

**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

ILLINOIS



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 – *21st 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>		
<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</p>		
<p>Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Illinois State Board of Education</p>		
<p>Address: 100 North First Street Springfield, IL 62777-0001</p>		
<p>Person to contact about this report:</p>		
<p>Name: Connie Wise</p>		
<p>Telephone: 217-782-0354</p>		
<p>Fax: 217-782-5333</p>		
<p>e-mail: cwise@isbe.net</p>		
<p>Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Christopher A. Koch</p>		
		<p>Friday, March 7, 2008, 7:44:31 PM</p>
<p>Signature</p>		<p>Date</p>

**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.

1.1.1 No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois has four state tests designed to meet the academic performance requirements of NCLB and state law. Each test has an advisory committee of educators with expertise in the various content areas to assist in test development and administration. Standard setting for Illinois tests use a modified Angoff technique.

ISAT--The Illinois Standards Achievement Test measures individual student achievement relative to the Illinois Learning Standards; results are reported to parents, teachers, and schools. The standards apply to all students taking ISAT (<http://www.isbe.net/ils/>). Grades 3-8: reading and mathematics.

Grades 4 and 7: science.

Challenge--Content Standards: Assessment frameworks demonstrating the cognitive complexity of assessment by grade--<http://www.isbe.net/assessment/IAFIndex.htm>.

Challenge--Achievement Standards: Through the frameworks, ISAT is a direct implementation of the standards.

Student performance levels--academic warning, below standards, meets, and exceeds.

IMAGE--The Illinois Measure of Annual Growth in English measures the progress of LEP students in reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 and 11 through simplified language.

Challenge--Content Standards: Mathematics frameworks (see above website).

Challenge--Achievement Standards: A committee of bilingual educators sets ranges of IMAGE scores within which test takers have a particular likelihood of succeeding on ISAT.

PSAE--The Prairie State Achievement Examination measures individual student achievement relative to the standards; results are reported to parents, teachers, and schools. The standards apply to all students taking the PSAE.

Grade 11 addresses reading, mathematics, and science.

Challenge--Content Standards: The PSAE frameworks describe what students are supposed to know by grade 11, and illustrate that the standards are rigorous and encourage teaching advanced skills.

Challenge--Achievement Standards: Through the frameworks, PSAE is a direct implementation of the standards.

Student performance levels--academic warning, below standards, meets, and exceeds.

The Grade 2 Assessment was last used in spring 2006.

IAA--The Illinois Alternate Assessment is intended for students with significant cognitive disabilities and measures individual student

achievement in reading and mathematics at grades 3-8 and 11, and achievement in science in grades 4, 7, and 11. Results are reported to parents, schools, and districts.

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.

The Illinois State Board of Education has developed a new state assessment for students who will take the Illinois Alternate Assessment (IAA) during school year 2007-2008.

The Illinois State Board of Education began test development for a new alternate assessment for students who are significantly cognitively disabled in spring 2006 by revising the Frameworks. Test items or tasks were then written from the Frameworks. Writing was piloted in fall 2006 in grades 3, 5, 6, 8, and 11. The writing operational was administered in grades 5, 8, and 11 in spring 2007. Standard setting for writing in grades 5, 8, and 11 was held in summer 2007. Reading and mathematics for grades 3-8 and 11, and science in grades 4, 7, and 11 were piloted in fall 2007. The operational test in reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 and 11; science in grades 4, 7, and 11; and writing in grades 5, 6, 8, and 11 will be administered in spring 2008. Standard setting for all assessed grades for reading, mathematics, and science will be held in May 2008. Standard setting for grade 6 writing will also occur. Reporting will occur on the results generated on this new alternate assessment for purposes of 2007-2008 accountability.

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.

Illinois has three state tests designed to meet the academic performance requirements of NCLB and state law. Each test has an advisory committee of educators with expertise in the various content areas to assist in test development and administration. Standard setting for Illinois tests use a form modified Angoff technique.

ISAT--the Illinois Standards Achievement Test measures individual student achievement relative to the Illinois Learning Standards; results are reported to parents, teachers, and schools. The standards apply to all students taking ISAT (<http://www.isbe.net/ils/>). Grades 3-8: reading and mathematics. Grades 4 and 7: science. Science has been assessed through ISAT since 1999-2000.

Challenge--Content Standards: Assessment frameworks demonstrating the cognitive complexity of assessment by grade--
<http://www.isbe.net/assessment/IAFIndex.htm>.

Challenge--Achievement Standards: Through the frameworks, ISAT is a direct implementation of the standards. Student performance levels--academic warning, below standards, meets, and exceeds.

PSAE--The Prairie State Achievement Examination measures individual student achievement relative to the standards; results are reported to parents, teachers, and schools. The standards apply to all students taking the PSAE. Grade 11 addresses reading, mathematics, and science. Science has been assessed through PSAE since 2000-2001.

Challenge--Content Standards: The PSAE frameworks describe what students are supposed to know by grade 11, and illustrate that the standards are rigorous and encourage teaching advanced skills.

Challenge--Achievement Standards: Through the frameworks, PSAE is a direct implementation of the standards. Student performance levels--academic warning, below standards, meets, and exceeds.

IAA--The Illinois Alternate Assessment is intended for students with significant cognitive disabilities and measures the individual student in achievement in reading and mathematics at grades 3-8 and 11. It measures achievement in science in grades 4, 7, and 11. Results are reported to parents, schools, and districts. Science has been assessed through tests directed toward students with significant cognitive disabilities since 1999-2000.

The Illinois State Board of Education began test development for a new alternate assessment for students who are significantly cognitively disabled in spring 2006 by revising the Frameworks. Test items or tasks were then written from the Frameworks. Writing was piloted in fall 2006 in grades 3, 5, 6, 8, and 11. The writing operational was administered in grades 5, 8, and 11 in spring 2007. Standard setting for writing in grades 5, 8, and 11 was held in summer 2007. Reading and mathematics for grades 3-8 and 11, and science in grades 4, 7, and 11 were piloted in fall 2007. The operational test in reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 and 11; science in grades 4, 7, and 11; and writing in grades 5, 6, 8, and 11 will be administered in spring 2008. Standard setting for all assessed grades for reading, mathematics, and science will be held in May 2008. Standard setting for grade 6 writing will also occur. Reporting will occur on the results generated on this new alternate assessment for purposes of 2007-2008 accountability.

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.

The Illinois Learning Standards for science were adopted in 1997.

