

**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**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**



**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: Office of the State Sup. of Edu., Office of Federa		
Address: 51 N Street, NE - Lower Level Washington, DC 20002		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Dr. Cynthia Bell		
Telephone: 202-442-5570		
Fax: 202-442-5534		
e-mail: cynthia.bell@dc.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Cynthia Bell, Executive Director, Office of the State Sup. of Edu., Office of Federal Grants Programs		
		<u>Friday, March 7, 2008, 3:25:10 PM</u>
_____ Signature		_____ Date

**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.

The District of Columbia public schools developed comprehensive and rigorous science standards for grades PreK- 12. The science standards were modeled after Indiana's state science standards, which received an "A" on their science standards as judged by the Fordham Foundation. The science standards are organized around three domains at the elementary level - earth, life, and physical science; linked by scientific inquiry and at the secondary level - biology, chemistry, physics, earth science, and environmental science. The newly revised science standards were approved by the Board of Education on April 21, 2006 and implementation began in the fall of 2006.

Upon the adoption of the new science standards and materials, all professional development training focuses on the standards and how the materials support the teaching of those concepts and skills. Workshops are conducted on a state-wide level, as well as in individual schools, including the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS), Charter Schools and private schools.

Now that the new science standards have been in effect for a year and a half, working groups at the elementary, middle and high school grade bands have met to review the standards for quality and effectiveness of the approved standards and to make sure that they are as challenging as possible. Recommendations for revisions are being collected and will be distributed for review across the state's schools. Any revisions to the standards will be submitted for approval by the District of Columbia State Board of Education (SBOE).

Governmental, non-governmental, and non-profit organizations have been reconnoitered and coordinated to bring to bear the excellent resources found in the District of Columbia. One such organization is the DC STEM ALLiance, a group involved in the development of teacher workshops, programs for students, and materials that are correlated to the DC Science standards to further strengthen the teaching of the standards.

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.

No revisions will be made to the DC CAS assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics in SY 2007-2008.

The District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS) for English/language arts and mathematics was implemented in spring 2006 for students at grades 3-8 and 10. The standard setting was conducted July 17-21, 2006 and the resulting academic achievement scores were presented to the state Board of Education and approved on July 27, 2006. The full standards setting report is available upon request. The external alignment study for the DC CAS was conducted in May 2007.

DCPS in collaboration with ILSSA developed the DC CAS Alternate Assessment which is portfolio system. DC revised the DC CAS Alt in SY 2006-2007 to incorporate NCLB requirements. These changes emphasized a more structured system that links to grade level content standards, identifies specific standards by grade and content area from which schools may select target skills for instruction and increased the number of academic entries measured while decreasing the number of program dimensions measured. Specifically, student portfolio entries had 3 entries per reading and 3 entries per mathematics as opposed to 1 entry for reading and math on the old system. The number of program dimensions switched from 4 to 1 (supports) and the focus was on the quality of the support rather than just the presence of a support. An additional change added a third dimension to the scoring rubric to address the alignment between the depth of the knowledge of the entries to the essence of the grade level standard. The state convened a committee of practitioners to review and make recommendations about these changes on October 19th. DC public school, public charter school and participants from the special education private schools were invited to attend. On October 26, ILSSA presented the changes and focus group feedback to the TAC. On November 24th and 25th DCPS assessment administrators and ILSSA participated in a seminar sponsored by the National Alternate Assessment Center. This seminar helped to clarify further, issues of required change under NCLB and concerns around the documentation technical quality of alternate assessments. Based on the feedback acquired through these three activities, DCPS and ILSSA refined the new alternate assessment teacher manual, resource documents and new rubrics. Citywide training for teachers consisted of one full day of training. Two technical support sessions for teachers occurred in January and March. A pre-scoring institute was conducted in March. The portfolios were scored in April. The external alignment study was conducted in May and the standard setting was conducted in June. The alternate achievement scores and performance descriptors were

presented to the State Board of Education members in July for initial approval and were presented to the full State Board of Education in October 2007.

