

**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**

**OHIO**



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

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

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (*NCLB*) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title IV, Part B – *21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

**PART I**

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

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

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

**PART II**

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

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2006-07 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report  For  State Formula Grant Programs  under the  Elementary And Secondary Education Act  as amended by the  No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Ohio Department of Education	
Address: 25 S. Front Street Columbus, OH 43215-4183	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Barry L. Bentley, Director, Office of Quality Assurance	
Telephone: 614-728-7851	
Fax: 614-752-1622	
e-mail: barry.bentley@ode.state.oh.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Susan T. Zelman	
_____ Signature	<u>Wednesday, March 5, 2008, 12:25:31 PM</u> Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
PART I**

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



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Plans for revision of academic content standards are being considered. A timeline has not yet been developed.

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.

Ohio is the lead state of a multi-state consortium to develop assessments of modified achievement standards. The goal is to produce tests operational in 2010-2011 school year.

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 state board of education plans to review data related to academic achievement standards three years after their adoption.

Achievement standards will need to be set for the new assessments of modified achievement standards that are expected to be operational in the 2010-2011 school year.

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.

Assessments in science have been administered to students beginning in 2005 for the Ohio Graduation Test (grade ten) and 2007 in grades five and eight.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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.

Achievement standards in science have been set for the Ohio Graduation Test at grade ten, the fifth grade test, the eighth grade test and the alternate assessments.

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	960470	955045	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1356	1347	99.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	13474	13435	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	159865	157500	98.5
Hispanic	23502	23191	98.7
White, non-Hispanic	733218	730725	99.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	144837	143082	98.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16781	16640	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	353930	350792	99.1
Migratory students	673	673	100.0
Male	493043	489763	99.3
Female	467427	465282	99.5

**Comments:** Accountability and reporting rules are somewhat different for test participation vs. test results. Thus, minor differences in statewide test counts can sometimes occur as a result of cases where a student's year end LEA is different from the LEA that was responsible for the original testing, or where passage of the test was recorded from a test administered the prior year. ODE is aware of said differences, and changes to the appropriate reporting mechanisms are in place for possible implementation by FY 2010.

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	53219	37.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	72524	50.8
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	17108	12.0
Total	142851	
<b>Comments:</b> Accountability and reporting rules are somewhat different for test participation vs. test results. Thus, minor differences in statewide test counts can sometimes occur as a result of cases where a student's year end LEA is different from the LEA that was responsible for the original testing, or where passage of the test was recorded from a test administered the prior year. ODE is aware of said differences, and changes to the appropriate reporting mechanisms are in place for possible implementation by FY 2010.		

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	965340	959990	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1373	1366	99.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	13315	13282	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	160850	158511	98.6
Hispanic	23680	23359	98.6
White, non-Hispanic	736758	734322	99.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	145636	143933	98.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16096	15976	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	357062	353942	99.1
Migratory students	712	707	99.3
Male	495441	492183	99.3
Female	469899	467807	99.6

**Comments:** Accountability and reporting rules are somewhat different for test participation vs. test results. Thus, minor differences in statewide test counts can sometimes occur as a result of cases where a student's year end LEA is different from the LEA that was responsible for the original testing, or where passage of the test was recorded from a test administered the prior year. ODE is aware of said differences, and changes to the appropriate reporting mechanisms are in place for possible implementation by FY 2010.

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	54507	37.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	72105	50.2
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	17112	11.9
Total	143724	
<p><b>Comments:</b> Accountability and reporting rules are somewhat different for test participation vs. test results. Thus, minor differences in statewide test counts can sometimes occur as a result of cases where a student's year end LEA is different from the LEA that was responsible for the original testing, or where passage of the test was recorded from a test administered the prior year. ODE is aware of said differences, and changes to the appropriate reporting mechanisms are in place for possible implementation by FY 2010.</p>		

