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

PUERTO RICO

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
__X__Part I, 2006-07   ___Part II, 2006-07

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
PUERTO RICO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Address:
PO BOX 190759
SAN JUAN PR 00919

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Mayra I. Sierra Sierra

Telephone: 787-759-8910

Fax: 787-751-6192

e-mail: sierra_ma@de.gobierno.pr

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
RAFAEL ARAGUNDE TORRES

_____   _Friday, March 7, 2008, 5:07:59 PM_
     Signature   Date

We are ammending the CSPR Part I to include the school improvement list to school year 2005-2006.

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The PRDE began drafting its standards in 1996 as reflected in its circular letter #1995-96 GENERAL DISPOSITIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STANDARDS OF EXCELENCE IN THE REGULAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS. Two major revisions have taken place in the years 2000 and 2006. The achievement and assessment standards were incorporated during the revision of the standards in the year 2000. The academic content and grade level expectations were developed and disseminated in the year 2006 for all academic content courses (Spanish, English, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Early Childhood, Fine Arts, Health, Physical Education and Library Services).

The documents disseminated included the competencies that each student needed to master in each class and grade level, which were aligned to the 2000 academic standards. These grade level expectations were prepared with the technical assistance of Dr. Norman L. Webb and correspond to the four academic programs that respond to the Prueba Puertorriqueña de Aprovechamiento Académico (PPAA)standardized test. Further revision of the 2000 academic standards was conducted during the summer of 2007, which also included the content and grade level expectations from 2006. The following criteria were identified in these documents: Rigor, Clarity, Specificity, Precise Language, Vertical Alignment and Horizontal Alignment.

This revision shows the grade and content expectations or competencies grade by grade and totally aligned with their corresponding standard. The revision included all the academic areas. The standards for the four programs that respond to the PPAA standardized test (Mathematic, Spanish, English and Science) were revised taking in consideration Dr. Norman L. Webb's observations from December 2005.

The PPAA standardized test was designed to systemically evaluate PRDE student academic achievement and to comply with the NCLB 2001 Academic Achievement and Academic Assessment Standards Requirements. The 2000 academic standards was the basis of the PPAA standardized test development. These standards had been developed by academic levels and needed to be converted to grade levels. The previous USDE Peer Review Process identified the need to align a number of documents; including the academic standards established by level and the learning/achievement expectations which were established by grade. This work needed to take into account the alignment study conducted by Dr. Norman Webb. In addition, a number of activities needed to be performed to address the discrepancies identified on the alignment study. Evidence was also collected of the work conducted in the revision of the levels of knowledge of the items used in the PPAA in light of the academic content standards; to ensure that the knowledge and skills within the standards were included in the state assessment. In addition the ongoing effort to maintain and guarantee the alignment process was also documented.

A plan was developed by programmatic area to align the academic standards by the level measured in the assessment with the grade level expectations as recommended by Dr. Norman Webb's alignment study and the Educational Testing Service, the company responsible for the development of the assessment to the alignment study.

Dr. Norman Webb recommended that a plan be developed by programmatic area to align the assessment of the academic standards which were developed by levels; with the grade level expectations. The alignment process included ample representation from experts in the field. Therefore, teachers and supervisors from the various content areas tested in the standardized assessment participated in the revision and provided their expertise.

In order to comply with the findings related to the alignment of the items of the PPAA standardized test; the PRDE organized a work session with the teachers that would be responsible for producing the new items for the test. The PRDE also contracted the services of Pearson Educational Measurement (PEM) to oversee the creation of the items. A team of Puerto Rican Math, English as a Second Language and Spanish teachers, created new items for grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11 and Science teachers created new items for grades 4, 8 and 11. Program Directors revised and created descriptors for the tests and revised the content level of the items to ensure an adequate balance.

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 <u>not</u> 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.

Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) has developed an assessment system to measure student achievement, the Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento Académico (PPAA). The PPAA is aligned to PRDE`s Academic Standards of Excellence and is designed to measure student achievement in Spanish, Mathematics, English as a second Language, and Science (grades 4, 8, and 11). The PPAA is administered annually to students in grades 3-8 and grade 11 consistent with the requirements of No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, P.L. 107-110, H. R. 1 (107th Cong. 2001) ("NCLB"). NCLB also requires all students to be tested in Science at least once in grades three through five, six through nine, and ten through twelve, by school year 2007 -2008.

