all students need to learn given aligned instruction, sufficient time, and intervention when necessary. The Standards are intended to set minimum expectations and be incorporated into a broader, locally designed curriculum.

Student performance on the Hawaii Content Standards in Science will be assessed through a statewide criterion referenced assessment directly linked to the Standards. Students will be assessed in grades 5, 7 and 11. The assessments are cumulative and evaluate the prior year's benchmarks inclusively. The initial administration of the HSA Science occurred in October 2007 and data will be available in Spring 2008.

Hawaii Content Performance Standards are available at <http://standardstoolkit.k12.hi.us/index.html>

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

### 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 *NCLB* 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 were tested in mathematics. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	93316	93023	99.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	526	523	99.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	74138	73937	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2152	2143	99.6
Hispanic	2801	2789	99.6
White, non-Hispanic	13699	13631	99.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10225	10184	99.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7498	7470	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	39593	39446	99.6
Migratory students	364	364	100.0
Male	48206	48038	99.6
Female	45110	44985	99.7
<b>Comments:</b> Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories for the state of Hawaii			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for 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 were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4471	44.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5350	52.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	321	3.2
Total	10142	
<b>Comments:</b> Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards are not available. As of this time, Hawaii does not assess Modified Achievement Standards.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 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 *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b># Students Enrolled</b>	<b># Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All students	93316	93084	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	526	525	99.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	74138	73973	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	2152	2135	99.2
Hispanic	2801	2790	99.6
White, non-Hispanic	13699	13661	99.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10225	10197	99.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7498	7475	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	39593	39469	99.7
Migratory students	364	364	100.0
Male	48206	48099	99.8
Female	45110	44985	99.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.



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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4694	46.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5120	50.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	324	3.2
Total	10138	
<b>Comments:</b> At this time, Hawaii does not assess Modified Achievement Standards.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

#### **1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* 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 were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient students (LEP)" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; and does not include monitored former LEP (MFLEP) 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 *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

**1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13556	6575	48.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	100	42	42.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	10730	5105	47.6
Black, non-Hispanic	347	124	35.7
Hispanic	413	162	39.2
White, non-Hispanic	1966	1142	58.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1262	171	13.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1520	405	26.6
Economically disadvantaged students	6025	2212	36.7
Migratory students	61	13	21.3
Male	6933	3192	46.0
Female	6623	3383	51.1
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13544	8298	61.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	101	56	55.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	10758	6429	59.8
Black, non-Hispanic	342	201	58.8
Hispanic	406	231	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	1937	1381	71.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1252	216	17.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1498	531	35.4
Economically disadvantaged students	5982	2987	49.9
Migratory students	62	27	43.5
Male	6944	3784	54.5
Female	6600	4514	68.4
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13350	6381	47.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	72	32	44.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	10397	4823	46.4
Black, non-Hispanic	328	125	38.1
Hispanic	475	157	33.1
White, non-Hispanic	2078	1244	59.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1364	154	11.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1220	237	19.4
Economically disadvantaged students	5877	2117	36.0
Migratory students	54	<N	
Male	6888	3122	45.3
Female	6462	3259	50.4
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13370	7217	54.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	72	38	52.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	10406	5383	51.7
Black, non-Hispanic	330	165	50.0
Hispanic	477	200	41.9
White, non-Hispanic	2085	1431	68.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1367	160	11.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1222	284	23.2
Economically disadvantaged students	5883	2469	42.0
Migratory students	54	12	22.2
Male	6900	3309	48.0
Female	6470	3908	60.4
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13688	5450	39.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	73	20	27.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	10807	4231	39.2
Black, non-Hispanic	295	85	28.8
Hispanic	410	130	31.7
White, non-Hispanic	2103	984	46.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1406	102	7.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1137	183	16.1
Economically disadvantaged students	5967	1680	28.2
Migratory students	56	<N	
Male	6975	2678	38.4
Female	6713	2772	41.3
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13687	8258	60.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	73	47	64.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	10808	6234	57.7
Black, non-Hispanic	293	179	61.1
Hispanic	410	236	57.6
White, non-Hispanic	2103	1562	74.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1401	192	13.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1138	246	21.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5967	2809	47.1
Migratory students	56	20	35.7
Male	6971	3794	54.4
Female	6716	4464	66.5
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13261	5187	39.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	71	18	25.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	10507	4049	38.5
Black, non-Hispanic	323	111	34.4
Hispanic	374	111	29.7
White, non-Hispanic	1986	898	45.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1449	92	6.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	892	124	13.9
Economically disadvantaged students	5697	1562	27.4
Migratory students	46	<N	
Male	6751	2480	36.7
Female	6510	2707	41.6
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.8 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13268	7359	55.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	72	36	50.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	10510	5547	52.8
Black, non-Hispanic	324	201	62.0
Hispanic	374	196	52.4
White, non-Hispanic	1988	1379	69.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1447	159	11.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	892	132	14.8
Economically disadvantaged students	5700	2370	41.6
Migratory students	46	<N	
Male	6756	3357	49.7
Female	6512	4002	61.5
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13154	4907	37.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	84	34	40.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	10587	3817	36.1
Black, non-Hispanic	299	92	30.8
Hispanic	399	117	29.3
White, non-Hispanic	1785	847	47.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1520	101	6.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	904	95	10.5
Economically disadvantaged students	5797	1469	25.3
Migratory students	49	<N	
Male	6817	2364	34.7
Female	6337	2543	40.1
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.10 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13180	8120	61.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	84	57	67.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	10605	6278	59.2
Black, non-Hispanic	297	185	62.3
Hispanic	397	247	62.2
White, non-Hispanic	1797	1353	75.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1526	222	14.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	905	185	20.4
Economically disadvantaged students	5807	2885	49.7
Migratory students	49	23	46.9
Male	6833	3686	53.9
Female	6347	4434	69.9
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13148	3371	25.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	66	<N	
Asian or Pacific Islander	10642	2670	25.1
Black, non-Hispanic	280	50	17.9
Hispanic	369	67	18.2
White, non-Hispanic	1791	576	32.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1578	51	3.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	831	60	7.2
Economically disadvantaged students	5521	911	16.5
Migratory students	51	<N	
Male	6858	1621	23.6
Female	6290	1750	27.8
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.12 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	13145	7910	60.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	67	44	65.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	10632	6153	57.9
Black, non-Hispanic	278	179	64.4
Hispanic	368	220	59.8
White, non-Hispanic	1800	1314	73.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1580	217	13.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	831	130	15.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5515	2665	48.3
Migratory students	51	18	35.3
Male	6864	3558	51.8
Female	6281	4352	69.3
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.