The Illinois learning Standards are located on the Illinois State Board of Education Web site at:
www.isbe.net/ils/science/standards.htm (science)

In SY 2006-07, science was assessed at grades 4, 7, and 11. The Illinois Assessment Frameworks were developed to define what elements of the Illinois Learning Standards would be assessed at each grade. The Frameworks can be accessed at:

www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/_science.pdf (grades 4 and 7)

www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/iaf_science_PSAEFinal.pdf (grade 11)

Cut scores for each assessment were set between 1999 and 2001. The cut scores can be accessed at www.isbe.net/assessment/htmls/ISAT_cut_points_05.htm. Performance Definitions of the four performance levels (exceeds standards, meets standards, below standards, academic warning) can be accessed at www.isbe.net/assessment/htmls/per_def.htm.

The Illinois Alternate Assessment is a portfolio assessment given to students who have significant cognitive disabilities. The Illinois Alternate Assessment uses a portfolio format to measure the proficiency of students in grades 4, 7, and 11 in science. The alternate performance indicators for science can be assessed at:

www.isbe.net/pdfs/API_science_0506.pdf. (science)

A new events-based assessment will be given in place of the portfolio in SY 2007-08. The Alternate Assessment Framework Priorities will be used in place of the alternate performance indicators and can be accessed for science at www.isbe.net/assessment/iaa.htm.

ISBE began test development for a new science alternate assessment for students who are significantly cognitively disabled in spring 2006 by revising the Frameworks. Test items or tasks were then written from the Frameworks. Science tasks were piloted for grades 4, 7, and 11 in fall 2007. The operational test for science in grades 4, 7, and 11 will be administered in spring 2008. Standard setting is scheduled for May 2008. Reporting will occur on the results generated on this assessment for purposes of 2007-2008 accountability.

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	1084006	1082266	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1755	1754	99.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	41712	41706	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	213786	213625	99.9
Hispanic	206168	206088	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	595373	595344	100.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	157988	157438	99.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	84098	83940	99.8
Economically disadvantaged students	455064	454847	100.0
Migratory students	546	546	100.0
Male	552801	552615	100.0
Female	529754	529651	100.0
Comments:			

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	67598	42.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	79357	50.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	10719	6.8
Total	157674	
<p>Comments: Illinois does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level achievement standards nor on modified achievement standards.</p> <p>The SEA considers all data provided in this table to be accurate. The number of students tested that is provided in 1.2.1 is for only graded students tested. The total number provided in 1.2.2 includes ungraded students who took the alternate assessment.</p> <p>The total number of children with disabilities provided in 1.3 is the total of those who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned; the total number provided in 1.2.2 is the total number of children with disabilities TESTED, not the total number who tested AND received a score.</p>		

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	1084006	1082266	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1755	1754	99.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	41712	41706	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	213786	213625	99.9
Hispanic	206168	206088	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	595373	595344	100.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	157988	157438	99.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	84098	83940	99.8
Economically disadvantaged students	455064	454847	100.0
Migratory students	546	546	100.0
Male	552801	552615	100.0
Female	529754	529651	100.0
Comments:			

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	67598	42.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	79357	50.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	10719	6.8
Total	157674	

Comments: Illinois does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level achievement standards nor on modified achievement standards.

The SEA considers all data provided in this table to be accurate. The number of students tested that is provided in 1.2.3 is for only graded students tested. The total number provided in 1.2.4 includes ungraded students who took the alternate assessment.

The total number of children with disabilities provided in 1.3 is the total of those who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned; the total number provided in 1.2.4 is the total number of children with disabilities TESTED, not the total number who tested AND received a score.

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

Grade 3	# 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	154757	130872	84.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	213	88.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	6092	5762	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	31230	21190	67.9
Hispanic	32874	25291	76.9
White, non-Hispanic	79879	74573	93.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22222	14983	67.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18783	13203	70.3
Economically disadvantaged students	71655	53381	74.5
Migratory students	95	83	87.4
Male	79239	66699	84.2
Female	75514	64170	85.0
Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 4,387			
# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 3,804			
% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 86.7			
The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.			

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

Grade 3	# 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	154424	110830	71.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	187	77.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6050	5352	88.5
Black, non-Hispanic	31239	15830	50.7
Hispanic	32602	20665	63.4
White, non-Hispanic	79851	65586	82.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22190	9724	43.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18408	11566	62.8
Economically disadvantaged students	71397	41344	57.9
Migratory students	95	63	66.3
Male	79060	53691	67.9
Female	75360	57137	75.8
Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 4,388			
# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 3,183			
% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 72.5			

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# 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	153080	129231	84.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	201	84.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	6103	5759	94.4
Black, non-Hispanic	29635	20042	67.6
Hispanic	31698	24735	78.0
White, non-Hispanic	81355	75054	92.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22992	14435	62.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17514	12574	71.8
Economically disadvantaged students	68797	51327	74.6
Migratory students	84	68	81.0
Male	78391	65505	83.6
Female	74680	63724	85.3

Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 3,993

Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 3,415

% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 85.5

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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

Grade 4	# 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	152837	111780	73.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	171	71.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	6061	5400	89.1
Black, non-Hispanic	29639	14918	50.3
Hispanic	31540	21386	67.8
White, non-Hispanic	81309	66954	82.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22944	9735	42.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17268	12045	69.8
Economically disadvantaged students	68657	40860	59.5
Migratory students	84	52	61.9
Male	78247	54954	70.2
Female	74583	56825	76.2

Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 3,996

Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 2,932

% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 73.4

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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

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

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# 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	154476	123966	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	233	186	79.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	6012	5628	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	30453	18258	60.0
Hispanic	31354	22667	72.3
White, non-Hispanic	82613	74096	89.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23144	12666	54.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15392	9446	61.4
Economically disadvantaged students	68765	46705	67.9
Migratory students	78	62	79.5
Male	79110	62573	79.1
Female	75361	61388	81.5
Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 3,761			
# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 3,097			
% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 82.4			
The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.			