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

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

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

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

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

#### 1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.



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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	132304	111732	84.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	192	156	81.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2115	1968	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	21614	13738	63.6
Hispanic	3744	2688	71.8
White, non-Hispanic	99485	88979	89.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	19348	12445	64.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2960	2115	71.5
Economically disadvantaged students	53465	39409	73.7
Migratory students	107	81	75.7
Male	67585	56898	84.2
Female	64719	54834	84.7
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 4203/5154 = 81.5%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	137924	107965	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	208	159	76.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2140	1878	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	22890	13124	57.3
Hispanic	4141	2588	62.5
White, non-Hispanic	103089	86167	83.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20168	11194	55.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3157	1902	60.3
Economically disadvantaged students	57002	37324	65.5
Migratory students	150	78	52.0
Male	70418	53531	76.0
Female	67506	54434	80.6
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 4049/5456 = 74.2%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	130769	99263	75.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	164	121	73.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1906	1684	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21039	10566	50.2
Hispanic	3416	2098	61.4
White, non-Hispanic	99456	81370	81.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	19880	10455	52.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2642	1601	60.6
Economically disadvantaged students	51527	31936	62.0
Migratory students	96	54	56.3
Male	67470	50713	75.2
Female	63299	48550	76.7
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 3424/4788 = 71.5%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	130610	104490	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	164	129	78.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1870	1663	88.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20975	11995	57.2
Hispanic	3362	2279	67.8
White, non-Hispanic	99452	84699	85.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	19884	11314	56.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2601	1642	63.1
Economically disadvantaged students	51439	34569	67.2
Migratory students	93	52	55.9
Male	67379	52508	77.9
Female	63231	51982	82.2
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 3725/4787 = 77.8%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	131622	80566	61.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	104	52.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1983	1651	83.3
Black, non-Hispanic	21431	6839	31.9
Hispanic	3343	1510	45.2
White, non-Hispanic	100207	68049	67.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20242	7066	34.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2439	1106	45.4
Economically disadvantaged students	50742	21751	42.9
Migratory students	111	43	38.7
Male	67539	41696	61.7
Female	64083	38870	60.7
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 2413/4459 = 54.1%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	131481	105180	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	153	76.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1944	1741	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	21394	12323	57.6
Hispanic	3295	2225	67.5
White, non-Hispanic	100192	85314	85.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20239	10486	51.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2417	1473	60.9
Economically disadvantaged students	50669	33721	66.6
Migratory students	110	60	54.6
Male	67450	52320	77.6
Female	64031	52860	82.6
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 3424/4456 = 76.8%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	135415	100144	74.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	119	64.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1894	1699	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	22363	10101	45.2
Hispanic	3266	2004	61.4
White, non-Hispanic	103501	83316	80.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20548	8683	42.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2046	1147	56.1
Economically disadvantaged students	50735	29154	57.5
Migratory students	100	57	57.0
Male	69527	51482	74.1
Female	65888	48662	73.9
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 2905/4205 = 69.1%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	135289	105131	77.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	140	75.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1861	1635	87.9
Black, non-Hispanic	22312	11862	53.2
Hispanic	3219	2008	62.4
White, non-Hispanic	103506	86329	83.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20539	10114	49.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2030	1099	54.1
Economically disadvantaged students	50655	31757	62.7
Migratory students	99	56	56.6
Male	69457	52445	75.5
Female	65832	52686	80.0
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 3157/4205 = 75.1%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	138835	98836	71.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	140	67.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1863	1661	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	23915	10764	45.0
Hispanic	3316	1866	56.3
White, non-Hispanic	105664	81838	77.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	21066	8006	38.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1934	1020	52.7
Economically disadvantaged students	51425	27739	53.9
Migratory students	94	44	46.8
Male	71588	50318	70.3
Female	67247	48518	72.2
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 2567/3870 = 66.3%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	138777	107533	77.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	208	148	71.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1834	1623	88.5
Black, non-Hispanic	23888	12531	52.5
Hispanic	3276	2062	62.9
White, non-Hispanic	105696	88225	83.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	21098	9407	44.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1920	1047	54.5
Economically disadvantaged students	51398	31787	61.8
Migratory students	93	53	57.0
Male	71554	53473	74.7
Female	67223	54060	80.4
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 2944/3875 = 76.0%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	142242	101680	71.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	115	59.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1812	1596	88.1
Black, non-Hispanic	24596	11155	45.4
Hispanic	3125	1761	56.4
White, non-Hispanic	108926	84690	77.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	21525	7682	35.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1834	953	52.0
Economically disadvantaged students	50292	27204	54.1
Migratory students	100	47	47.0
Male	73056	51622	70.7
Female	69186	50058	72.4
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 2363/3590 = 65.8%.			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	142111	113905	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	147	76.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1780	1571	88.3
Black, non-Hispanic	24565	14700	59.8
Hispanic	3096	2021	65.3
White, non-Hispanic	108892	92690	85.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	21507	9765	45.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1817	929	51.1
Economically disadvantaged students	50236	33125	65.9
Migratory students	98	44	44.9
Male	72962	56205	77.0
Female	69149	57700	83.4
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 2776/3585 = 77.4%.			

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

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	143877	116762	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	206	150	72.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1862	1705	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22549	12710	56.4
Hispanic	2982	2026	67.9
White, non-Hispanic	113496	98046	86.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20471	9124	44.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1527	887	58.1
Economically disadvantaged students	42606	27922	65.5
Migratory students	65	37	56.9
Male	73004	59402	81.4
Female	70873	57360	80.9
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 2125/2782 = 76.4%.			

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	143820	124948	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	163	78.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1853	1693	91.4
Black, non-Hispanic	22496	16418	73.0
Hispanic	2971	2221	74.8
White, non-Hispanic	113506	102088	89.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20498	10667	52.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1523	907	59.6
Economically disadvantaged students	42544	32139	75.5
Migratory students	64	42	65.6
Male	72972	61204	83.9
Female	70848	63744	90.0
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 2365/2787 = 84.9%.			