**1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	12904	3726	28.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	<N	
Asian or Pacific Islander	10383	2915	28.1
Black, non-Hispanic	255	54	21.2
Hispanic	334	67	20.1
White, non-Hispanic	1867	680	36.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1570	34	2.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	917	114	12.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4384	760	17.3
Migratory students	45	<N	
Male	6843	1957	28.6
Female	6061	1769	29.2
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.14 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School**

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	12912	8339	64.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	65	49	75.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	10389	6469	62.3
Black, non-Hispanic	254	178	70.1
Hispanic	338	188	55.6
White, non-Hispanic	1866	1455	78.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1570	274	17.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	916	181	19.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4393	2240	51.0
Migratory students	45	24	53.3
Male	6847	4022	58.7
Female	6065	4317	71.2
<b>Comments:</b> New test and content standards were developed for all grade levels for administration in 2006-2007 SY. Thus new proficiency levels were also established for all grade levels.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	282	184	65.2
Districts	1		
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. 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 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	193	118	61.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	167	102	61.1
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	26	16	61.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

**Note:** New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))<sup>1</sup>
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1\\_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Hawaii Department of Education has developed a Framework for School Improvement which outlines the NCLB requirements, sanctions, support services, reports, assessments, etc. for the different levels of accountability. For example, restructuring schools may select (1) conversion to a charter School or (2) state Takeover. Under the state takeover, the Complex Area Superintendents (CASs) determine one of two options based on a comprehensive assessment of the school: (1) comprehensive restructuring with the CAS as the Restructuring Provider or an external professional services provider or (2) an array of services coordinated by the CAS as the Restructuring Provider. Significant funding and technical assistance are provided to support the schools' improvement efforts.

Schools identified for school improvement, corrective action or restructuring may access any of the support provided by the State and Complex Area Teams.

Critical Ally Team (State Support)/Complex Area Team

Critical Ally Teams/Complex Area Teams (CATs) assist schools to critically assess and prioritize areas needing improvement (conduct comprehensive needs assessment ) and undertake systematic improvement. They are allies of schools because they provide a set of objective "eyes" for schools to look at themselves critically to determine and gauge the success of their efforts to raise student achievement and other indicators of school success.

The Critical Ally Team/Complex Area Team, under the direction of the Complex Area Superintendent (CAS), is made up of complex area members and may include State personnel as determined by the CAS, and is an important source of support to the schools.

Critical Ally Team/Complex Area Team Responsibilities:

• Uses the Report of Findings (a written report by the AYP Response Team) or assists the school to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment to analyze, clarify, and crystallize the problem(s). The Report of Findings is a written summary of the comprehensive needs assessment. The findings in this report target the root causes of the instructional and organizational problems that are critical for the school and complex to address in order to improve student achievement in a year's time.

• Assists in implementing corrective action measures outlined in the school's Academic and Financial Plan (AcFn)

• State personnel are also available to provide professional development, consultative or on-site services to complex area level and school level personnel in standards-based curriculum and instruction, assessment, content development, fiscal requirements and procedures, etc. These services may be requested by school administrators or complex area personnel via the Complex Area Superintendents.

Professional Services Provider (PSP):

A school may access a menu of professional services from Professional Services Providers to provide an array of services or comprehensive model.

The contract development are completed by the State for the Professional Services Providers; thereby, eliminating the schools to engage in the time-consuming process of writing and navigating a contract to approval.