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

Grade 5	# 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	154333	108339	70.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	233	165	70.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	5978	5208	87.1
Black, non-Hispanic	30478	13728	45.0
Hispanic	31261	21226	67.9
White, non-Hispanic	82573	65336	79.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23122	8530	36.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15215	11230	73.8
Economically disadvantaged students	68654	38494	56.1
Migratory students	78	55	70.5
Male	79035	52726	66.7
Female	75293	55609	73.9
Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 3,760			
# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 2,649			
% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 70.5			

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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

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

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# 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	159912	128280	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	269	219	81.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5897	5541	94.0
Black, non-Hispanic	32524	19683	60.5
Hispanic	31694	23243	73.3
White, non-Hispanic	85919	76645	89.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23264	11432	49.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11826	6799	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	70346	47966	68.2
Migratory students	87	53	60.9
Male	82176	64588	78.6
Female	77729	63687	81.9

Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 3,545

Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 2,916

% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 82.3

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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

Grade 6	# 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	159914	116965	73.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	269	206	76.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	5867	5249	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	32569	17396	53.4
Hispanic	31639	19873	62.8
White, non-Hispanic	85960	71518	83.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23303	8510	36.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11697	5920	50.6
Economically disadvantaged students	70325	41057	58.4
Migratory students	87	55	63.2
Male	82175	57294	69.7
Female	77732	59667	76.8

Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 3,548

Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 2,694

% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 75.9

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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

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

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# 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	160824	126362	78.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	251	194	77.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	5850	5480	93.7
Black, non-Hispanic	34056	19764	58.0
Hispanic	30275	21863	72.2
White, non-Hispanic	87075	76432	87.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23844	10187	42.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9091	5162	56.8
Economically disadvantaged students	69241	45481	65.7
Migratory students	84	57	67.9
Male	82729	64103	77.5
Female	78085	62255	79.7

Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 3,245

Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 2,589

% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 79.8

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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

Grade 7	# 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	161034	117325	72.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	251	198	78.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	5836	5198	89.1
Black, non-Hispanic	34119	18628	54.6
Hispanic	30264	19116	63.2
White, non-Hispanic	87243	71698	82.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23934	8091	33.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8991	4299	47.8
Economically disadvantaged students	69291	40662	58.7
Migratory students	83	54	65.1
Male	82826	57077	68.9
Female	78198	60245	77.0

Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 3,249

Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 2,458

% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 75.7

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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

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

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# 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	157720	126508	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	273	214	78.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5743	5365	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	32341	19807	61.2
Hispanic	28530	20847	73.1
White, non-Hispanic	88039	78013	88.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23517	10019	42.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6576	3403	51.7
Economically disadvantaged students	64697	43797	67.7
Migratory students	75	46	61.3
Male	80710	63390	78.5
Female	77002	63114	82.0

Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 2,723

Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 2,236

% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 82.1

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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

Grade 8	# 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	157862	127672	80.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	273	223	81.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	5721	5238	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	32431	22569	69.6
Hispanic	28523	20844	73.1
White, non-Hispanic	88115	76510	86.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23609	9971	42.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6476	3334	51.5
Economically disadvantaged students	64790	45725	70.6
Migratory students	75	50	66.7
Male	80806	61961	76.7
Female	77048	65705	85.3

Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 2,727

Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 2,257

% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 82.8

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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

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

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	134898	70518	52.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	132	55.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	5865	4340	74.0
Black, non-Hispanic	21039	4185	19.9
Hispanic	18328	5845	31.9
White, non-Hispanic	87831	55324	63.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16240	2927	18.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4297	1299	30.2
Economically disadvantaged students	37623	10355	27.5
Migratory students	40	<N	
Male	66335	36521	55.1
Female	68560	33996	49.6

Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 1,384

Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 648

% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 46.8

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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	134833	73299	54.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	134	56.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	5865	4001	68.2
Black, non-Hispanic	21023	6006	28.6
Hispanic	18308	6502	35.5
White, non-Hispanic	87801	55864	63.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16216	3782	23.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4283	2131	49.8
Economically disadvantaged students	37597	12454	33.1
Migratory students	40	13	32.5
Male	66291	34133	51.5
Female	68539	39164	57.1

Comments: Multiracial: # Students Completing Assessment = 1,384

Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 730

% Students Scoring At or Above Proficient = 52.8

The SEA considers the data provided in this table to be accurate. In previous years, the SEA provided this information based on self-reported district data. Beginning with SY 2006-07, the SEA is providing this information based on data collected through the statewide Student Information System, which allows for more accurate data collection through assignment of unique student identifiers.

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

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	3792	2896	76.4
Districts	871	626	71.9
Comments:			

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	2225	1621	72.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1011	551	54.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1214	1070	88.1
Comments:			

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
789	555	70.3
Comments:		

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))¹
- 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.

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Illinois State Board of Education maintains a system of support for all schools in school improvement corrective action or restructuring status.

When a school first moves into school improvement status after not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two consecutive years, the school must complete a school improvement plan that targets the areas in which AYP was not made. The school improvement plan is monitored by the statewide system of support and each school has a minimum of one person assigned to assist in developing the school improvement plan. This person helps to guide the school in designing the plan and making a determination about other factors beyond academics that may be preventing the school from making AYP, such as behavior management, cultural concerns, etc.

The school improvement plan is monitored to ensure that the school is following or amending the plan, as appropriate. The school support person assigned by the SEA assists with writing and monitoring the plan and with promoting its acceptance by the local board of education. Each local school board must have a peer review team review the plan and recommend it for approval by the local school board. The school support person then monitors the plan for acceptance in the school.

School improvement plans must be for two years and include student teacher and parent strategies and activities, which must be written to show how the administrator or system of support person would be able to identify outcomes when observing a classroom.

If a school does not make AYP during the two years of the plan, the school then moves into corrective action status. The corrective action plan is a two-year plan that must address the measures described in NCLB Section 1116.

If the school has not made AYP after the fifth AYP calculation, the school district must develop a restructuring plan for the school and must implement the plan the following year or after the sixth calculation. The school district must use one of the options listed in NCLB Section 1116 to move into restructuring implementation. Assistance continues to be provided by the system of support person and increases to a higher level of support if the school moves into corrective action and/or restructuring status.

For FY08 511 Illinois schools have been placed in improvement status based on 2006-2007 data.

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.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: This information was not collected for SY 2006-07. The data collection instrument will be revised to collect this information for SY 2007-08.	

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.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: This information was not collected for SY 2006-07. The data collection instrument will be revised to collect this information for SY 2007-08.	

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 Action²)
- 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.

² 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.

The Illinois State Board of Education has established a system of support for school districts that do not make adequate yearly progress (AYP).

When a school district does not make AYP for two consecutive years the district must complete a district improvement plan. In the district improvement plan, an objective must be established for each area in which the district is not making AYP in order to assist the district to make AYP. A Regional System of Support Providers (RESPRO) team is assigned to work with the school district to develop and implement the district improvement plan.

If after four years the school district has not reached the level of student performance required to make AYP, the district must file a district improvement plan for review by the Illinois State Board of Education. During this review the SEA requires the district to accept one of the required steps listed in NCLB Section 1116. In most cases, this results in the district ensuring implementation of a new curriculum with access for all students in the district. It is interesting to note that of the 38 school districts currently in corrective action status based on 2006-2007 data, 24 are high school districts. Most of these are in corrective action status based on the special education population. These school districts must participate in a telephone conference with the SEA and explain how the district is going to make AYP or show marked improvement. This is not the only sanction the SEA imposes, but it is the one that is most often chosen. The RESPRO system of support team works with the school district until it makes AYP for two consecutive years.