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

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

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

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

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	3840	2385	62.1
Districts	613	184	30.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	2084	1204	57.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	974	464	47.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1110	740	66.7
<b>Comments:</b> Two district-wide targeted assistance programs were not evaluated for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2006-2007. This affects two categories, "All Title I schools" and "Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools," along with each associated "Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-2007."			

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
588	168	28.6
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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



#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Ohio Department of Education through its Office of Field Relations is implementing a statewide system of support for school improvement services. The primary focus of the system is to support district leadership to build the capacity to help their low performing schools improve.

The system is deployed through 12 Regional School Improvement Teams. These teams identify strategic and focused support for district leaders by:

- Further analyzing the raw data that resulted in the August 2007 Report Card results to determine specific academic needs including the performance of subgroups;
- Creating district profiles of priority districts and their low performing schools using information from discussion with the district leadership team and a review of district accountability data;
- Creating a plan for each service delivery area to provide professional development and technical assistance targeted first to priority districts; and
- Deploying services and evaluating their effectiveness.

During the 2007-08 school year technical assistance based on student performance data is deployed strategically to those districts most in need prioritized as follows:

- Districts with buildings in School Improvement Status (SIS);
- Districts with buildings in At Risk Status or SI Delay status;
- Districts with buildings that met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two years and have recently exited School Improvement status; and
- Districts in Improvement Status Academic Watch or Academic Emergency (not already identified in the other priority areas).

Resources provided to districts to support their schools include the services of a regional school improvement facilitator (RSIF). RSIFs as members of the Regional School Improvement Team assist district leadership in developing and implementing their district and school improvement plans. For districts with low performing schools RSIFs help district and school leadership align their improvement efforts. Additionally other state products programs and services are strategically targeted to those districts to support their low performing schools. For example state professional development training in reading instruction is targeted to the following:

- Helping district and school leadership in understanding the initiative and the role that leadership plays to support teachers in using the information to improve classroom practice; and
- Assuring a critical mass of educators in those schools participate in the initiatives to assure that there is an ongoing professional dialogue that extends beyond the training with a resulting impact on educator practice and ultimately student achievement.

Additionally Title I served schools identified for improvement are eligible for targeted Title I school improvement funds. Those schools are to employ academic coaches (educational leaders) who are employed by the district through an entity other than the district to work with internal Building Coaches building staff and building leadership to increase ongoing capacity to implement standards-based education. Building coaches work with district coaches to ensure efforts at the building and district are aligned.

We are also piloting 54 Math Specialists (now in year two) in buildings that are in Title I served and SI status in Math according to the latest Local Report Card. These Specialists receive intensive technical assistance from Ohio State University to develop the district's capacity to deliver high quality instruction in mathematics. They then coach the other math teachers in their buildings to increase the collective content and instructional knowledge of all teachers in the area of mathematics.

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

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	66
Extension of the school year or school day	7
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	17
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	39
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	63
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	54
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	1
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	1
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	31
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Office of Field Relations collaborates with offices throughout the Ohio Department of Education and regional providers to coordinate a Statewide System of School Improvement Support founded on the principle of building a district's capacity to plan and implement school improvement processes. By working with district and instructional leaders the system assists districts in learning how to work better with school leadership to increase student achievement for all students while closing achievement gaps. Using a Tri-Tiered service delivery model ODE provides aligned resources information tools professional development and technical assistance to all districts with greater intensity focused on the lowest-performing districts (e.g. the 160 Districts in DI status and/or Districts with Buildings in SI status).

Rather than providing services as part of the district's team members of the state's 12 Regional School Improvement Teams (RSITs) act as partners to improve and leverage existing services in support of the district's improvement plan. RSIT members are selected based on experience demonstrated success with school improvement support and knowledge about the six key elements of school improvement process: data analysis; focused planning; research-based best practices; high-quality professional development; resource management; and implementation and monitoring.

Through the Tri-Tiered model the RSITs help districts close achievement gaps in reading math and sub-group performance by providing High Quality Technical Assistance to district and instructional leaders based on district data. Tier 1 -- Intensive Services -- Frequent and intensive coaching of districts with schools and districts in improvement status to develop the capacity for planning and implementing school improvement processes. Tier 2 -- Targeted Services -- periodic assistance to develop district capacity to plan and implement school improvement processes for districts and schools in "At Risk" status. Tier 3 -- Universal Access -- Provision of access to select products and programs to build regional capacity to plan and implement school improvement processes.

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

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

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	23
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	18
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	12
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

**1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations**

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

	<b>Districts</b>	<b>Schools</b>
Final AYP and identification determinations	08/14/07	08/14/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)		
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

**1.4.7 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.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	5	0
Schools	18	7
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	08/06/07
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

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 following criteria will be used to determine the State's priorities:

-Serve the lowest-achieving schools;

-Demonstrate the greatest need for school improvement funds; and

-Demonstrate the strongest commitment to ensuring the funds will enable the lowest achieving schools to meet the progress goals included in their school improvement plans under section 1116(b)(3)(A)(v).