Array of Services from Professional Services Providers

The Array of Services is a menu of professional services that are available through approved Professional Services Providers. These services for NCLB status schools are determined by the CAS, the agent of the State, in consultation with the Professional Services Provider and the principal of the school.

Each Professional Services Provider has been approved to provide services to schools in one or more of the following categories of school improvement:

1. School Leadership Development

2. Standards-based Education / Professional Development

3. Assessment System

4. Learning Environment

5. Family/Parent/Community Support.

Comprehensive Model by Professional Services Providers

Restructuring in Hawaii is a State takeover. The CAS may determine if a school needs a comprehensive approach to improve the quality of classroom instruction and increase student achievement. A comprehensive model includes all the categories for school improvement I- school leadership, assessment system, standards-based education/professional development, learning environment, and parent/family/community partnerships. A CAS or contracted Professional Services Provider is tasked to assist Restructuring schools by (1) focusing on targeted areas that impact the total learning environment, and (2) working on-site at the schools for the duration of the school year to develop and implement a customized plan of action.

AYP Response Team

The AYP Response Team, comprised of complex area and State personnel, is deployed to provide support to CASs and schools in this prioritized order: 1) Planning for Restructuring and 2) Corrective Action schools, 3) Restructuring Schools to update need assessment and 4) Schools in Improvement.

The AYP Response Team conducts on-site comprehensive needs assessment and completes a written report. The CAS, CAT, and school leadership utilize the findings to revise or develop their Strategic Plan and AcFn Plan.

Academic Coach Embedded in Schools:

Teachers receive assistance from veteran colleagues in dealing with difficulties that they have been experiencing in the classroom, thereby becoming more effective classroom teachers. These teachers are linked with the academic coach who will provide ongoing support through observations, feedback conferences, mentoring, modeling, and sharing of ideas and resources.

Leadership Mentors

In order to address this rising concerns for the principalship, the Leadership Mentor program is a powerful way to help leaders develop new insights into the profession, reduce isolation, help build a collegial network among professional colleagues, and assist in the principals' move from a level of survival to success in meeting Department expectations for school improvement.

All first year principals receive professional support during their first year on the job through the monthly New Principals Academy sessions, mentoring by a successful retired principal, and focus on a Leadership Growth Plan. Differentiated services are provided based on the AYP status of the school.

Veteran principals serving in a new assignment or in a challenging school context receive services from a Leadership Mentor.

School Turnaround Services:

The intent of School Turnaround services is to provide school improvement services and resources that will enable schools to increase student achievement. In addition, a secondary goal is to build the capacity of the Hawaii Department of Education by creating a core of specialists who have been trained to turn around schools and to provide school leadership and school improvement services.

School Leadership Development and Service:

School Turnaround: School Leadership Development and Service aims to assist principals improve academic achievement at low-performing schools. A senior Turnaround Specialist is assigned to each school to consult and provide guidance on strategic actions or enabling activities for school improvement. The Turnaround Specialist coaches the principals on developing their schools' learning communities and their ability to conduct research, collaborate, plan, and participate in decision-making. The program is designed to equip school leaders with strategies and focus to break the cycle of underperformance and improve academic results.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	31
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	31
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	31
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	49
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1\\_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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

In the space below, 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.

Not Applicable: Hawaii is an SEA/LEA.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.



**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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Implementing 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 SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b> Hawaii has a single educational system. It is an SEA/LEA and does not have districts.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	09/01/07	09/01/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	07/19/07	07/19/07
<b>Comments:</b> September 1, 2007 AYP results are Preliminary Final results due to scanning irregularities by our testing vendor.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 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 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	31	11
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	08/31/07
---	----------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds**

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Every school is required to annually submit an Academic and Financial Plan. This is a single document that addresses three Goals, which every school must address. Schools must plan and coordinate the funding aligned to implement the priority activities that best meet the needs of students to attain or sustain proficiency in all areas. The three Goals are:

- a. Improve Student Academic Achievement through Standards-Based Education
- b. Provide Comprehensive Support for All Students
- c. Continuously Improve Performance and Quality

For each goal, the school must select specific objectives and prioritize strategies to achieve the objective, based on a needs assessment of the school, and tied to measures of effectiveness and annual benchmarks.

- a. Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that are/is designed to build the capacity of school staff to improve the school and are/is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures. This strategy drives school improvement in Hawaii.
- b. Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement.
- c. Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

Although educational services are customized for each school, other technical assistance providers are included in the training sessions and meetings. Because schools need to access student achievement and other outcome related measures from the State system, technical staff and complex area specialists are frequently included in these sessions to enable communications and follow up support to build capacity at the local site.

These three School Improvement Strategies target the three Goals all schools must address in their School Academic and Financial Plan. The Plan further requires the school to present a rationale for the strategies identified in the Plan, and also requires that enabling activities be described, with initial and intermediate outcomes spelled out. It also requires that a timeline and the estimated amounts for expenditures be stated. The review and approval process for each school's Academic and Financial Plan will affirm that the Plan targets the priority needs of the school.