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.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	37
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	1
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
Comments:	

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	09/06/07	09/06/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	06/13/07	06/13/07
Comments:		

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	9	1
Schools	7	0
Comments:		

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	10/18/07
---	----------

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.

The Illinois State Board of Education, with the approval of each school district that has schools in school improvement corrective action or restructuring status, uses Section 1003(a) funds to establish and fund a statewide system of support through the Regional System of Support Providers (RESPRO). The SEA does not distribute Section 1003(a) funds to individual schools, so the SEA does not employ a method for distributing the funds to schools.

The statewide RESPRO system of support works with all schools' status and provides a greater level of service to schools in corrective action, and greater still to schools in restructuring planning.

The types of activities supported by the RESPRO system of support include professional development, working with teachers in the schools to develop a school improvement plan, designing course content, and any area determined by the school to be of assistance toward making adequate yearly progress. The RESPRO system of support also provides numerous professional development opportunities for teachers to learn how to use data when developing a school improvement plan.

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	206
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	173
Comments:	

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	105006
Who applied to transfer	3439
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	2297

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
Comments: The Illinois State Board of Education does not collect information from school districts specifically on students who transferred in a prior year AND in the current year.	

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$
Comments: This information was not collected by the SEA for SY 2006-07; however, the SY 2007-08 data collection instrument will include a request for this information.	

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

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	73
Comments:	

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.³
- 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.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 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	504
Comments:	

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	308866
Who applied for supplemental educational services	58589
Who received supplemental educational services	46397
Comments: These numbers are self-reported data from school districts via the Illinois State Board of Education NCLB Performance Report, November 2007.	

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	\$ 49989609
Comments: This represents the amounts reported by school districts in expenditure reports for projects with end dates of June 30 and August 31, 2007, that requested SES expenses in their budgets.	

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	154372	149424	96.8	4948	3.2
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	22352	18624	83.3	3728	16.7
Low-poverty schools	36784	36706	99.8	78	0.2
All elementary schools	114409	109915	96.1	4494	3.9
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	10000	9646	96.5	354	3.5
Low-poverty schools	13952	13936	99.9	16	0.1
All secondary schools	39963	39509	98.9	454	1.1
Comments:					

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 SEA 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	12.1
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	7.7
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	13.1
Other (please explain)	67.1
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)	35.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	7.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	23.9
Other (please explain)	33.8
Total	100.0
Comments: Other (Elementary and Secondary) -- Bilingual classrooms taught by staff who hold Type 29 teaching certificates; classes taught by substitute teachers.	

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.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	66.7	16.3
Poverty metric used	Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.	
Secondary schools	45.4	14.7
Poverty metric used	Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.	
Comments:		

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.ncele.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
18	Dual language	Spanish	50.0	50.0
18	Two-way immersion	Spanish	50.0	50.0
138	Transitional bilingual	Spanish	75.0	75.0
15	Developmental bilingual	Spanish	50.0	50.0
0	Heritage language	none	0.0	0.0
88	Sheltered English instruction			
0	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
84	Content-based ESL			
154	Pull-out ESL			
158	Other (explain)			

Comments: Dual Language and Two-way immersion--Also offered in Cantonese and Japanese.

Transitional bilingual--Also offered in Arabic, Assyrian/Syriac, Bosnian/Serb/Croat, Bulgarian, Cantonese, Gujarati, Japanese, Mandarin, Pilipino/Tagalog, Polish, Spanish, Ukrainian, Urdu, and Vietnamese.

Illinois does not offer Heritage language, Structured English immersion, and SDAE programs.

In Illinois, "Other" refers to ESL using other instructional delivery methods other than pull-out, such as "push-in," self-contained (50% or more of the day), self-contained (less than 50% of the day), or team teaching. Therefore it was thought to be appropriate to separate this model from "Pull-out ESL."

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	174694
Comments: The total unduplicated number of LEP students reported--174,694, is the same number reported in 1.6.3.1.2.	

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	152864
Polish	6951
Arabic	3386
Urdu	2353
Korean	1951

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: Pilipino (Tagalog) was 1,866 and Chinese Mandarin was 1,767. Includes ALL K-12 LEP students.

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.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	164391
Not tested/State annual ELP	23805
Subtotal	188196
LEP/One Data Point	60161
Comments: The numbers in 1.6.3.1.1 include all LEP students. The number of LEP students who did not participate in Title III LEPs was not reported in 1.6.3.1.2 and 1.6.3.2.3.	

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.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	152660
Not tested/State annual ELP	22034
Subtotal	174694
LEP/One Data Point	53469
Comments: The subtotal reported here--174,694, is the same number reported in 1.6.2.1.	
Students not tested were either sick or had been withdrawn by parents during the testing window, had moved prior to the test, or the test was not appropriate or valid for administering to students, such as those with significant cognitive disabilities.	

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>
Comments:	

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	85.0	99534	95.5	Y
No progress		4696		
ELP attainment	10.0	49939	26.5	Y

Comments: In Illinois, progress is determined by taking two years of valid student scores. Adding together "making progress" (99,534) plus "no progress" (4,696) equals 104,230. In 1.6.3.1.1, the number tested was 164,391. Subtracting 60,161 (LEP One/Data Point) from 164,391 equals 104,230, which is the same total in 1.6.3.2.2.

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	85.0	94720	95.5	Y
No progress		4471		
ELP attainment	10.0	45964	26.3	Y
Comments: Adding together "making progress" (94,720) and "no progress" (4,471) equals 99,191. In 1.6.3.1.2, the number tested was 152,660. Subtracting 53,469 (LEP One/Data Point) from 152,660 equals 99,191, which is the same total in 1.6.3.2.3.				

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

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

MFLEP	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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	14864
MFLEP/AYP grades	10290
Comments:	

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	75698
LEP HS/Non-AYP	15046
LEP other grades	
Comments: Illinois does not have LEP students in "other grades."	

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
Comments:	

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	
Comments: Not Applicable.	

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	
Comments: Not Applicable.	

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
Comments: Not Applicable.		

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
Comments: Not Applicable.		