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.

No changes will be made to the academic achievement standards in reading and mathematics for the DC CAS in SY 2007-2008.

The DC CAS-Alt alternate achievement standards were established in 2007 through a formal standard setting procedure. (Standard setting report is available upon request.) Teams of special and general educators participated in the process. Alternate achievement scores were determined and performance descriptors were written during these activities. The scores and descriptors were presented to the State Board of Education members in July for initial approval and were again presented to the full State Board of Education in October for approval and acceptance.

No changes will be made to the DC CAS -Alt academic achievement standards for reading and mathematics in SY2007-2008

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.

In 2006 and early 2007, a DC CAS Science Assessment Task Force was convened to make recommendations about the science assessment design and specifications. In addition to DEAA staff and the Director of Science, the task force was comprised of educators and administrators from DC Public Schools and the public charter schools, Bilingual Education, Division of Special Education and a representative from the Center for Excellence in Education.

The DC CAS Science Task Force provided recommendations about the following:

1) Identify the grade levels to be measure.

Grades 5, 8, and Biology were the identified grade levels in three grade bands (elementary, middle and high school) to be assessed under NCLB. The Task Force decided that Grade 3 would be measured informally or through DC BAS to provide student data for informing science instruction.

2) Identify the content standards to be measured.

The reporting categories will in general use the science content strand designation.

3) Identify reporting categories for the science assessment.

The format should include both multiple choice and some constructed response questions.

4) Determine the number of items that should be used to measure each strand.

The tests will include both field test and operational items.

5) Recommend item format.

Test length will vary according to grade level, but should contain a minimum of six (6) questions per reporting category.

The DC CAS Science assessments were field tested in spring 2007 at grades 5, 8, and Biology, covering the elementary, middle school and high school grade bands.

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.

Students will take the DC CAS in Science the spring of 2008 in grades 5, 8, and Biology (those students currently enrolled). A formal standard setting will be conducted to develop the achievement standards in July 2008. The achievement standards will be presented to the state Board of Education for approval in July 2008. Entry points within the science standards were identified for the development of an alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Science assessment development timeline:

• Development of Science Assessments

• Process Tracking Timeline/System Activity Due Date

• Complete Science Standards May 2006

• Adoption of Science Standards by BOE June 2006

• Complete Procurement July 2006 - Office of Contracts and Acquisitions agreed

• to permit the state to modify the CTB test development contract to include science

• Kickoff Meeting with SEA Science Specialists September 14, 2006

• Finalize grades and subjects September 25, 2006

• Complete specifications for development of science test October 2006

• Present recommendation to BOE - e.g., grades 5, 8, and biology December 2006

• Item development/selection meetings December/January 2006

• First draft - booklets and answer document (science) January 2007

• First draft - science test coordinator's manual February 2007

• Blue line copies - booklet, manual, and answer document February 2007

• Field test DC CAS in Science May 2007

• Item selection/development workshops - science June-July 2007

• Operational Administration - DC CAS in Science April-May 2008

• Draft Science descriptors June 2007

• Formal Standard Setting with development of achievement standards and State Board of Education approval July 2008

• Science reports available September 2008

• Technical reports for DC CAS in Science on or before December 2008

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.



### 1.2.1 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	35207	33645	95.6
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	469	456	97.2
Black, non-Hispanic	30081	28685	95.4
Hispanic	3086	2968	96.2
White, non-Hispanic	1571	1536	97.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6867	6210	90.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2095	2037	97.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22254	21472	96.5
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	17704	16771	94.7
Female	17503	16874	96.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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	5713	91.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	504	8.1
Total	6217	
<b>Comments:</b> Data reported as collected.		