During the school year 2006-2007 PRDE conducted the administration of operational forms for Spanish, Math and ESL for grades 3-8, 11 and the administration of operational forms for science in grades 4, 8 and 11. On April 17 -23, 2007, the PPAA assessments in Spanish, Mathematics, and English as a Second Language (ESL) were administered to all eligible public school students in grades 3-8 and 11. The Spanish and Mathematics tests were administered in two 45-minute sessions. The ESL tests were administered in two 45-minute sessions and one 60-minute session. This was the fourth operational administration of the PPAA in grades 3, 6, 8, and 11 and the third in grades 4, 5, and 7. The purpose of the operational test was: 1) to fulfill the accountability requirements of NCLB; and 2) to provide feedback about student learning as related to the Puerto Rico Content Standards. Field test forms in Spanish, Mathematics, ESL and Science were administered on April 23, 2007. The primary purpose of the field test was to collect student response data on a large set of newly developed items to enable construction of future 60-item operational forms of the PPAA.

There is an alternate assessment the Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Evaluación Alterna (PPEA) for students with severe cognitive disabilities. The Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Evaluación Alterna (PPEA) were developed in 2005. The PPEA has one portfolio assessment per content area. The PRDE developed alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in Spanish, English as a second Language and Mathematics. Alternate assessment like the PPEA are designed to measure the performance of students with significant cognitive disabilities who are unable to participate in the general education assessment used by districts and states (even with special accommodations) as determined by the individual student's IEP team. Participants in the PPEA comprise approximately 1% of the total tested student population. It is mandatory that students with disabilities participate in either the PPAA or PPEA. Each student IEP team decides which assessment is appropriate for the individual student.

Eligible students participate in the PPEA in grades 3-8, and 11. To determine the grade level of a student for the purpose of accountability in the state assessment program, the PRDE procedure is to use the age appropriate grade for the student as of September 1st of the calendar year. The number of students that participated in the current administration of the PPEA was 1,931.

Test Content

The Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento Académico (PPAA) is a standards-based, criterion-referenced assessment system designed to monitor the academic progress of Puerto Rico students as mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Currently, the PPPA evaluates students in grades 3-8 and 11 in the subjects of Spanish, Mathematics, and English as a Second Language (ESL). Science was assessed operationally in grades 4, 8 and 11 on April 2007.

PPAA- Spanish

The PPAA test for Spanish is a paper- based multiple choice exams given in grades 3-8 and 11. On the test, students respond to questions. They answer questions about concepts and skills in four different Spanish strands: (1) Oral and Written Communication ; (2) Auditory Discrimination, Reading and Observation; (3) Research and Technology; and (4) Ethics, Esthetics and Culture. The number of Ãtems by strand varies by grade, however all tests are comprised of 60 questions. Test questions are in multiple - choice. The test is administered island wide on one specific day with make up days available for students who are absent.

PPAA - Mathematics

The PPAA test for Mathematics is a paper-based multiple choice exam given in grades 3-8 and 11. On the test, students respond to questions. They answer questions about concepts and skill in different Mathematics strands: (1) Numerals and Operation; (2) Algebra; (3) Geometry; (4) Measurement; and (5) Data Analysis and Probability. The number of items by strand varies by grade, however all tests are comprised of 60 questions. Test questions are in multiple - choice. The test is administered island wide on one specific day with make up days available for students who are absent.

PPAA - English as a Second Language

The PPAA test for English as a Second Language is a paper- based multiple choice exam given in grades 3-8 and 11. On the test, students respond to questions. They answer questions about concepts and skills in four different English as a Second Language strands: (1) Oral Communication; (2) Written Communication; (3) Reading Comprehension; and (4) Literary Appreciation. The number of items by strand varies by grade, however all tests are comprised of 60 questions. There are no questions specifically related to Literary Appreciation as this strand is incorporated into questions covering the other strands. The tests questions are in multiple - choice. The test is administered island wide one specific day with make up days available for students who are absent.

A revision was also conducted to align the grade level expectations and competencies with the achievement standards in the four areas covered by the PPAA standardized test, namely English, Spanish, Math and Science. This revision was conducted parallel to the revision of the academic content standards and incorporated experts in the various academic areas. This revision process began in 2000 and continued throughout 2006-2007. The latest outcomes on this initiative were informed as part of the outstanding issues of the previous PRDE Peer Review.