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
6551	8313	14864
Comments:		

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

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

1.6.3.6.2 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
10202	8200	80.4	2002

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
10210	6567	64.3	3643

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	196
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	167
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	10
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	10
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	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	3
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	7
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	50
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	4
Comments: Total number of subgrantees for the year: There were 196 school district subgrantees in 2007 but 14 did not have the required "n" size of 30 or more. Therefore only 182 school districts have AMAO status.	
The reason Illinois decided not to do AMAO consortia is because of challenges involved in the validity of the calculations. In Illinois, the calculation of AMAO progress requires two years of comparable valid data. To make valid comparisons, it is necessary to include in the analysis only consortia that have the same member of districts for two consecutive years. The configuration, or membership, of consortia in Illinois appears to change from year to year. For instance, some districts changed consortium membership within a two-year period; some districts operated as individual Title III districts in the previous year and decided to establish a consortium in the current year. In Illinois, the decision was made not to include districts that recently received Title III funds in the AMAO progress calculations. Since Illinois does not calculate AMAO progress for consortia, for consistency, Illinois also did not calculate AMAO proficiency attainment and AMAO AYP at the consortia level.	
A meeting between the two Illinois State Board of Education divisions responsible for AMAO policies and calculation is scheduled in the near future to discuss AMAO progress for consortia in Illinois so that this issue can be addressed and reported for SY 2007-08.	

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>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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.	
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
50147	9808	53

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.	5593
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.	6004
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	3016

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

Comments:

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	189	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	98	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	112	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	100	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	44	
Other (Explain in comment box)	96	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	161	12152
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	173	3520
PD provided to principals	128	751
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	134	499
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	120	1416
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	35	403
Total		18741
<p>Comments: Instructional strategies for LEP students: Only 189 (96%) of the 196 Title III subgrantees submitted the Illinois Bilingual Education Program Delivery Report before the electronic data collection system closed on June 30, 2007, despite the numerous telephone calls and e-mails that were made to remind the districts to submit the reports (particularly to the seven missing districts). The ISBE Division of English Language Learning will continue to conduct monitoring visits to investigate the nonsubmission of reports.</p> <p>Participation in each of the PD activities is not mutually exclusive in Illinois. One district can be reported as participating in more than one PD activity.</p> <p>In "Other" type of PD activity--U.S. culture and history is provided for both teaching and nonteaching staff.</p>		

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
07/01/06	09/01/06	90
Comments:		

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.

Illinois has eliminated redundancy by consolidating four separate grant applications into a single consolidated grant application. Several years ago, school districts were required to complete as many as four separate applications for additional funds to serve their ELL student population. Today, school districts can apply for the various grants through a single menu-driven electronic application.

To shorten the process of distributing Title II funds, one option is to make the grant application available at least one to two months before the end of the school year. Currently, the completed grant application is due on June 30 at the end of the school year. Because the applications are being reviewed by SEA staff during the summer months when school district personnel are on summer break, the approval process is delayed until school district staff is able to respond to questions regarding the grant application. For example, to ensure that Title III funds budgeted for the regular school year supplement and not supplant local/state funds, SEA staff must contact school district staff to clarify the proposed budgeted activities. The alternative is to limit activities budgeted during the regular school year to professional development and parental outreach. All before- and after-school and summer school activities are considered supplemental, and therefore are less time-consuming to review and approve. This alternative can become a viable option only if it is supported by USDE.

In order for Illinois to implement Option A (that is, limit Title III funds for professional development, parental outreach, and before-/after-school and summer school activities), USDE needs to communicate in writing to all SEAs that Title III funds are only approvable for these activities. This option is easier to implement because it is less time-consuming to confirm/verify that professional development, parental outreach, and before-/after-school and summer school activities are supplemental. When Title III funds are used outside of these activities, however, it is more difficult and time-consuming to confirm/verify that districts are not using Title III funds to supplant local/state funds.

Another alternative is to make regional sites available for SEA staff to meet with school districts to review and approve the application before the end of the school year. The SEA would be able to meet with district personnel to review and approve the applications onsite. If there are concerns during the application review process, SEA staff questions and concerns can be communicated in person to district personnel, and the problems may be addressed onsite.

Illinois has already taken steps to implement Option B in school year 2007-08 by hosting a series of webcasts, scheduled to begin April 15, 2008. These webcasts will be used to assist districts in completing the Consolidated Application for 2008-09. During that period, district personnel will be able to ask for clarifications and request additional guidance to complete the FY09 Consolidated

Application. By school year 2008-2009 it will be possible to create time slots and identify locations in advance for district personnel to meet with their assigned SEA consultant to pre-approve their TBE/TPI, LIPLEPS, and IEP budgets.

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
Comments:	

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	87.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	80.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	78.3
Hispanic	77.1
White, non-Hispanic	92.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	77.2
Limited English proficient	63.2
Economically disadvantaged	76.5
Migratory students	41.7
Male	85.6
Female	89.9
Comments: Multiracial Graduation Rate: 88.2	
The SEA considers all data provided in this table to be accurate. The migratory student group is a small population; small populations may have large fluctuations in data.	

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	3.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.7
Black, non-Hispanic	7.7
Hispanic	6.7
White, non-Hispanic	2.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5.0
Limited English proficient	6.8
Economically disadvantaged	4.6
Migratory students	5.8
Male	4.5
Female	3.4
Comments: Multiracial: 1.8%	
The SEA considers all data provided in this table to be accurate.	

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	840	840
LEAs with subgrants	32	32
Total	872	872
Comments:		

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)	422	529
K	816	776
1	789	894
2	738	917
3	697	961
4	671	841
5	625	792
6	614	882
7	500	842
8	514	797
9	465	1205
10	460	818
11	444	633
12	545	634
Ungraded	0	0
Total	8300	11521
Comments: There are no ungraded schools participating in the Illinois NCLB Title 10 Part C Program.		

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	1205	2061
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6435	9156
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	102	55
Hotels/Motels	558	249
Total	8300	11521
Comments:		

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)	560
K	809
1	919
2	949
3	985
4	865
5	811
6	908
7	878
8	821
9	1244
10	844
11	651
12	657
Ungraded	0
Total	11901

Comments: There are no ungraded schools participating in the Illinois NCLB Title 10 Part C Program.

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	818
Migratory children/youth	105
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3106
Limit English proficient students	643

Comments:

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

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	68
2. Expedited evaluations	68
3. Staff professional development and awareness	68
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	68
5. Transportation	68
6. Early childhood programs	68
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	68
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	68
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	68
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	68
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	68
12. Counseling	68
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	68
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	68
15. School supplies	68
16. Referral to other programs and services	68
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	68
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments: Illinois has no "other" Support Services categories.	

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

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	318
2. School Selection	83
3. Transportation	656
4. School records	287
5. Immunizations	353
6. Other medical records	
7. Other Barriers	335
Comments: The total number of subgrantees that reported barriers for #5 (Immunizations) and #6 (Other medical records) is combined in the total for #5.	