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.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	35207	33667	95.6
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander	469	435	92.8
Black, non-Hispanic	30081	28804	95.8
Hispanic	3086	2901	94.0
White, non-Hispanic	1571	1527	97.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6867	6263	91.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2095	1922	91.7
Economically disadvantaged students	22254	21498	96.6
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	17704	16802	94.9
Female	17503	16865	96.4
<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	5766	92.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	504	8.0
Total	6270	
<b>Comments:</b> The data are reported as we have it in our records.		

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	1467	432	29.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	62	33	53.2
Black, non-Hispanic	971	202	20.8
Hispanic	169	41	24.3
White, non-Hispanic	265	156	58.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	106	27	25.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	155	41	26.5
Economically disadvantaged students	766	153	20.0
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	730	221	30.3
Female	737	211	28.6

**Comments:** No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

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	2063	186	9.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	65	<N	
Black, non-Hispanic	1509	89	5.9
Hispanic	199	19	9.5
White, non-Hispanic	290	70	24.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	178	31	17.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	181	11	6.1
Economically disadvantaged students	1138	60	5.3
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	953	83	8.7
Female	1110	103	9.3

**Comments:** No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

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	1665	275	16.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	40	15	37.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1201	138	11.5
Hispanic	191	21	11.0
White, non-Hispanic	233	101	43.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	100	18	18.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	134	19	14.2
Economically disadvantaged students	905	96	10.6
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	811	141	17.4
Female	854	134	15.7

**Comments:** No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

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	1772	227	12.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	38	<N	
Black, non-Hispanic	1289	116	9.0
Hispanic	200	19	9.5
White, non-Hispanic	245	86	35.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	147	28	19.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	125	<N	
Economically disadvantaged students	962	76	7.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	832	90	10.8
Female	940	137	14.6

**Comments:** No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

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	1444	270	18.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	45	14	31.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1027	133	13.0
Hispanic	164	29	17.7
White, non-Hispanic	208	94	45.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	73	16	21.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	63	<N	
Economically disadvantaged students	778	97	12.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	712	138	19.4
Female	732	132	18.0

**Comments:** A new testing and scoring system was introduced to the students this year.

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	1832	261	14.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	45	15	33.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1382	138	10.0
Hispanic	186	23	12.4
White, non-Hispanic	219	85	38.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	138	21	15.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	61	<N	
Economically disadvantaged students	1034	87	8.4
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	819	89	10.9
Female	1013	172	17.0

**Comments:** A new testing and scoring system was introduced to the students this year.

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	1548	324	20.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	52	30	57.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1161	174	15.0
Hispanic	167	31	18.6
White, non-Hispanic	168	89	53.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	93	17	18.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	56	<N	
Economically disadvantaged students	860	131	15.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	718	135	18.8
Female	830	189	22.8

**Comments:** A new testing and scoring system was introduced to the students this year.

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.

**1.3.8 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	2058	214	10.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	45	10	22.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1634	102	6.2
Hispanic	198	19	9.6
White, non-Hispanic	181	83	45.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	187	18	9.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	54	<N	
Economically disadvantaged students	1194	63	5.3
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	891	83	9.3
Female	1167	131	11.2

**Comments:** A new testing and scoring system was introduced to the students this year.

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.

**1.3.9 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	1686	203	12.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	29	10	34.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1379	111	8.0
Hispanic	129	12	9.3
White, non-Hispanic	149	70	47.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	129	17	13.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	44	<N	
Economically disadvantaged students	946	69	7.3
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	785	105	13.4
Female	901	98	10.9

**Comments:** A new testing and scoring system was introduced to the students this year.

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.

**1.3.10 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	1795	305	17.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	30	12	40.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1484	199	13.4
Hispanic	130	17	13.1
White, non-Hispanic	151	77	51.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	135	23	17.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32	<N	
Economically disadvantaged students	1004	113	11.3
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	737	115	15.6
Female	1058	190	18.0

**Comments:** A new testing and scoring system was introduced to the students this year.

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.