To support their interventions for school improvement all schools in status receive a range of assistance through a process whereby Complex Areas and schools can access resources and supports targeted to the needs of each school. Assistance can be both internal and external to the Department and is acquired through the Complex Area Superintendent, in collaboration with the State Superintendent and various offices of the Department. For example, schools can access services from educational consultants or other professional services providers with expertise in various components of school improvement. Schools can also get services from academic coaches, leadership mentors, and ultimately, turnaround specialists for restructuring schools.

Title I 1003(a) funds are allocated to Restructuring, Planning for Restructuring, and School Improvement Year 2 schools. For Restructuring schools, funds are provided to supplement the school's Title I allocation to cover the total cost of the restructuring plan as approved in the Academic and Financial Plan. Planning for Restructuring and Corrective Action schools receive \$25,000 and School Improvement Year 2 schools receive \$18,000 in addition to their Title I allocation. In all schools, 1003(a) funds are combined with Title I and other school funds to ensure that the school improvement activities as planned can be fully funded.

In restructuring schools, 1003(a) funds are used primarily to procure comprehensive restructuring services from educational services providers with a proven record of success in working with similar schools. Edison Alliance, America's Choice and Educational Testing Service (Focus on Standards) are the most widely contracted providers in Hawaii. All three providers have onsite staff based in Hawaii who work with schools. For example, training is provided to principals to enable them to become

turnaround agents in the school, through coaching and mentoring. School leadership teams are trained in formative student assessment using a formal student assessment program that provides regular feedback to teachers for instructional improvement purposes. Examples are the Edison Alliance Benchmark Assessment program and the ETS Instructional Development Management System (IDMS). In the area of curriculum and instructional support, these providers bring specialists in Reading, Math, Special Education and ELL to the schools. Teachers are provided with intensive training and follow up is consistent and regularly provided. One comprehensive provider has academic coaches (Reading and Math) at each of the schools it works with. All schools are also provided with training on the use and analysis of student assessment data based on regular student assessment administered monthly or at least quarterly. The impact on instruction is evident with intensive follow up for selected teaching staff that need further assistance.

In Planning for Restructuring and Corrective Action schools, 1003(a) funds are used to hire additional teaching personnel with specific expertise or to contract educational services providers who provide training in specific areas of need. Funds are also used to contract providers to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment of a school, which then becomes the baseline for the school improvement plan and activities. These funds supplement the total cost for all school improvement activities at the school.

Source – Manual input by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 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.

##### 1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	139
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	110
<b>Comments:</b> 139 Title I public schools' students were eligible for public school choice transfers to 110 public schools in NCLB "good standing" during SY2006-2007.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

##### 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 for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	89478
Who applied to transfer	559
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	559

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> Public School Choice data reflects student transfers for SY2006-07 only.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**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 in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 20323
<b>Comments:</b> \$20,323 was spend on student transportation for public school choice eligible students for SY2006-2007.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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 options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0
<b>Comments:</b> HIDOE is one SEA/LEA. HIDOE does not have LEAs that are unable to provide public school choice.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a 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.<sup>3</sup>
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	85
<b>Comments:</b> Data reflects number of schools who students received supplemental educational services from the 99 Title I School eligible to receive services.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

#### FAQ about supplemental education services

*How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"?* States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	37083
Who applied for supplemental educational services	6145
Who received supplemental educational services	4822
<b>Comments:</b> 6,145 supplemental educational services applications were received, but only 4,822 parent/students completed the SES agreement of services process and received free tutoring services.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3312634
<b>Comments:</b> 4,882 students received supplemental educational services and \$3,312,634.00 was spent for those tutoring services.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the *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 each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) 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. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	29064	18863	64.9	10201	35.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	1169	967	82.7	202	17.3
Low-poverty schools	1236	1107	89.6	129	10.4
All elementary schools	5240	4518	86.2	722	13.8
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	3034	1763	58.1	1271	41.9
Low-poverty schools	9067	5744	63.4	3323	36.6
All secondary schools	23824	14345	60.2	9479	39.8
<b>Comments:</b>					

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.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

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.

Elementary classes are counted such that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.
--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.



**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 percent 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. 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 were 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 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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

In the table 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.

	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
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	32.7
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	10.3
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	57.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	
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)	41.3
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	30.3
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	28.4
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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.

	<b>High-Poverty Schools</b> (more than what %)	<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b> (less than what %)
Elementary schools	47.0	29.4
Poverty metric used	Percentage of free, reduced and certified lunch qualified students.	
Secondary schools	57.4	29.6
Poverty metric used	Percentage of free, reduced and certified lunch qualified students.	
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.
- b. *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.