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	1168	498
4	1052	424
5	970	346
6	1056	444
7	983	443
8	946	590
High School	712	149
Comments:		

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	1154	986
4	1058	584
5	974	481
6	1048	514
7	980	471
8	939	534
High School	698	120
Comments:		

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).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	256
K	114
1	123
2	113
3	116
4	94
5	106
6	97
7	127
8	115
9	121
10	100
11	73
12	40
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	185
Total	1780
Comments:	

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.

Illinois experienced a decrease from SY 2005-06 in the number of migrant students identified in the state. This decrease was due to several factors, including:

1. Some communities did not receive the anticipated number of arrivals as a result of changes in hiring practices or crop conditions. For example, cold weather destroyed the peach crop in southern Illinois.
2. Employers and immigrant workers not familiar with the Migrant Education Program are more reluctant to share information with recruiters than they have been in the past. Concerns about pending immigrant legislation have raised their caution levels.
3. In communities close to Chicago, farm land has been replaced with urban development and the number of migrant families in the area has declined.

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).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	85
K	62
1	90
2	70
3	62
4	58
5	62
6	59
7	51
8	57
9	57
10	43
11	29
12	11
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	<N
Total	
Comments:	

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.

The number of students reported in Category 2 (801) represents a decrease of 10.7 percent from SY 2005-06. This decrease reflects the lower number of migrants identified in the state overall in 2006-07. However, the 801 migrant children served in the summer program represents 45 percent of the total number of migrant children identified in the state--a figure almost equal to the 44.5 percent reported for SY 2005-06.

In summer 2007, local projects identified high-school-age youth, as well as much younger children, who did not participate in summer school because they worked in the fields. In some communities, migrant children attended summer programs funded through sources other than the migrant education program, and thus were not counted in Category 2.

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.

Data for the Illinois child count for Category 1 and Category 2 were collected through the New Generation System (NGS), a web-based interstate information network that gathers data on migrant students. Child counts for the last reporting period were also collected through NGS.

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

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The source document for the Illinois migrant child count is the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Student information is recorded manually on the Illinois COE. The eligibility of each child counted is documented with a current valid COE and Supplemental Documentation form on file at the local level, with an approved copy of the COE located at the statewide records office. Illinois uses a three-year COE, but a new COE is completed for each year in which a migrant family makes a new qualifying move.

The following data are collected for each child included in the count:

*DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION, including parents' names and the names, address, and birth dates of children/youths.

*SPECIFIC ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA, including 1) residency date; 2) qualifying arrival date; 3) moved from where/to where; 4) whether the children moved with or to join a parent, guardian, or spouse, or on their own; 5) whether the move was to enable them to obtain or seek temporary or seasonal employment in fishing or agricultural work; 6) a description of the qualifying activity; 7) whether the work is a principal means of livelihood; 8) whether the child's schooling was interrupted; and 9) documentation of residency in the state during the year.

*PROGRAM PARTICIPATION DATA, such as enrollment and withdrawal dates and available academic and health information.

*CONFIRMATION DATA, including the signature of the recruiter, the signature of the family member interviewed, the initials of the local reviewer, and the initials of the state reviewer.

Only certified migrant recruiters who have successfully completed the annual state training complete COEs. Local recruiters employed by local MEP projects identify migrant children and complete COEs. At the state level, the Illinois Migrant Council was contracted to coordinate recruiting efforts and also to conduct recruiting and complete COEs in areas of the state that local recruiters did not reach.

The activities conducted to collect the data follow the guidelines included in the "Illinois Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual" (http://www.isbe.net/bilingual/htmls/migrant_resources.htm). Only certified recruiters who have participated in the annual state recruiter training may complete a COE. Recruiters initially collect information from families in a face-to-face interview. The signature of the parent/guardian or unaccompanied youth interviewed is required on the COE. The recruiter also completes a Supplemental Documentation form for each family.

As specified in the state quality control plan, designated personnel at the local and state levels review and approve the COE. Any questionable items on the COE are sent back to the local project for correction. The local project contacts the statewide records office to request a unique student identifier for each newly identified migrant child. The statewide records office issues a unique student identifier once they have reviewed all available information to ensure that the student is not already entered on the state's centralized data system, NGS. Then the trained local project staff enters student information on NGS.

Recruiters complete COEs on a daily basis throughout the year and trained NGS data specialists enroll students by entering demographic and enrollment information into NGS in accordance with the state requirements and timelines specified in "Illinois Migrant Education Program Requirements and Timelines: New Generation System and ID&R Data Flow." Written procedures stipulate that an enrollment should be entered within five working days after the information is collected on a COE. Residency verification, based on a combination of school records review, telephone calls, and face-to-face interviews, is conducted between September 1 and October 31, and the verification information on each migrant student is entered on the NGS history line reflecting the appropriate reporting period.

For migrant students who reside in Illinois for a second or third year without another qualifying move, the Illinois MEP uses a three-year COE to verify residency and continuing eligibility in the second and third years. Local projects use the Continuing Enrollment/Residency Worksheet to update grade level, enrollment type, school of attendance and enrollment date.

The Category 2 child count includes only children with documented attendance in MEP-funded summer programs in Illinois. Local projects maintain individual student attendance records and submit average daily attendance figures as part of the application for MEP funds. Teachers record attendance and trained NGS data entry specialists enter student enrollment and participation information into the NGS information system. Based on their records, local projects indicate participation in the MEP-funded summer program for each eligible migrant student on NGS. Information for the summer program is entered on the NGS information

system by data entry specialists at local project sites throughout the summer term as students enroll. Illinois NGS requirements and timelines stipulate that enrollment information be entered into NGS within five working days of COE completion.

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.

The COE information is completed manually on paper by the recruiter. Local projects maintain attendance records used to identify students who participated in MEP summer term projects. Trained NGS data entry specialists enter student enrollment and participation information into the NGS information system. Information collected through NGS is used to generate Category 1 AND Category 2 counts.

Local project data entry specialists input student data from the COE or Continuing Enrollment/Residency Worksheet into the NGS. The statewide records office compares COEs and NGS entries for all local projects to ensure that the data entered match the information on the COE. The statewide records office sends reports of any discrepancies to local projects for correction. At the end of the local program grant period a final review identifies any remaining discrepancies to be resolved.

The record update process allows the local project to include a child in a new funding year by recertifying that child's residency during the new year. The Illinois COE contains a space for documentation of continuing eligibility and residency verification. In the update, each child's residency is confirmed through personal interview, review of school attendance records, or, less frequently, via telephone.

When local school MEP personnel are not able to completely input student data, the state records office provides data entry assistance.