**1.3.11 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	1721	243	14.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	40	11	27.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1397	144	10.3
Hispanic	165	17	10.3
White, non-Hispanic	119	71	59.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	133	21	15.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	49	<N	
Economically disadvantaged students	959	91	9.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	814	129	15.8
Female	907	114	12.6

**Comments:** A new testing and scoring system was introduced to the students this year.

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.

**1.3.12 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	1665	281	16.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	29	<N	
Black, non-Hispanic	1364	179	13.1
Hispanic	152	21	13.8
White, non-Hispanic	120	79	65.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	138	19	13.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	30	<N	
Economically disadvantaged students	897	90	10.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	709	121	17.1
Female	956	160	16.7

**Comments:** A new testing and scoring system was introduced to the students this year.

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.

**1.3.13 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	1344	197	14.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	46	13	28.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1046	97	9.3
Hispanic	122	15	12.3
White, non-Hispanic	130	72	55.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	66	11	16.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	46	<N	
Economically disadvantaged students	613	66	10.8
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	594	93	15.7
Female	750	104	13.9

**Comments:** A new testing and scoring system was introduced to the students this year.

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.

**1.3.14 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	1483	268	18.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	31	<N	
Black, non-Hispanic	1183	162	13.7
Hispanic	133	22	16.5
White, non-Hispanic	136	75	55.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	81	17	21.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25	<N	
Economically disadvantaged students	669	76	11.4
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	595	90	15.1
Female	888	178	20.0

**Comments:** A new testing and scoring system was introduced to the students this year.

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.



**1.4 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	122	30	24.6
Districts	19	3	15.8
<b>Comments:</b> Some public schools in the District of Columbia were closed during SY 2006-2007.			

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	108	19	17.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	107	19	17.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1		
<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
19	3	15.8
<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.

We did not have state system of support in SY 2006 - 2007 we were in the process of developing one. A committee met and developed a State System of Support plan that was submitted to the United States Department of Education in July 2007.
--

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	0
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

**1.4.4.4 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)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

## 1.4.5 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.

We did not have state system of support in SY 2006 - 2007 we were in the process of developing one. A committee met and developed a State System of Support plan that was submitted to the United States Department of Education in July 2007.
--

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	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

#### 1.4.6 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)	08/01/07	08/01/07
<b>Comments:</b> Although memo says that principals have only until August 8, 2007, by law we must give 30 days. Operationally, schools can (and do) appeal at any time, even years later		

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	2	2
Schools	11	2

**Comments:** We define appeals as questions only about the accuracy of the data. We do not include questions, for example, about apparent contradictions between the formative and summative results, questions about definitions of AYP targets, questions about who is a 10th grader, etcetera.

Based on this definition, the number of appeals is 11 and there were 2 determinations in favor of the schools. In the first, the determination was that the school should not be defined as a secondary school and, therefore, is no longer accountable for attendance (IDEA PCS). The school's overall status did not change, however; only the status for attendance changed.

In the second case, the appeal was in regard to the number of students in a subgroup and the safe harbor calculation from 3 years ago. While this was a policy interpretation, rather than an accuracy determination, the state agreed with the school and changed the AYP status of the school (Kamit Institute for Magnificent Achievers PCS or KIMA).

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	09/02/07
---	----------

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.

\*Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools:

For SY 2006-2007, section 1003(a) of ESEA funds were allocated to all schools that were identified as in need of improvement. There were no other priorities established by the state.

\*Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.):

For SY 2006-2007, section 1003(a) of ESEA funds were distributed equally. All schools identified as in need of improvement received \$50,000.00.

\*Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds:

School Improvement activities being done by schools that have been identified for improvement and received school improvement funds under Section 1003(a) include: use of coaches, turnaround specialists or other facilitators to work with principals and teachers; professional development for principals and teachers; reorganization of curriculum or instructional time; tutorial services or other targeted instruction for low-achieving students; new curricular materials or other supplies.