The formula used to distribute funds includes:

-1 point for each building in any school improvement status

-0.1 point for each 10 non-proficient students in the district

-1 point for each percentage point of non-proficient students in the district aggregate

-The state will fund a minimum of 75% of all school improvement schools in the selected districts.

The purpose of the funds is to improve the quality of instruction. They could fund coaches supported by the ODE literacy and/or math initiative. They could fund experienced internal coaches who already demonstrate high qualifications in the content areas and in coaching. They could fund the implementation of research based programs and strategies to improve instruction. The funds cannot be used to reduce class size.

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	225
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	227
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	175595
Who applied to transfer	
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	2133

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	Yes <u>    </u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	No Response <u>    </u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No Response <u>    </u>
<b>Comments:</b> The number of students who applied to transfer is not available.	

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

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

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 989425
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	48
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.<sup>3</sup>
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

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

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

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	225
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

#### FAQ about supplemental education services

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

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	110182
Who applied for supplemental educational services	
Who received supplemental educational services	11927
<b>Comments:</b> The number of students who applied for supplemental educational services is not available.	

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	\$ 15805688
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*.

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	546054	526681	96.5	19373	3.5
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	85885	76892	89.5	8993	10.5
Low-poverty schools	89360	88659	99.2	701	0.8
All elementary schools	274884	266804	97.1	8080	2.9
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	38827	33876	87.2	4951	12.8
Low-poverty schools	64827	64055	98.8	772	1.2
All secondary schools	271170	259877	95.8	11293	4.2
<b>Comments:</b>					

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state uses a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times once for each core subject area taught.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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	65.9
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	16.7
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.1
Other (please explain)	7.4
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)	43.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	33.7
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	13.1
Other (please explain)	9.9
Total	100.0
<b>Comments:</b> Other: Elementary school classes taught by teachers not properly certified; Secondary school classes taught by teachers not properly certified.	

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

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	<b>High-Poverty Schools</b> (more than what %)	<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b> (less than what %)
Elementary schools	55.3	19.8
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantage	
Secondary schools	45.2	14.0
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantage	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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



**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
6	Dual language	Spanish	60.0	40.0
1	Two-way immersion	French	60.0	40.0
9	Transitional bilingual	Spanish	70.0	30.0
2	Developmental bilingual	Spanish	60.0	40.0
1	Heritage language	Spanish	75.0	25.0
30	Sheltered English instruction			
22	Structured English immersion			
21	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
40	Content-based ESL			
84	Pull-out ESL			
10	Other (explain)			

**Comments:** Other programs include the following:

-Individualized and/or small group instruction within the classroom - 7

-Individual classroom coaching, including short-term native language support as needed for newcomers - 2

-Newcomer Programs (Welcome Centers) -1

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

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

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data****1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	27616
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

**1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	14155
Somali	3484
Arabic	1960
Japanese	1043
German	980

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

**Comments:** Russian 715; Vietnamese 655; Ukrainian 569; Korean 566; Serb-Croat 384

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

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

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

#### 1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

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

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

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

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

##### Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

<b>ALL LEP Testing Status</b>	<b>#</b>
Tested/State annual ELP	27039
Not tested/State annual ELP	8365
Subtotal	35402
LEP/One Data Point	10173
<b>Comments:</b> LEP students not tested include those students whose parents refused to have their children tested, those students who for some reason took only part(s) of the test and those students who were classified as "proficient-trial mainstream." Under previous state guidelines, LEP students in the proficient-trial mainstream category were assessed via other measures rather than through the ELP test (this state policy has been changed so that all LEP students are now required to take the state ELP test).	

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

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:**

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

<b>Title III LEP Testing Status</b>	<b>#</b>
Tested/State annual ELP	22797
Not tested/State annual ELP	4819
Subtotal	27616
LEP/One Data Point	7491
<b>Comments:</b> LEP students not tested include those students whose parents refused to have their children tested, those students who for some reason took only part(s) of the test and those students who were classified as "proficient-trial mainstream." Under previous state guidelines, LEP students in the proficient-trial mainstream category were assessed via other measures rather than through the ELP test (this state policy has been changed so that all LEP students are now required to take the state ELP test).	

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

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

**1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	52.9	6264	37.1	N
No progress		10602		
ELP attainment	80.0	656	22.8	N

**Comments:** Due to changes made in Ohio's data system in 2006-2007, a number of LEAs may have under reported the number of LEP students in the ELP attainment category. The Ohio SEA will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs to insure accurate data reporting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility**

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

	#
Total MFLEP	616
MFLEP/AYP grades	416
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

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

Grade	#
LEP K-2	11977
LEP HS/Non-AYP	4755
LEP other grades	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

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

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b> Ohio allows native language accommodations only for LEP students who have been enrolled in U.S. schools for less than three years and are at the "beginning" or "intermediate" level in both reading and writing in the English language proficiency test most recently administered. Native language accommodations that are allowed include oral translation of allowable parts of the test and a Spanish bilingual printed form of the test (in grades 3-8). Ohio does not provide a native language translation of the content of the language arts tests (reading).	