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.

Math

The Puerto Rico standards for mathematics have been designed to achieve a balance among concepts, skills, and problem solving. The curriculum stresses rigorous concept development, presents realistic and relevant tasks, and keeps a strong emphasis on computational skills. At all grades, the curriculum encourages students to reason mathematically, to evaluate mathematical arguments both formally and informally, to use the language of mathematics to communicate ideas and information precisely, and to make connections among mathematical topics and to other disciplines. The development of Math Standards was led by a Mathematics Advisory Panel: an expert panel of mathematicians, mathematics educators, curriculum specialists, and mathematics supervisors representing a broad spectrum of perspectives about mathematics education. This panel was established during the fall 2005. The Panel included qualified practicing research mathematicians. It explicitly excluded persons with actual or potential conflicts of interest (e.g., authors of textbooks which are under consideration, recipients of educational awards and grants for developing and disseminating particular educational philosophies or teaching models which, if implemented, would result in pecuniary gain) . In October 2006 the Panel met to assure that all Peer Review compliance issues be corrected by May 2007, including issues pertaining to academic standards. Continuous discussions on the revision and alignment of the Standards of Excellence 2000 document were carried out during the school year 2006-2007. The focus group met periodically during the months of October 2006 through December 2006 to discuss and analyze the report submitted by Norman Webb and the "Peer Review Notes" in order to comply with the recommendations provided by the Department of Education. A "Corrective Plan" was prepared to align assessment to the content standards and grade level expectations. This Panel worked to align the performance level descriptors with the grade level expectations. A massive training was conducted in Villalba, Puerto Rico for school Superintendents, Auxiliary Superintendents, School Directors, Zone Supervisors and Special Education Teachers during the month of November 2006.

The Math Program in the Academic Affairs Division of the Department of Education went through a validation process during the month of September 2007 for the new Content Standards and Grade Level Expectation. The group consisted on Teachers, Zone Supervisors, School Directors, Special Education Teachers, Retired Teachers, University Professors, Curriculum Specialists and the Program Director. The new performance standards make heavy demands on teachers of mathematics, and extensive professional development will be needed. Training for ALL teachers began in Winter 2007. Initial training for grades K-12 teachers begins in fall 2007, with implementation in these grades in fall 2008. The Math Program provided professional development and training sixty Zone Supervisors and Administrators in all School District during the months of December 2007. All personnel including teachers will be trained in the new Content Standards and Grade Level Expectation during January 2008 through March 2008. The training resources consisted of ALL Zone Supervisors. They prepared the training during the month of October and November 2007. Technical Assistance will be provided (January through March 2008). The Mathematics Standards Panel will also be in charge of producing the Puerto Rico Grade-Level Mathematics Framework aligned with the content standards, know as Guias Operacionales de Grado. Objectives of the Framework include: provision of research-based information about how children learn and corresponding instructional strategies; guidance for developers and authors of instructional resources to ensure alignment with the Mathematics Content Standards, and specification of a reasonable balance between basic computational and procedural skills, problem solving, and conceptual understanding. The Frameworks should also specify the minimum core knowledge for entering university, pursuing a scientific or mathematical career, taking advanced placement tests, etc. A new circular letter (CC 1-2007-2008) was approved by the Secretary of Education to align the curriculum to the new Standards. Professional Standards are being developed by the MATH Program to align teacher's practices to the Content Standards. The program will follow up and provide ongoing technical assistance to ensure that all teachers fully implement the revised Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations in August 2008. This document will be the base for the new items in the PPAA standardized test in 2009 as well as for daily lesson plans in order to promote individualized instruction and increased student achievement. A Document called Academic Technical Assistance is being written to visit school and verify implementation. In addition a web-based document called Mathematics Curriculum Alignment Survey (inspired in the Survey of Enacted Curricullum) is being develop to check alignment with classroom practices and objectives.