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	38
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	0
<b>Comments:</b> We do not have any data collected for question #2 "Public Schools to which students transferred for public school choice".	

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	37756
Who applied to transfer	241
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	241

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>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2010077
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	136
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	33734
Who applied for supplemental educational services	3926
Who received supplemental educational services	3926
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	\$ 7527451
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	12492	7067	56.6	5425	43.4
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	848	645	76.1	203	23.9
Low-poverty schools	686	472	68.8	214	31.2
All elementary schools	2374	1751	73.8	623	26.2
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	1141	635	55.7	506	44.3
Low-poverty schools	4853	2773	57.1	2080	42.9
All secondary schools	10118	5316	52.5	4802	47.5
<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.

The District of Columbia counts elementary classes so 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.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	10.5
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.1
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	89.3
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	0.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	24.5
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	75.3
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	83.7	62.7
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	85.4	63.7
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch.	
<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:**

- # 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.)**)
- 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>.
- Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
- % 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).
- 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
2	Dual language	Spanish	50.0	50.0
	Two-way immersion			
1	Transitional bilingual	Spanish	10.0	90.0
	Developmental bilingual			
	Heritage language			
	Sheltered English instruction			
	Structured English immersion			
	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
3	Content-based ESL			
3	Pull-out ESL			
	Other (explain)			
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

**1.6.2 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.

	<b>#</b>
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	4717
<b>Comments:</b>	

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
Spanish	3567
Amharic	154
Chinese	147
French	114
Vietnamese	109

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

<b>Comments:</b>
------------------

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	5176
Not tested/State annual ELP	273
Subtotal	5449
LEP/One Data Point	1657
<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	4751
Not tested/State annual ELP	273
Subtotal	5024
LEP/One Data Point	1493
<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	50.0	1180	41.0	N
No progress		1678		
ELP attainment	33.0	237	33.0	Y
<b>Comments:</b>				

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				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
<b>Comments:</b>				

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>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.



**1.6.3.4.3 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	587
MFLEP/AYP grades	434
<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	1828
LEP HS/Non-AYP	853
LEP other grades	154
<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.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
203	384	587
<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
407	245	60.2	162

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
406	273	67.2	133

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	3
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	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	1
<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.

**1.6.4.2 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:**

- 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.
- 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.
- 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
791	76	1

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

**Comments:**

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</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>No</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.	123
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.	123
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:** Total number of LEP students enrolled in schools in the State has been on a declining trend

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.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	3	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	3	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	3	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	3	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	3	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	3	500
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	3	300
PD provided to principals	3	210
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	3	250
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	3	60
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	2	12
Total		1332

**Comments:** DCPS offers PD in various ways. The PD listed above is offered on many different occasions throughout the school year. We are counting participants as if they attended once when indeed they may have attended to more than one offering. Several of the PD were offered as a class or a two part series so participants may have attended more than one session. During school year 06-07 professional development was offered to the following groups of people:

Principals and New Principals

Directors of Charter Schools

Central Office Administrators

Registrars

Secretaries

Teachers and New Teachers

Dual Language Teachers

Bilingual/ESL Teachers

Non-instructional Aides/ Bilingual Paraprofessional

Directors of Departments

The Joint Advisory Council- Advocacy group composed of community-based organizations

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
<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.

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>	

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	66.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	

**Comments:** The above numerical graduation percentage-rates summary (For All Students) is for the cohort of 9th graders that entered the District of Columbia's public senior high schools in the fall of 2003 and matriculated to graduation in the spring of 2007. During their four-year educational experience with DCPS, the technical collection methodologies were not in place to collect disaggregated data for subgroups, SES and gender as being required in this section of the CSPR. Same is being reported for the lack of data for private and charter high schools' graduates. It has been a practice of not collecting data on special education, limited English proficient and low-income students, as well. The thinking at the time was that these students' graduation rates were subsumed in the graduation percentage-rate summary.