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	Spanish, Somali, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin
4	Spanish, Somali, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin
5	Spanish, Somali, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin
6	Spanish, Somali, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin
7	Spanish, Somali, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin
8	Spanish, Somali, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin
HS	Spanish, Somali, Japanese, Arabic, Mandarin
<b>Comments:</b> In addition to a written translation of the test content in mathematics (for grades 3-8 only), the Ohio SEA has developed oral translations of the test content in mathematics on CDs for the above indicated languages in the indicated grade levels. For eligible LEP students who speak languages other than those provided on native language CDs, districts may request that an oral translator translate allowable parts of the tests.	

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	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
HS	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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



#### 1.6.3.5.4 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
2402	1020	42.5
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* 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
0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* 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
218	406	624
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
402	321	79.9	

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

**Comments:**

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

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
406	360	88.7	

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	106
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	25
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	30
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	3
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	8
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	19
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	38
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	5
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	16
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	27
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	3
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	26
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	
<b>Comments:</b> As communicated previously to the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Ohio has not been able to accurately and completely make AMAO determinations prior to 2006-2007 due to challenges relating to data collection and analysis, as well as due to the time it has taken for Ohio to develop and put into place a common statewide ELP annual assessment. For this reason, determinations can not be made regarding number of grantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years. As agreed with ED, Ohio will make all required AMAO determinations for the 2006-2007 school year and thereafter.	

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

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

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

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
11606	6379	40

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.	1203
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.	554
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	409

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	82	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	74	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	61	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	38	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	38	
Other (Explain in comment box)	13	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	71	3853
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	76	1337
PD provided to principals	55	852
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	48	485
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	40	741
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	16	207
Total		7475
<p><b>Comments:</b> Other content addressed in professional development activities include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Intake procedures for newly enrolled LEP students</li> <li>-Understanding and addressing diverse cultural backgrounds of LEP students and their families</li> <li>-Strategies for involving parents of LEP students in the educational progress of their children</li> </ul>		

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	07/15/06	14
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

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

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES**

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	86.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	71.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	69.0
Hispanic	73.8
White, non-Hispanic	89.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	83.6
Limited English proficient	77.2
Economically disadvantaged	75.0
Migratory students	78.6
Male	84.3
Female	88.0
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial = 79.0%.	

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.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	4.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.8
Black, non-Hispanic	10.0
Hispanic	8.3
White, non-Hispanic	2.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3.6
Limited English proficient	6.2
Economically disadvantaged	7.3
Migratory students	3.7
Male	4.5
Female	3.7
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial = 7.1%.	

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	1071	1071
LEAs with subgrants	20	20
Total	1091	1091
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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



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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	<N	484
K	292	845
1	293	840
2	286	827
3	277	831
4	229	726
5	241	710
6	215	728
7	217	763
8	185	814
9	510	1110
10	255	607
11	162	416
12	230	379
Ungraded	<N	100
Total	3398	10180
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

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

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	328	5696
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1999	3407
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	883	821
Hotels/Motels	188	256
Total	3398	10180
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

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

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	484
K	845
1	840
2	827
3	831
4	726
5	710
6	728
7	763
8	814
9	1110
10	607
11	416
12	379
Ungraded	100
Total	10180
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	458
Migratory children/youth	<N
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1325
Limit English proficient students	139
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	10
2. School Selection	8
3. Transportation	12
4. School records	10
5. Immunizations	7
6. Other medical records	5
7. Other Barriers	7
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	661	334
4	547	263
5	516	247
6	529	199
7	677	312
8	570	254
High School	667	457
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	575	339
4	528	231
5	526	118
6	520	195
7	668	254
8	571	209
High School	758	401
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

**1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS**

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

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

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

**FAQs on Child Count:**

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

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	408
K	231
1	167
2	171
3	166
4	148
5	127
6	132
7	116
8	121
9	123
10	107
11	64
12	37
Ungraded	11
Out-of-school	1109
Total	3238
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

Category 1 decreased 14% from the previous year. We have continued to experience this downward slope since 2003. This trend is attributed to a decline in migrant families with school-age children returning to Ohio and a rise in adult single male workers who do not qualify for the migrant education programs. Another variable is farmers who are electing to grow more traditional crops like corn and soy beans as opposed to crops that require contracting migrant workers which is causing many migrant camps to close down permanently.

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

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

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	117
K	149
1	88
2	101
3	95
4	70
5	80
6	62
7	47
8	50
9	38
10	38
11	19
12	<N
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	245
Total	1209
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

Category 2 decreased 12% from the previous year. We have continued to experience this downward slope since 2003. This trend is attributed to a decline in migrant families with school-age children returning to Ohio and a rise in adult single male workers who do not qualify for the migrant education programs. Another variable is farmers who are electing to grow more traditional crops like corn and soy beans as opposed to crops that require contracting migrant workers which is causing many migrant camps to close down permanently.

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.