English

The English Program assigned to the Academic Affairs Division of the Department of Education has worked on the revision of the Standards of Excellence 2000 and its Grade Level Expectations. This work plan was conducted during the school year 2006/2007

through the school year 2007/2008. The development of this work will guarantee a more profound teaching and learning process to ensure that the content standards and its grade level expectations are aligned to the curriculum to accomplish an effective standardized test. Standards tell us what is relevant in the subject area and offers the fundamental conceptual components for the development of the curriculum. The following plan guarantees the learning of English through the use of a challenging content, performance, and assessment standards. During Phase I a corrective plan was written based on the document "Alignment Analysis of Language Arts Standard and Assessment Report" by Norman Webb, December 2005. This document offered valuable information on the alignment of the standards of excellence with grade expectations for the students learning process in order to measure their academic achievement. This would help PRDE revise content and achievement standards in order to comply with the requirements of the Law 107-110 "No Child left Behind Act". Expectations.Thus, the English Program formed a focus group in October 2006 that was composed of six English Zone Supervisors, a Curriculum Specialist, and an English Program Director. This group's ultimate goal was to assure that all Peer Review compliance issues be corrected by May 2007, including issues pertaining to academic standards. The focus group met periodically during the months of October 2006 through December 2006 to discuss and analyze the report submitted by Norman Webb and the "Peer Review Notes" in order to comply with the recommendations provided by the Department of Education. A "Corrective Plan" was prepared to align assessment to the content standards and grade level expectations. This focus group worked along with the English Program to align the performance level descriptors with the grade level expectations. A massive training was conducted in Villalba, Puerto Rico for school Superintendents, Auxiliary Superintendents, School Directors, Zone Supervisors and Special Education Teachers during the month of November 2006. The information was disseminated throughout all school districts and furtther training was conducted on Grade Level Expectations. During September 2006 the English Program went through a validation process for the new English Content Standards and Grade level expectations.

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.

During the school year 2006-07 PRDE conducted the administration of operational forms for science in grades 4, 8 and 11. Also PRDE conducted a Standard Setting for Science in grades 4,8 and 11 and developed cut scores that were adopted by PRDE.

PRDE Science Standard Testing was conducted on June 5 through 7, 2007, in San Juan, Puerto Rico, to set standards for Science, in grades 4, 8 and 11, on the PPAA Tests. A total of 48 educators participated for three days to establish Achievement Level Descriptors and recommend cut scores. On the third day, a subcommittee of educators met to review the recommended cut scores. The item mapping procedure was applied to set the standards.

The PPAA test for Science is a paper - based multiple choice exam given in grades 4-8 and 11. On the test, students respond to questions. They answer questions about concepts and skills in seven different Science strands: (1) Science structure and organization levels; (2) Science, technology and society; (3) Matter Structure and Organization Levels; (4) Models and Systems; (5) Energy; (6) Interactions; and (7) Changeand Observation. The number of Ãtems varies by strand and by grade, however all tests are comprised of 60 questions. Strands one and seven and strands two and three are paired in terms of reporting. Test questions are in multiple - choice. The tests is administered island wide on one specific day with make up days available for students who are absent.

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

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

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Science program began revising its content standards and grade level expectations in 2006 in order to comply with NCLB requirements that stipulated they be prepared by grade and not by level. The grade level expectations were used to revise the Achievement Standards. The revision was performed by a number of field experts from the various academic areas. The (TRI-LIN) Company was contracted to oversee the work and its validation by a number of teachers in the classroom. This was followed by training of regional directors, superintendents, school directors and science teachers. Further training was provided at the district level and teachers expressed how these documents helped them in their task of teaching students to the standards and in being able to achieve the expected outcomes.

The revision of the content standards began on March 2007 with technical assistance from a team composed of a Professor from Sacred Heart University, a teacher who would assist the university professor and the participation of eleven teachers from K to 3rd grade, 4th to 6th grade, 7th to 9th grade and three high school science teachers. The criteria used for the revision of the science standards and grade level expectations were: rigor, clarity, specificity, precise language horizontal alignment and depth of knowledge.

The Science program has been revising the 2000 Science content standards as well as the grade level expectations. The content standards will clearly establish the concepts and skills by grade and content. On march 23 2006 the academic program directors in the Secretariat of Academic Affairs began the process of planning the revision process in order to comply with the No Child Left Behind Law. TheTRI-LIN Company was hired to coordinate the revision effort and the document would serve as the base for the specifications that would be used for the PPAA standardized test. During the months of May and June the Science program convened a group of Science teachers, supervisors and a university consultant to develop the grade level expectations by grade and content. This revised the achievement standards from level to grade.