However, to remedy this situation, District of Columbia State Department of Education (OSSE) was recently awarded a multi-million dollar federal grant to establish a State Longitudinal Educational Data Warehouse (SLEDW), similarly to ones operating in several states' departments of education. OSSE was one a few state departments of education to receive a grant for a SLEDW (to systemically drive student academic achievement).

The SLEDW will enable OSSE to collect, archive, analyze and report various entitlement programs data in formats, such as for racial and ethnic subgroups, disability students, limited English proficient students, low- and high-income level students, and for students based on gender and/or grade-level elements.

When SLEDW is fully implemented and institutionalized, the system will have interoperability capability, which means it should be able to interface across various operating platforms with other operating systems, extracting and retrieving a plethora of data elements for analysis in meeting specific federal reporting requirements.

Currently, SLEDW's Stirring Committee is busy employing the necessary strategies required to bring the system on line by late spring of 2008. With the addition of SLEDW, OSSE should be able to collect, archive, analyze and report data findings in formats as requested by the CSPR for the 2007-2008 school year. Moreover, SLEDW should enable OSSE to comply with all research, evaluation and dissemination requirements as prescribed by No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (NCLB).

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	7.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.5
Black, non-Hispanic	6.6
Hispanic	7.6
White, non-Hispanic	3.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	6.7
Female	5.3
<p><b>Comments:</b> The explanation for the lack of information relative to elements IDEA, ELL and SES students is reported in the comments section of the above graduation-rates report. However, with the establishment of SLEDW in 2008, OSSE will have the capacity and should be in a position to properly address these reporting requirements as stipulated by CSPR I and other requirements of NCLB.</p>	

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	164	47
LEAs with subgrants	0	0
Total	164	47
<b>Comments:</b> The District of Columbia does not award subgrants.		

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:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	61	0
K	46	0
1	70	0
2	41	0
3	60	0
4	44	0
5	49	0
6	63	0
7	50	0
8	66	0
9	58	0
10	46	0
11	22	0
12	14	0
Ungraded	134	0
Total	824	0

**Comments:** This report does not capture students attending public charter schools nor an accurate number of unaccompanied and doubled up youth.

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.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	381	0
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	191	0
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	96	0
Hotels/Motels	156	0
Total	824	0

**Comments:** The unsheltered category is an approximate number determined by the actual numbers provided in the three other categories.

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)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Total	0
<b>Comments:</b> The District of Columbia does not provide subgrants to its LEA's.	

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	11
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	49
Limit English proficient students	81
<b>Comments:</b> The numbers reflect those that were successfully identified at the time of monitor.	

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.

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	0
2. Expedited evaluations	0
3. Staff professional development and awareness	0
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	0
5. Transportation	0
6. Early childhood programs	0
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	0
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	0
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	0
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	0
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	0
12. Counseling	0
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	0
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	0
15. School supplies	0
16. Referral to other programs and services	0
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	0
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
<b>Comments:</b> Items 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 were/are available offered and/or provided to all eligible (under Title X) students. The District of Columbia does not award subgrants to LEA's.	

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.

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
1. Eligibility for homeless services	0
2. School Selection	0
3. Transportation	0
4. School records	0
5. Immunizations	0
6. Other medical records	0
7. Other Barriers	0
<b>Comments:</b> LEA's reported: 3 for item 2 & 6 for item 7. DC does not award subgrants to its LEA's.	

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	58	19
4	43	14
5	49	16
6	61	20
7	48	16
8	64	21
High School	45	13
<b>Comments:</b> Public Charter Schools were not counted in SY 2006-2007.		

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	58	15
4	42	11
5	47	12
6	61	15
7	48	12
8	64	16
High School	44	10
<b>Comments:</b> Public Charter Schools were not counted in SY2006-2007.		

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)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
<b>Comments:</b> District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.	

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0

**Comments:** District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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.

District of Columbia did not receive funding for this program in SY 2006-2007.

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

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