NGS creates a history line for each new or updated COE. The history line is coded to identify regular school year enrollment or participant or residency only for the Category 1 count. A history line is created for each child enrolled in summer school to be included in the Category 2 count. NGS assigns a unique student ID to each child so that an unduplicated count can be produced.

Periodically, reports of data entered onto NGS are distributed to local projects for review. Local projects also generate their own NGS reports to ensure that all identified children have been included in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts, and to eliminate any duplication.

Illinois establishes a deadline for entering all data into the system for the reporting year. After all data are entered, the state runs the federal performance reports using NGS and checks the data for errors before submitting the data to the Office of Migrant Education in the Consolidated State Performance Report.

Student information obtained during home visits or other sources is used to update MEP records. NGS allows for multiple enrollment data entry. However, for each student, residency is verified through the COE and enrollment information is updated on the Continuing Enrollment/Residency Worksheet.

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.

Data for Category 1 and Category 2 counts are collected using the same procedures and quality control plan. All data for both counts are entered and maintained on the NGS.

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.

Illinois uses NGS to generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

1. Only students with COEs that document their eligibility or continuing eligibility as "migratory children" resident in Illinois are included in the NGS database. Each child is assigned a unique identification number on NGS. The assignment of the unique student identification number is performed by a single individual--the NGS data entry specialist employed by the Illinois Migrant Council. Prior to assigning a new ID, the data entry specialist conducts a thorough search of students in the NGS database to ensure that duplicate records are not generated. The NGS duplicate student report is then used on a regular basis to catch any possible duplicates. If duplicates are found, a process to verify the duplication takes place and the student is deleted from the NGS database.

NGS programming uses the eligibility information entered for each child, including the birth date, to generate an unduplicated child count report, which includes only migrant children ages 3-21 who were eligible for at least one day during the counting period of 09/01/2006 to 08/31/2007, based on federal eligibility requirements.

2. NGS programming counts all eligible children with confirmed residency in Illinois for at least one day during the eligible counting period of 09/01/2006 to 08/31/2007. For two-year-olds who turned three during the counting period, local projects verified each child's residency after the third birthday and entered the date of residency verification information into NGS.

Record updates are conducted to verify continuing residency for all children identified in a previous year, as well. Illinois uses school/program attendance records or information obtained during a home visit to confirm residency. Less frequently, a phone conversation with the family may be used to confirm residency after the initial COE has been completed.

For Category 1 and Category 2 counts, NGS queries filter out any child who did not meet the following criteria during the child count period:

- a. Was between the ages of 3-21 (and had not graduated from high school).
- b. Was within 36 months of QAD and had a qualifying activity.
- c. Had a third birthday before the end date.
- d. Was resident in the state for at least one day.

The NGS query is programmed to count a student once in the Illinois child count by using the enrollment withdrawal and residency verification dates and current age/grade entered for every student identified and recruited during the reporting period to determine whether that student is to be included in the count.

3. For the Category 2 count, the NGS query is programmed to include only eligible children who received either MEP-funded services under a summer enrollment flag of "S" (Illinois funds no programs with intersession periods). A summer enrollment is entered into the NGS system only after the student is enrolled in and physically attending an MEP-funded summer program. Local projects are required to keep records of student enrollment and attendance. Summer migrant programs operate each year only during June 1 through August 31.

4. NGS is programmed to count a student only once statewide in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. NGS creates a unique student identification number for each new student entered into the NGS centralized database. Before a new student record can be created, the system checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name. Potential duplicates are then checked against additional fields, such as first name, birth date, and parents' names. Matching fields trigger further review of NGS reports, COEs, and enrollment lists. Data are consolidated; duplicates are removed and students are sorted by current age for children not yet in kindergarten and by grade for K-12 students based on the information entered on the student record in NGS. Two

NGS-generated reports provide the unduplicated child count figures sorted by age/grade for the state.

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.

The Illinois Category 2 count was generated through the NGS, which is the same system used to calculate the Category 1 count.

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.

The Illinois MEP Quality Control Plan for Identification and Recruitment has the following goals:

- *To identify and recruit all eligible migrant children residing in Illinois.
- *To ensure that proper MEP eligibility determinations are made in a collaborative manner by MEP personnel.
- *To ensure that proper MEP eligibility determinations are supported by accurate documentation.

In order to accomplish these goals, the Illinois MEP program conducted the following activities:

Recruiter Training and Support--

All recruiters were required to attend the annual Illinois MEP two-day Identification and Recruitment training in April to become authorized to complete COEs. Training emphasized eligibility determinations, documentation, quality control techniques, recruiting strategies, and programmatic and policy updates and changes. Follow-up training was offered at the Statewide MEP Workshop in June. The state Identification and Recruitment Coordinator provided ongoing technical assistance and support throughout the year. He visited local projects and reviewed their recruiting practices and documentation during the summer. All recruiters received a copy of the "Illinois Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual," which is also available online. The manual contains written procedures for documenting eligibility. The NGS data system has written procedures for entering student data. NGS data entry specialist training is offered annually at the statewide migrant workshop in June.

Proper Eligibility Determinations and Documentation Quality Controls--

State procedures require that recruiters interview families and verify all elements that determine eligibility before entering student data into the NGS. Recruiters maintain documentation to back up their recruiting activity and decisions, including: 1) a supplemental documentation form that requires additional information to support decisions about Intent to Seek Moves Temporary Work Status Principal Means of Livelihood and Interrupted Schooling, and 2) a recruiter's log. Recruiters use a COE review checklist to review the COE for completeness, accuracy, and full documentation of eligibility. Each COE is signed by the recruiter, as well as the parent guardian or self-eligible youth interviewed and is initialed by the local project reviewer.

State NGS implementation guidelines require that the completed COE be sent promptly to the statewide records office for review for accuracy completeness and full eligibility documentation. The statewide records office contacts the local program to resolve any questions. If the eligibility status cannot be resolved, SEA staff review the COE to make an eligibility determination.

State and Local Random COE Checks--

Each MEP-funded local project is required to develop a local quality control plan that includes a random check of the COEs prepared by each recruiter. This process involves a review of the document to determine its face validity and an interview with the family to ensure that the recorded information was verified. The local projects report the results of their quality control review to the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator.

The state also conducts re-interviews of randomly selected migrant families. Re-interviewers are individuals familiar with the migrant community, but not directly associated with the local project that initially determined MEP-eligibility. A committee of reviewers determines whether the information that has been gathered confirms the child's eligibility. This year one local project had one COE that could not be substantiated through the re-interview. The state informed the project of the problem and provided them with additional technical assistance to avoid a similar inaccuracy in the future.