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs** (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

**Note:** Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program** = Type 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/expert/glossary.html>.
3. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
	Dual language			
	Two-way immersion			
	Transitional bilingual			
	Developmental bilingual			
	Heritage language			
9	Sheltered English instruction			
	Structured English immersion			
9	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
9	Content-based ESL			
9	Pull-out ESL			
9	Other (explain)			
<b>Comments:</b> Part-time teachers go into the classroom and assist the teacher and give language instructional support to the students.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	16854
<b>Comments:</b> LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group 648, category set A.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Ilokano	2908
Marshallese	1344
Tagalog	1234
Chuukese	1220
Spanish	944

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

**Comments:** Samoan (876), Japanese (648), Cantonese (605), Vietnamese (424), Korean (422), Tongan (395)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

#### 1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

##### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

##### Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

<b>ALL LEP Testing Status</b>	<b>#</b>
Tested/State annual ELP	10175
Not tested/State annual ELP	4761
Subtotal	14936
LEP/One Data Point	1918
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

**Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:**

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

<b>Title III LEP Testing Status</b>	<b>#</b>
Tested/State annual ELP	10175
Not tested/State annual ELP	4761
Subtotal	14936
LEP/One Data Point	1918
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results**

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

**1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs** (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.



**1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	84.0	8225	49.0	N
No progress		6816		
ELP attainment	0.0	0	0.0	Y
<b>Comments:</b> 0.0: The State did not have one ELP attainment target for 06-07. The Math and Reading/Language Arts figures are as follows: The Math target was 28% (994 students or 16%.) The Reading/Language Arts target was 44% (1424 students or 23%.) Students who made both Math and Reading/Language Arts numbered 680 or 11%. The State will have one ELP attainment target in 07-08.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

### 1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

#### Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress	84.0	8225	49.0	N
No progress		6816		
ELP attainment	0.0	0	0.0	Y
<b>Comments:</b> 0.0: The State did not have one ELP attainment target for 06-07. The Math and Reading/Language Arts figures are as follows: The Math target was 28% (994 students or 16%.) The Reading/Language Arts target was 44% (1424 students or 23%.) Students who made both Math and Reading/Language Arts numbered 680 or 11%. The State will have one ELP attainment target for 07-08.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

**1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results** (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

**1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility**

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP)** (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

**Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:****1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

**2. Total MFLEP =** State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	4320
MFLEP/AYP grades	3058
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades** (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

**Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:****1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	5433
LEP HS/Non-AYP	2528
LEP other grades	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language** (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

\* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given** (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given** (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results** (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

**Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results** (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

**Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored** (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

**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.

<b># Year One</b>	<b># Year Two</b>	<b>Total</b>
2267	2053	4320
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics** (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3022	1254	41.5	1768

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

**Comments:**

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts** (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
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.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2300	1616	70.3	684

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

**Comments:**

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.



**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** (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). 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. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

**Note:** Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) reserved funds for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	9
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	4
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	4
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	4
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments:</b> 00: The State does not have the mechanism in place to calculate the information yet. The State will put a mechanism in place for 07-08.	
000: The State has not required subgrantees to submit an improvement plan but will request one in 07-08.	
0000: The State is unable to answer this because the assessment began in 05-06. The State will have this information at the end of 08-09.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability** (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs** (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students** (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and 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 in 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 receive services in Title III LIEPs under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) ONLY.
- 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 LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) that have immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
2794	0	9

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

**Comments:** 00: In 06-07, the State allocated immigrant children and youth funds to its subgrantees as part of its subgrantee application under section 3111 and not in a separate process focused on significant increase. In 07-08, the State will make a separate allotment for immigrant children and youth.

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

**Note:** This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds** (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No Response</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>No Response</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

**Comments:**

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

#### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

**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 and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	0
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	0
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	0

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

**Comments:** 0: The State is not currently collecting this information. The State is in the process of reviewing and clarifying its requirements for ELL teachers for 07-08.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

\* 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 (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**  
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Professional Development Activity** = Subgrantee activities for professional development 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 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in PD activities.

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	9	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	9	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	9	
Other (Explain in comment box)	9	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	9	561
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	9	483
PD provided to principals	9	41
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	2	12
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	9	1603
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	3	343
Total		3043
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 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 in the format MM/DD/YY.

##### 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 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/06	2/20/07	167
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 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 State will send out the request for Title III program plans in the Spring of 2008 in anticipation of Title III funds release on July 1, 2008.
---

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

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

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> No schools identified as persistently dangerous.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	60.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	79.5
Black, non-Hispanic	77.3
Hispanic	75.8
White, non-Hispanic	78.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	73.8
Limited English proficient	81.6
Economically disadvantaged	77.0
Migratory students	66.7
Male	77.0
Female	81.4

**Comments:** Differences of more than 10% from last year data for American Indian or Alaskan Native, Limited English proficient and Migratory students have been checked and verified. These groups have relatively small population sizes.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
  - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
  - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
  - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.



### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4.6
Hispanic	6.8
White, non-Hispanic	5.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2.6
Limited English proficient	8.9
Economically disadvantaged	5.1
Migratory students	7.4
Male	5.2
Female	4.3
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

*What is a dropout?* A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	0	0
LEAs with subgrants	1	1
Total	1	1
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	58
K	0	82
1	0	77
2	0	76
3	0	67
4	0	57
5	0	64
6	0	53
7	0	55
8	0	49
9	0	66
10	0	50
11	0	54
12	0	30
Ungraded	0	294
Total	0	1132
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths**

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

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	0	718
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	0	144
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	0	267
Hotels/Motels	0	3
Total	0	1132
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	58
K	82
1	77
2	75
3	67
4	57
5	53
6	63
7	55
8	49
9	66
10	50
11	54
12	30
Ungraded	296
Total	1132

**Comments:**

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	10
Migratory children/youth	53
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	119
Limit English proficient students	170

**Comments:**

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	1
2. Expedited evaluations	1
3. Staff professional development and awareness	1
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	1
5. Transportation	1
6. Early childhood programs	1
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	1
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	1
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	1
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	1
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	1
12. Counseling	1
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	0
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	1
15. School supplies	1
16. Referral to other programs and services	1
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	1
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	1
2. School Selection	1
3. Transportation	1
4. School records	0
5. Immunizations	1
6. Other medical records	1
7. Other Barriers	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *NCLB* 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 *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	52	18
4	0	0
5	47	14
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	50	<N
High School	15	<N
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	52	<N
4	0	0
5	47	<N
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	50	<N
High School	15	<N
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS**

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

Please note that in submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

**FAQs on Child Count:**

*How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

*How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	65
K	47
1	43
2	46
3	37
4	38
5	49
6	33
7	39
8	34
9	40
10	47
11	31
12	29
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	<N
Total	
<b>Comments:</b> Data reflects the reporting period of September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.



**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease in numbers for Category 1 is due to several factors. When our recruiters went to requalify those families whose eligibility was expiring or going to expire, many of the families did not requalify because they were settling out into other jobs in the area that were not migrant eligible (e.g hotel industry). Another reason for the low numbers is the lack of recruiters in the area where we have a heavy concentration of migrant students. This problem is being addressed for the 2007-08 school year. Finally, what may be a significant reason for the change in the numbers is that the field that we are asked to draw our numbers from is September 1, 2006 - August 31, 2007. During the school year 2006-07, our schools all adopted the same master school year calendar. Hence, all the schools in the State of Hawaii began the new school year on July 27, 2006. This could affect the count of eligible students that we are reporting as some may be missed in this report.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	19
K	11
1	19
2	14
3	16
4	16
5	<N
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	12
10	<N
11	12
12	<N
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	139
<b>Comments:</b> The summer count is reported by the sites. Data is collected from the state At Risk Worksheet that each site completes annually.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A significant factor that all of our schools in our state experienced during the Summer 2007 school year is a shorter summer break due to Hawaii's movement to a single school year calendar for all schools. The summer break was shortened to six weeks rather than the normal eight weeks. This did not leave much time for schools to run a summer program across the state. If a summer program was runned it was more for enrichment purposes rather than assisting with academics.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Hawaii utilized appropriately coded historical data from the MIS2000 system to generate the 2006-2007 child count reports. The MIS2000 Snap report for table C-7 was used to compile the category 1 and category 2 child count. MIS2000 was also used to check for duplicates by matching data elements and adjustments were made. Over-age students and those turning 3 years of age were similarly flagged via the system. All two year-olds turning 3 years of age during the count dates were moved up and included in the 3-21 year age range for count purposes. Category 2 counts were verified through documentation provided through enrollment lists, attendance rosters, etc. Periodic checks of status reports were conducted to determine accuracy of coded information. In addition, Hawaii's state-wide student information VAX system was used to verify enrollment, withdrawal, and demographic data. A special team of trained in the identification and recruitment process in our state verified residency during the count period and documented new qualifying moves by completing a new COE. In addition, Hawaii requires recruiters to contact migrant families annually, at minimum, and to record contact information/status in the appropriate section of the COE. All changes and new information is entered into the MIS2000 system throughout the year prior to generating the child count reports. A thorough manual review of child count lists is conducted by program staff prior to submittal to this report.

Hawaii utilized the MIS2000 system to manage the state's data and to generate its 2005-2006 child count report. MIS2000 was used to check for duplicates and a total count. Hence, the same system for both reporting periods.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data inputted in the MIS2000 database system reflects the information documented on the state approved Hawaii Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form. The data collected included: Parent and Child Data (name, date of birth, gender, race, place of birth, parent's or guardian's names, physical and/or mailing address, student identification number); Eligibility Data (QAD, residency date, termination date, withdrawal date, qualifying activity, where the family moved to and from); School Information (enrollment date, withdrawal date, enrollment type (regular/summer), grade, name of facility); Other (worker's name, whether the child moved with, to join, or on his or her own, type of work, i.e. seasonal, temporary, or fishing related, interviewer's name, who the information was obtained from, assurance that parents were informed of the Family Rights and Privacy Act, interviewer's signature, reviewer's initials, date interview was conducted, SEA certification).