The 2006-2007 Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count were generated using the Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2). OMSIS2 is a client/server management information system utilizing the Filemaker suite of hosted database tools. OMSIS2 is developed and maintained by TRECA a non-profit entity providing K-12 educational technology services through a consortium of Ohio public school districts.

Ohio also participates in the NGS consortium. Unique student identifier numbers assigned to newly identified children are provided by NGS. This way students identified in Ohio or any other NGS consortium member state can be assigned their unique NGS USID number within Ohio's database. All Ohio Migrant Education historical data is thereby correlated based upon the USID number with every NGS consortium member state and the student's complete migratory history and credit accrual history can be collected and made available online. During the Category 1 and Category 2 counts NGS is sometimes used as a reference source.

The system used to report last year's counts was different. The Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS1) was a Windows-based, client/server database system incorporating a custom-developed Visual Basic client connecting each workstation to a Microsoft Access backend database hosted on a Windows server. Most reports were produced using Access reporting tools, while most data entry and review was conducted through the Visual Basic client. Other Windows-based automation, including remotely-triggered batch file processing and 3rd-party VB extensions, were also incorporated into OMSIS1. The 2006-2007 Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count were generated using the new OMSIS2 system. OMSIS2 is a client/server management information system utilizing the Filemaker suite of hosted database tools. Both OMSIS1 and OMSIS2 were developed and maintained by TRECA, a non-profit entity providing K-12 educational technology services through a consortium of Ohio public school districts.

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.

On the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) the following information is gathered: SECTION I Parent Data & Residence - parent's/guardian's name race home language Ohio current address home base address and home base school district. SECTION II Student Data -children's names sex birth date birthplace grade level and USID number date arrived in Ohio and date arrived in school district. SECTION III Eligibility Data - former address new address QAD reason for moving qualifying activity and description/type of agricultural work in which household members are engaged. SECTION IV Comments - eligibility/ educational. All LEA programs are required to fill out attendance forms and transfer documents on every eligible child that is served for their summer and fall programs. This information has the number of days enrolled and present as well as all education information which includes reading skills math skills and English proficiency level. Secondary credit information forms are also required for all 7th through 12th graders. This information includes classes and credit hours in which the student participated. After these forms are completed the records coordinator and data entry specialist check to make sure that the forms are completed and the information is inputted into OMSIS2.

Eligibility data specifically Residency Date QAD Qualifying Activity and PMOL are secured by the recruiters at the time of face-to-face interview and recorded on a COE. The COE is then sent by the Local Education Agency to the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC). Quality control procedures are conducted at OMEC to ensure the completion and correctness of the written eligibility information before data entry. Teachers provide our Records Clerk with student enrollment and participation data for our on-site and in-home summer-term programs. This information is then submitted to OMEC for data entry and record storage.

Recruiters are responsible for the completion of the Certificate of Eligibility through a personal interview with the child's family. This data is collected generally beginning in May and ending in November for Ohio's seasonal qualifying work e.g. a variety of vegetables fruits processing plants greenhouses. The data are collected on a year-round basis for non-traditional agricultural work such as poultry farms and meat processing plants. Summer programs are held during the period of time between end of school in the spring and when it starts school in the fall. This varies slightly from district to district. Programs are running from June to August. Our year-round and fall programs are held in districts during the school year as appropriate for their migrant populations.

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.

OMEC enters data into OMSIS2 from the original COE documents Comprehensive Needs Assessment forms advocacy forms verification forms transfer documents and secondary credit forms at the State Ohio Migrant Education Center. COEs first go through an extensive quality control in which the Identification and Recruitment coordinator signs stating that the COE is complete and accurate. The OMSIS2 interface provides fault tolerance during multiple-user access and also provides extensive error checking at the time of input. Student information is updated as soon as the transfer records and secondary credit information is received from the LEA programs. Every year verification forms are run for each district to make sure that the students current address qualifying arrival date parents' names residency dates are accurate. If there are any changes the data entry staff at the Ohio Migrant Education Center makes the corrections by going into the student edit table in OMSIS2 to ensure accuracy.

OMSIS2 incorporates a FileMaker Pro client interface and a backend database hosted using Filemaker Server. This not only affords programmatic record locking control but also reduces the possibility of a simple clerical error causing major data loss. Some mass update capabilities exist including up to six siblings on a single COE update for example. Multiple immunization records can also be simultaneously input for a child and a number of time saving queries designed specifically around the data entry methods in use at OMEC are built into OMSIS2 to enhance OMEC's productivity by allowing for point-and-click field population.

When students are identified in Ohio for the first time OMEC staff first checks the NGS system to see if they have been identified elsewhere. If they have then Ohio uses the student's existing USID number as shown in the NGS system. This check of the NGS system is accomplished using the worldwide web and NGS' password-protected system. A USID number is created on the NGS system if no number exists for a given student. If NGS has a number that number is used. In all cases the number either in or assigned for students through the NGS system is the only number used in Ohio's database for students. When students are first

identified and entered into the database they are all Category I students. They are not counted in Category II unless they also are eligible for and receive funded summer services.