Monitoring--

Review of eligibility documentation and student attendance records is included in the SEA monitoring of local projects.

Review of Procedures--

The SEA reviews eligibility documentation and student attendance records as part of regular monitoring results of the state and local

re-interview processes each year, and uses the results to modify the material covered in the annual recruiter training. The SEA reviews statewide recruiting efforts each year at meetings with local project directors in October, February, and June, and uses feedback to adjust recruiting procedures.

Children determined to be ineligible were removed from the NGS data and were not included in the child count.

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.

The State Quality Control Plan establishes the minimum quality control requirements of all MEP Identification and Recruitment efforts throughout the state. Controls are implemented at the state and local levels. Each MEP project develops an SEA-approved Local Quality Control Plan to specify how the requirements of the State Quality Control Plan are to be implemented locally. The State and Local Quality Control Plans each require that eligibility verifications be conducted to ensure that the Illinois MEP is recruiting eligible children only.

Summary of State and Local Quality Control Results--

Total Children Represented by Interviews: 134

Total Eligible Children Represented by Interviews: 132 (98.51%)

State-Level Procedures--

Consistent with the State Quality Control Plan, the Illinois MEP verified the eligibility of the children currently enrolled in the MEP via re-interview by an independent trained third-party. The SEA re-interview process used a standard instrument that included all items required to make an accurate migrant eligibility determination. Re-interviewers independent from the original recruiters were employed to conduct face-to-face interviews with families. Re-interviewers received training and guidance and worked under the direction of the state ID&R Coordinator. Samples were generated by randomly selecting 3 percent of the children from each project site according to its Short School Identification (SSID). A minimum of two COEs completed by every certified recruiter was evaluated; furthermore, eligibility verifications were divided as evenly as possible among a project's recruiters.

State Quality Control Results Summary--

Sample Size: 42 children

Interviews Completed (target children): 42 children (100%)

Number of Target Children Reviewed: 42

Eligibility Confirmed of Target Children: 41 (97.62%)

Number Siblings of Target Children Reviewed: 48

Eligibility Confirmed of Siblings of Target Children: 47 (97.92%)

Total Children Reviewed: 90

Eligibility Confirmed of Total Children Reviewed: 88 (97.78%)

Local Quality Control Procedures--

Local Quality Control Plans require that the eligibility of a project's COEs completed during the current program year be verified via re-interview by an independent trained third-party. A minimum of two COEs completed by every certified recruiter is evaluated; furthermore, eligibility verifications are divided as evenly as possible among a project's recruiters.

Local Quality Control Results Summary--

Sample Size: 20 COEs

COEs Examined (interview completed): 20 (100%)

Confirmed Eligibility on COEs: 20 (100%)

Children Represented by COEs (including siblings): 44

Eligible Children Represented by Interviews: 44 (100%)

Children ascertained to be ineligible were removed from the NGS data and not included in the child count. Local projects were informed of any children identified as ineligible and the local projects communicated this decision to the families who were affected.

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.

NGS data entry specialists participate in annual training and receive ongoing technical assistance throughout the year in the form of written guidelines and resource staff at the Illinois Migrant Council, who respond to questions statewide. For new families not included in the NGS, the local project contacts the statewide migrant records office to request a unique student identification number to permit entry of student data. Local project data entry specialists update information for students who already have unique student identification numbers in NGS. The statewide migrant records office reviews the NGS data entered by local projects to ensure that the NGS record matched the information collected on the COE and then sends electronic reports of discrepancies to all migrant-funded sites. Sites use this information to verify migrant student data against COEs on file and to assess identification and recruitment procedures. The Illinois Migrant Council uses these reports to provide technical assistance and design follow-up training. The SEA uses these reports to monitor child counts and the provision of services to eligible children as proposed by their local grant applications.

The Illinois MEP Quality Control Plan includes several check points for verifying that accurate migrant child eligibility data are collected. The COE must be approved by both a local COE reviewer and the state COE reviewer. The state migrant student records office reviews all COE copies using a COE Review Checklist to verify completeness, accuracy, and MEP eligibility. The office also compares COE information to that entered into the NGS data collection system. If information is incomplete or inconsistent, the office contacts the local program for correction or to follow-up with the family.

The Illinois MEP Identification and Recruitment Manual provides recruiters, reviewers, and local project administrators with written eligibility guidance, as well as quality control procedures designed for implementation at both state and local levels. COEs are completed by certified recruiters who must successfully complete annual training. A certified local reviewer, who has also successfully completed training, reviews the accuracy and completeness of all COEs. Copies of COEs are forwarded to the data entry specialist employed by the Illinois Migrant Council, who then conducts another review and compares COE information with that entered in NGS to identify any inconsistencies or missing information. Reports detailing needed information are sent to local project staff for clarification/completion/correction. A final review of all COEs is conducted by the State Reviewer. Again, a request for clarification of any incomplete or inconsistent information is sent back to local project staff for follow up.

At least bimonthly, a Unique Student Count Report by district is prepared to monitor child counts and is provided to the State ID&R Coordinator, the IMC Director of Migrant Education Services, and the State MEP Director. This report includes Category 1 and Category 2 unique student counts, as well as max enrollment counts for districts. Unique state student counts for the past 10 years are routinely shown at the end of the district report to aid in year-by-year comparisons.

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.

The State of Illinois verifies that the children included in the child count meet the eligibility criteria through ongoing substantiations by the statewide migrant records office and the SEA of COEs and by cross-checking the COEs against reports generated by NGS.

When discrepancies are identified, local programs are contacted to provide additional information and NGS data are corrected.

Efforts to continually improve the accuracy of eligibility determinations include mandated ID&R training for all recruiters in the spring, with follow-up sessions conducted at the statewide migrant education workshop in June; targeted trainings during the year; annual updates to the ID&R Manual; and provision of both telephone and onsite technical assistance, as needed.

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.

The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator provided technical assistance to the local school district that completed the one incorrect COE identified through the re-interview process. In addition, annual recruiter training will be modified to include areas of concern identified through the re-interview results, along with recruiter questions, onsite technical assistance findings, and consultations with MEP staff from other states through Illinois' participation in the ConQIR Migrant Consortium Incentive grant project.

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.

Over the past few years, Illinois has invested a great deal of time and resources in developing a solid quality control system for identification and recruitment that focuses heavily on recruiter training, ongoing technical assistance and support for recruiters, and timely review of COEs at the state and local levels. The results of the SY 2006-07 re-interview process reflect these efforts. Illinois will continue to monitor and improve the controls that are in place and to incorporate the resources developed through participation in the ConQIR Migrant Consortium Incentive grant project.

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

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