After carefully revising the document to include all necessary input from the field, a system-wide dissemination process of the document began on November 13-18th, 2006 throughout all the school districts. Science supervisors were critical in coordination and training process. The following criteria were used in the revision of the content and achievement Science standards: rigor, clarity, specificity, precise language and horizontal alignment.

The PRDE determined that the standardized assessment in Science would be conducted in the grades 4th, 8th, and 11th. The test was piloted in 2006 and a functional test was conducted on April 2007. The standard setting was held on June 5th-7th with a total of 48 Science teachers representative of all the geographical areas of Puerto Rico. The cohorts and levels (basic, proficient and advanced) for the 2007 PPAA test were established. The Science program completed the revision of the content standards and the achievement standards in 2007 and established the specifications for the new Science standardized testing which is based in the areas of: Nature of Science, Technology and Society, The Models and the Systems, Energy, Interactions, Conservation and Change.

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	293682	287791	98.0
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	53804	52183	97.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4822	4648	96.4
Economically disadvantaged students	229358	224591	97.9
Migratory students			
Male	149958	146605	97.8
Female	143724	141186	98.2
Comments: The race/ethnicity categories described in the PRDE Accountability Workbook are different from the Directive 15 and can not be cross-walked to the five permitted values. For this reason the values were not included in the detailed records; however, PRDE included the students by grade level and performance level and in the category ALL STUDENTS. There is a minor discrepancy in the total shown due 2 uncoded student assessment in the gender field.			

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	15671	30.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	34611	66.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1902	3.6
Total	52184	
Comments: There is a minor discrepancy in the total shown due to 2 uncoded student assessment in the gender field.		

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	293682	284224	96.8
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	53804	51392	95.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4822	4555	94.5
Economically disadvantaged students	229358	221582	96.6
Migratory students			
Male	149958	144653	96.5
Female	143724	139571	97.1
Comments: There is a minor discrepancy in the total shown due to 2 uncoded student assessment in the gender field.			

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	15398	30.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	34088	66.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1907	3.7
Total	51393	
Comments: There is a minor discrepancy in the total shown and the gender due to 2 uncoded student assessment in the gender field.		

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 <u>not</u> include monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students.

1.3.2　Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41277	32012	77.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8509	5748	67.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	711	506	71.2
Economically disadvantaged students	33710	25708	76.3
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21141	16146	76.4
Female	20133	15865	78.8

Comments: The race/ethnicity categories described in the PRDE Accountability Workbook are different from the Directive 15 and can not be cross-walked to the five permitted values. For this reason the values were not

included in the detailed records; however, PRDE included the students by grade level and performance level and in the category ALL STUDENTS.

For SY 2006-2007 PRDE developed a plan in order to assess the mayority of the students.

The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.

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

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	40874	24055	58.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8402	3740	44.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	702	315	44.9
Economically disadvantaged students	33351	18979	56.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	20932	11238	53.7
Female	19939	12816	64.3

Comments: The race/ethnicity categories described in the PRDE Accountability Workbook are different from the Directive 15 and can not be cross-walked to the five permitted values. For this reason the values were not

included in the detailed records; however, PRDE included the students by grade level and performance level and in the category ALL STUDENTS.

For SY 2006-2007 PRDE put developed a plan in order to assess the mayority of the students.

The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41793	26803	64.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8889	4429	49.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	668	371	55.5
Economically disadvantaged students	33717	20888	62.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21473	13160	61.3
Female	20318	13642	67.1

Comments: The race/ethnicity categories described in the PRDE Accountability Workbook are different from the Directive 15 and can not be cross-walked to the five permitted values. For this reason the values were not included in the detailed records; however, PRDE included the students by grade level and performance level and in the category ALL STUDENTS.

For SY 2006-2007 PRDE developed a plan in order to assess the mayority of the students.

The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.

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

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41480	23852	57.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8801	3678	41.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	654	281	43.0
Economically disadvantaged students	33436	18560	55.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21302	11110	52.2
Female	20176	12741	63.1

Comments: The race/ethnicity categories described in the PRDE Accountability Workbook are different from the Directive 15 and can not be cross-walked to the five permitted values. For this reason the values were not included in the detailed records; however, PRDE included the students by grade level and performance level and in the category ALL STUDENTS.

For SY 2006-2007 PRDE developed a plan in order to assess the mayority of the students.

The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41922	24727	59.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8652	3532	40.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	614	308	50.2
Economically disadvantaged students	33674	19089	56.7
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21612	12085	55.9
Female	20310	12642	62.2
Comments: The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.			