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 Category 2 count only differs from the Category 1 count by which backend database tables are required to produce accurate and complete numbers. The Category 2 count references additional tables.

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.

A query is run against the data base described above for category I students.) It identifies those students between ages 3 and 21 (as shown by the Student Identification Table) that have made a qualifying move within the past 36 months (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table) and have had a third birthday before the end date of the program in which they participated (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table the Student Identification Table and the Supplemental Program Information Table) or before the end of their residency in Ohio (we may reference an older sibling's enrollment information to determine this third criterion). Another query is run for the Category II students that includes all of the above but additionally has a summer service indicator. The fields used to run this particular query are SID.USID SID. LastName SID. FirstName ED.USID SID.DeseasedDate SID.GraduationDate SID. SID.BithDate ED. LastQualifyingMove ED.Enrollmentdate ED.WithdrawalDate ED.OhioArrivalDate and several flag fields that serve to exclude specific instances for example children who turn 3 during the school year but for whom no Ohio residency can be guaranteed except at the age of two. The database administrator or the administrator's representative at the Ohio Migrant Education Center executes these queries and updates a series of flags in a specific order. Each September a home visit is made to each student for whom a valid COE exists to determine if the student is still resident in the state. This verification date is added to our database. It will serve as an indication that the student is eligible to be included in category I for the new program year. All students added through a new COE during the program year are additionally counted as previously described.

Summer program students are flagged in the student information table. A query is run against this data that lists all students served during the summer. These students are served in one or more of the following ways: district site-based summer programs in-home instruction ESL programs health fair participation. Recorded participation in a funding-eligible instructional service during the Summer/Intersession period is required and must documented before an indicator can be updated in OMSIS2 that triggers the counting of a particular child. This is verified when the queries used in the child counts screen by the date of the services provided. If the date shown for the service does not fall during the designated summer period being counted then it will not qualify a child to be counted. Each child counted always has at least one qualifying service for which has been documented a qualifying date. Services provided to children whose eligibility has just expired may be reported at the local level but quality control procedures at the Ohio Migrant Education Center are in place to exclude these records from being entered into OMSIS2 or in a few cases entered with a 'N' in the funding flag field. Therefore non-funded services provided to these children will not be inadvertently counted as funded.

Every student has a unique USID number that insures the child is only counted once. "New" students are checked out carefully in two different databases - the Ohio (OMSIS2) database and the Texas (NGS) database - to ensure that they have not already been assigned a different USID number. This is part of the quality control at the Ohio Migrant Education Center. Some of the quality-control criteria used to ensure the unique identity of a "new" child include: surname parent/guardian first names alternate spellings of surnames migratory histories of families with similar names and date of birth. If the child is determined to be a valid "new" child by these criteria then the OMEC staff enters the child into the NGS database which assigns the USID and Ohio uses this USID as an aid to its primary identifier in OMSIS2 as well.

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 two counts are generated using the same system except for the particular differences already mentioned in the preceding section.

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 following quality control procedures are used to review and ensure the accuracy of written eligibility information. The Ohio Department of Education Ohio Migrant Education Center and local migrant education projects assure accuracy. A standard COE that conforms to Federal guidelines is used statewide in Ohio. Recruiters directors and clerks are trained on completion of the form at our annual recruitment conference. Quality control is assured at the local district level through a process that requires directors to review and sign each COE for students from their district. Once the COE flows to the Ohio Migrant Education Center the state recruitment coordinator and the state records transfer coordinator again review the COE for correctness and completeness. The COE is entered into the database only after each of these people has approved it.

LEA recruiters transfer record clerks and project directors receive periodic updates on assistance procedures and guidelines for Identification and Recruitment. An annual recruitment conference is held each spring that provides an in-depth instruction on COE completion. Other meetings are called as needed. All recruiters receive a detailed handbook that provides them with eligibility criteria and COE completion guidance.

All state personnel are trained in interviewing migrant families and recording all eligibility data on a standard COE form. Recruiters and Clerks receive mandated extensive training and training manual in the completion of the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) in following areas:

- a. The eligibility criteria
- b. Interview procedures
- c. Monitoring for accountability
- d. The role of the recruiter

The COE is the primary tool for collecting the data that certifies the children to qualify for migrant services. Once completed and checked for accuracy information from the form is entered into the state database and becomes the basis for Category I identification. COE are checked for accuracy by LEA transfer record clerks as well as project directors before it is turned into the Ohio Migrant Education Center by checking past verification forms for eligibility student records and verifying birth dates on the NGS system. The identification and recruitment coordinator also signs that quality control is done on the COE before it is checked for complete accuracy and inputted into the Ohio Data Base system. If a discrepancy occurs when it is received into the Records Office the coordinator will then ask the identification and recruitment coordinator to contact the recruiter to revisit the family.

Recruiters and LEA transfer record clerks review COEs for accuracy and completeness. COE are then reviewed and co-signed by the project Directors before sending them to the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator at the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC) who checks forms for quality control. COE are then passed on for data entry and storage of information. All questionable COE are returned to the district and then to recruiters for further explanation documentation and/or completion.