During the 2006-2007 count period, MEP staff, recruiters, and special ID&R team made telephone or personal face-to-face contact with families to verify information, determine continued eligibility, and to validate new qualifying moves. All data on new qualifying moves was documented on state-approved COEs. In addition, recruiters, MEP staff, and ID&R team verified residency dates, enrollment/withdrawal dates for the school year, summer enrollment/withdrawal dates, and supplemental services provided to students. Recruiters, MEP staff, and ID&R team also contacted school clerks and registrars for status updates on previously qualified students and to obtain lists of newly-arrived potential eligibles for follow-up. Churches, farms, agricultural businesses, co-ops, farm labor contractors, university extension personnel, applicable state agencies, human resources leaders and community organizations were also contacted for referrals.

Hawaii recruiters meet with the MEP Director semiannually to review eligibility criteria and eligibility lists. Individual recruiters met with the director in between meeting dates on a at needs basis. Data updated into the MIS2000 on a regular basis by the MEP secretary who manages the data base. Recruiters are provided with a list of all eligible students in the State to assist them in their recruitment efforts. All families with soon to expire QAD dates are contacted to determine if a new qualifying move has occurred. In addition, Hawaii added another field to the MIS2000 record system to include the name of the recruiter for each COE for quick and easy reference. This has significantly improved efficiency whenever questions have arisen that required recruiter verification or input.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All information was recorded on the state COE form where recruiters also noted questions and explanation regarding eligibility in the comment section. Recruiters signed the COEs and the original and triplicate NCR copies were forwarded to the SEA. Upon receipt, the SEA reviewed the COE, verified information contained by comparing it to the State VAX system, and certified eligibility by signing them. The original white copy of the COE was retained by the SEA for their files and the triplicate NCR copies forwarded back to the recruiters for their files.

Throughout the year and before the end of the school year, recruiters made contact with their families and recorded status information in the appropriate section of the NCR copies of the COE, noting contact date, eligibility status and initialed them. They then forwarded the first NCR copy to the SEA with changes and status noted. This copy was added to the SEA original file. If a change in status required a new COE, this information was noted on the NCR copy and a new COE was completed and forwarded with it. The process was repeated each year throughout the three-year eligibility period until the original and three copies were on file at the SEA or until a new COE was generated for a new qualifying move.

The SEA secretary, who serves as data records clerk, inputted all COE information and student participation in regular and summer term into the MIS2000 database system, enabling her to maintain the system and generate all necessary reports.

The resource teacher or records data clerk reviewed the COEs which were forwarded to the state director for final review and signature. This final signature certified eligibility. In the absence of the state director, the state Migrant Education Even Start (MEES) resource teacher has authority to certify student for eligibility.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Hawaii developed an excel spreadsheet with drop down menus that is forwarded electronically to all schools to report MEP-funded services students received during the regular school year and summer terms. These are returned to the SEA electronically where a master spreadsheet is maintained for use in preparing child count and consolidated performance reports as well as a basis for data collection for input into the MIS2000 system.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MIS2000 is a unique database system with built-in features that assure that a child is counted only once. To comply with those features, a meticulous effort is made to code each child appropriately as per the COE information, verifying enrollment, withdrawal and other demographic data with our statewide student information VAX system data so that the system can generate accurate child count reports that meet the four (4) criteria mentioned above. The SEA migrant secretary is the only individual permitted to input data into the system ensuring that data is inputted and coded accurately and consistently. Each student is coded in either the regular "R" or summer "S" enrollment type.

The SEA migrant secretary maintains direct communication with MIS 2000 staff that created special reports assuring that only the students meeting the criteria for the child count reports are included.

A C7 12-Month List report generates lists of students between ages 3-21, who are within 3 years of their QAD, and who had a Residency, QAD, Withdraw date, Enroll date, or Term date during the date range requested of 09/01/2006 and 08/31/2007, and have a regular "R" enroll type.

A C7 Summer List report was also created that generates a list of students with the same criteria as the 12 month list but who were coded with summer "S" enroll type and who were coded with a supplemental service provided to them (e.g., summer school, preschool, etc.)

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Hawaii developed an excel spreadsheet with drop down menus that is forwarded electronically to all schools to report MEP-funded services students received during the regular school year and summer terms. These are returned to the SEA electronically where a master spreadsheet is maintained for use in preparing child count and consolidated performance reports as well as a basis for data collection for input into the MIS2000 system.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Hawaii has a state COE approval process to ensure that only eligible children are entered into the MIS2000 database system. A standard COE is used statewide. The first quality control measure is to ensure that all recruiters participate in a comprehensive recruiter-training program. A recruiter must have at least 20 hours of training prior to being certified as a Hawaii migrant recruiter. Recruiters receive annual eight-hour review sessions before the start of the new school year to review basic eligibility criterion. The SEA also meets with recruiters semiannually to allow recruiters to review eligibility criteria to strengthen their recruitment skills, and to network and share new information and ideas.