Recruiters resolve complex and questionable information on the COE forms by consulting the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and the State Transfer Record Coordinator for answers to eligibility questions issues of Principal Means of Livelihood and other needed technical Assistance.

Ohio's MEP State Director provides assistance to questions requiring interpretation of Federal/State laws regulations or policies.

The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator periodically evaluates the effectiveness of quality control and revises procedures if necessary to assure effective systems operation. Information from the National Recruitment Conference and from sessions at the National Migrant Conference as well as pertinent memos and regulations are reviewed annually and used to update quality control as well as other identification and recruitment issues.

The final quality Control of all COEs is made at the Ohio Migrant Education Center. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and Records Coordinator review all data to ensure correctness of the written eligibility information. If there are any discrepancies on the student record the LEA migrant staff will be contacted immediately. The recruiter will revisit the family to secure the proper legal information and return it to OMEC for final processing.

Once quality control procedures have been completed as indicated above the records transfer coordinator enters the record into the

database. This is the final process in the COE data acquisition process.

The Identification and Recruitment coordinator is responsible for a yearly review and update of quality control and COE completion procedures. These procedures are documented in our Identification and Recruitment Manual. Personnel are provided training at our annual spring recruitment conference on how to review summer site records input data and run reports.

Ohio did not implement re-interview procedures similar to the one states were required to do in 2005, but the SEA does review eligibility documentation as part of monitoring. Ohio has a few migratory activities specific to the state as well as predictable migratory trends and patterns. The SEA uses this knowledge to identify certain irregularities in eligibility determinations. Based on these irregularities, the SEA will conduct an inquiry into every case that seems irregular. A re-interview of the family is sometimes required by the State ID&R Coordinator to make certain that a proper determination has been made. If children are found to be ineligible, migrant educational services are immediately discontinued and the child(ren) removed from the state count. The recruiter who made the incorrect eligibility determination receives additional training and follow-up, and the incident is used as a case study for future recruiter state trainings.

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.

Approximately 5% of all recruiter COEs during the reporting year were re-interviewed. No errors were found in the re-interview initiative.

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.

Verification forms are printed annually and submitted to LEAs in the fall of each year to verify whether or not students are still here for the new program year Category I count. Directors verify demographic data accuracy use these same lists. Lists are returned to OMEC for data base update when completed. Individual files are pulled at random during the winter months to review them for accuracy.

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.

A set of preparatory queries is run before the performance report queries are run. Preparatory queries are used to search each field for potentially bad data such as a Grade Level of "P7" instead of "07" and anything that is the wrong length or outside of the normal range. If an incorrect value is found the correct value is then input into the Ohio Data Base System. One query uses Grade-Level as its criteria for dividing students in the chart while another uses only birthdates. If the two counts of summer eligible disagree then an error must exist in either a Birth date field or a GradeLevel field. These two crosscheck queries often find a 3-year-old who was reported as 2 year-old or vice versa. This is typically the very last check for us before all of the final query numbers are generated.

Duplications are eliminated by self-imposed auditing procedures that use "Find Duplicates" queries that are run against the resulting set of US ID numbers. These audit queries reveal any student who is being duplicated in any count for any reason.

A general example of the "Find Duplicates" query as written in Structured Query Language (SQL) is:

```
SELECT DISTINCTROW First ([21-SummerCountParticipantsEligible]. USID) AS [USID Field] Count (Perf2002-21SummerCountParticipantsEligible. USID) AS NumberOfDups
```

FROM [21-SummerCountParticipantsEligible]

GROUP BY [21-SummerCountParticipantsEligible]. USID

HAVING (Count ([21-SummerCountParticipantsEligible].USID))>1));

In this example the record set being searched for duplicates is "21-SummerCountParticipantsEligible" in the above query. This is the name of the Category 2 child count final query. Any base query name however can be plugged in to the above query. Doing so immediately will reveal any duplicate USID numbers that may appear in its final record set allowing for the data to be corrected for that record. Usually there are no duplicate records and the "Find Duplicates" query will verify this by returning an empty set. But if a duplicate is found then the "Find Duplicates" query will return the USID number. This allows ODE to look at that student's records find the problem make the correction and run the child count query again to make sure that our child count has been reduced to the accurate number.

If a duplicate is found the error causing it is pinpointed and steps are taken to locate and examine all records that might be likely to contain a similar error. This is accomplished by writing spot-check SQL queries.

The State Migrant Education Director collects all data from the Queries listed in this document and reviews them for accuracy reasonableness and completeness. OMEC additionally provides the State Director with numbers from the previous years for Identification and Recruitment and services provided broken out by counties as identified and served. The director is thereby able to compare data from previous years as the state performance report is completed.

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 SEA will continue its aggressive monitoring of the state Identification and Recruitment efforts to ensure proper determination of migrant eligibility.

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.

There are no concerns.

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

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