The State COE approval process has several steps to ensure the eligibility of migrant children identified and included in the annual count:

1. The recruiter completes and signs a state approved COE form after a face-to-face or telephone interview including all the information requested on the form; as well as any additional comments that may assist in determining eligibility.
2. The recruiter submits the original and triplicate NCR COE signed forms to the SEA records clerk who checks that all the necessary information is present.
3. If there are questionable areas or additional information needed to determine eligibility, the records clerk returns the COE to the recruiter.
4. The recruiter obtains the necessary information and re-submits the COE form.
5. The records clerk verifies the demographic information through the state informational VAX system and then forwards the COE to the resource teacher and program director for final approval and signatures.
6. The records clerk enters the information in the MIS2000 database system.
7. Three signed copies of the COE are forwarded to the recruiter for his or her files.
8. The records clerk files the original copy of the COE in the SEA file.
9. The same process is followed as new qualifying move dates are entered.
10. The SEA Director is the final authority for resolving eligibility issues at the local and state level.

Hawaii also incorporated a checklist targeting key eligibility criteria that must be completed by the recruiter and attached to each new COE. Recruiters review and update checklist information whenever parent contact is made throughout the year. Copies of checklists are forwarded to the SEA and placed in the COE file after review and verification by the SEA.

Even though these quality control procedures have several checks and balances and involve several different people, the SEA provides a final check by selecting a random sample of COEs to verify information and documentation. Information received from the random sampling serves as a basis for future procedural revisions. A record of all quality improvement actions are maintained at the SEA. Identification and recruitment practices of individual recruiters are monitored regularly and all inputted information is reviewed on a regular basis. Whenever questions or discrepancies are noted, the SEA follows up by contacting families for verification.

For summer/intercession projects, the SEA reviews student attendance records and makes on-site visits to selected projects. The SEA also randomly selects a family for re-interview by telephone or personal visit for quality control.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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



of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A reinterviewing process was not done during this reporting period. However, a recertification was done for those families whose COE recently expired or was going to expire by the end of the school year. A list of those families who met this criterion was generated from the MIS2000 system. A trained ID&R team took the list, divided it by areas of responsibility, and followed up with each family. 636 families were contacted for recertification. 119 families were found to have made a qualifying move in the last two years and thus retained their eligibility status.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For accuracy of child count data, periodic status reports are generated from the MIS2000 system. SEA staff reviews the information to check for accuracy, verify QAD, and qualifying move dates by comparing the information with COE records on file. Additionally, SEA staff checks to determine if services students received were appropriately coded.

All necessary updates in family and student data were inputted into the MIS2000 system. The completed C7 Snap Report, incorporated by MIS2000, was used to generate the 2006-2007 child count reports for both the Category 1 and Category 2.

Quality checks provide the basis for auditing child count records and data for accuracy. In addition, the Hawaii COE includes a section requiring documentation of annual contacts with families to review eligibility status.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

SEA staff met with recruiters in late September to review child count information and provide them with status reports that included anniversary dates of all children assigned to their complexes. Recruiters, MEP Staff, and ID&R team contacted families for another personal interview to verify student and eligibility information. If the child was not in school, the recruiter/MEP Staff/ID&R team verified that the child was a resident and present in the State during the child count period. Updates were forwarded to the records clerk for system input. As a final check the SEA does a thorough manual review of child count data prior to submittal of the child count report to OME to ensure that the data submitted is accurate.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Based on the recertification process that was done during the 2006-07 school year, a ID&R training plan was developed for the 2007-08 school year. An integral piece of this plan was the hiring of more recruiters for those areas that had a high population of migrant families settling in that area. In addition to this, was to assign a recruiter to each complex of schools so that they became a contact point for our schools. Monthly meetings with the MEP staff at the school level has helped to facilitate an awareness of the ID&R process so that the school level personnel can assist the recruiters in identifying those families in need of migrant services. There should be a significant increase in the number of eligible families for the 2007-08 child count report.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No concern in the accuracy of the reported child count. The numbers reported are as accurate as stated.

As stated earlier in this report, the decrease in numbers for Category 1 is due to several factors. When our recruiters went to requalify those families whose eligibility was expiring or going to expire, many of the families did not requalify because they were settling out into other jobs in the area that were not migrant eligible (e.g hotel industry). Another reason for the low numbers is the lack of recruiters in the area where we have a heavy concentration of migrant students. This problem is being addressed for the 2007-08 school year. Finally, what may be a significant reason for the change in the numbers is that the field that we are asked to draw our numbers from is September 1, 2006 - August 31, 2007. During the school year 2006-07, our schools all adopted the same master school year calendar. Hence, all the schools in the State of Hawaii began the new school year on July 27, 2006. This could affect the count of eligible students that we are reporting as some may be missed in this report.

The Category 2 data is preliminary as we are still awaiting some of the data from the summer school programs as all have not been turned in at the time of this report. A significant factor that all of our schools in our state experienced during the Summer 2007 school year is a shorter summer break due to Hawaii's movement to a single school year calendar for all schools. The summer break was shortened to six weeks rather than the normal eight weeks. This did not leave much time for schools to run a summer program across the state. If a summer program was runned it was more for enrichment purposes rather than assisting with academics.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.