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

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41606	22131	53.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8552	3067	35.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	603	254	42.1
Economically disadvantaged students	33403	17068	51.1
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21416	10093	47.1
Female	20190	12038	59.6
Comments: The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42602	22214	52.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8384	2788	33.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	611	288	47.1
Economically disadvantaged students	33809	16784	49.6
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21816	10623	48.7
Female	20785	11591	55.8
Comments: The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.			

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

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42239	17882	42.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8300	1940	23.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	608	195	32.1
Economically disadvantaged students	33480	13244	39.6
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21609	7600	35.2
Female	20629	10282	49.8
Comments: The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	43704	18281	41.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7860	1670	21.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	701	253	36.1
Economically disadvantaged students	33749	13180	39.1
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	22611	8755	38.7
Female	21090	9526	45.2
Comments: The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.			

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

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42977	18885	43.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7685	1743	22.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	683	211	30.9
Economically disadvantaged students	33132	13527	40.8
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	22200	7776	35.0
Female	20775	11109	53.5
Comments: The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41716	18793	45.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6413	1518	23.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	657	228	34.7
Economically disadvantaged students	31921	13466	42.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21127	8794	41.6
Female	20589	9999	48.6
Comments: The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.			

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

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41030	16772	40.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6286	1250	19.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	639	150	23.5
Economically disadvantaged students	31338	11886	37.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	20750	6605	31.8
Female	20280	10167	50.1
Comments: The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.			

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	34782	15608	44.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3477	664	19.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	686	237	34.5
Economically disadvantaged students	24012	9964	41.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	16822	7183	42.7
Female	17957	8425	46.9
Comments: The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.			

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	34021	17477	51.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3367	648	19.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	666	190	28.5
Economically disadvantaged students	23443	11125	47.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	16441	6731	40.9
Female	17578	10745	61.1
Comments: The zero is not the actual value, is only included for certification.			

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	1501	800	53.3
Districts			
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts.* 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	1495	796	53.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1388	761	54.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	107	35	32.7
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts.* 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
1	0	0.0
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

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

---

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Schools that fail to attain AYP as determined through the PRDE's standardized test and that are identified for improvement receive technical assistance and support services depending of the number of years they may have been in program improvement. Schools in first year receive support and technical assistance from the school district. A total of 76 schools in high risk status receive services through various service providers. Schools in second to eighth year of program improvement receive supplementary services from a number of qualified service providers. Schools in fifth, sixth and seventh year of improvement receive support through the Systemic Iniciative for School Transformation (ISTE) an initiative based on a resiliency model that targets total school transformation. In addition, schools in second and third year of program improvement receive support and technical assistance through specific initiatives spearheaded by the English, Spanish and Math programs which target schools that did not attain AYP due to low achievement in the "Pruebas PuertorriqueÃ±as de Aprovechamiento AcadÃ©mico(PPAA)"Puerto Rico Standarized Test" in their specific academic area. There are other schools in 21 school districts program improvement that participate in the Systemic Alternative for School Transformation (ASTE) with a model based on schools of excellence and best practices that aims to transform schools and improve academic achievement through proven scientifically based models of excellence.

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	0
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	76
Comments: PRDE is implementing new actions for schools in corrective action and restructuring at the end of the school year 2006-2007 and continuing to be fully implemented in the 2007-2008 school year.	

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

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	13
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments: PRDE is implementing new actions for schools in corrective action and restructuring at the end of the school year 2006-2007 and continuing to be fully implemented in the 2007-2008 school year.	

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[2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

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

---

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The PRDE allocates combined funds to provide school improvement services to the LEAs (PRDE school districts) that have the highest concentration of schools in need of improvement, offering supplementary educational services, and contracting external companies that provide technical assistance to participating schools. Each school identified for school improvement prepares a school plan that includes strategies to promote effective school transformation, school improvement, increased student achievement, professional development, parental involvement and the effective integration of program funds to maximize effectiveness of services. For schools in restructuring process (8) the PRDE sub-contracts private educational companies that compete and are selected through an RFP process in order to provide systemic technical assistance. A formal circular letter# 18-2006-07 was disseminated throughout the system in 2006 notifying parents about their rights to opt for public school choice.

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

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

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

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

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

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations		10/31/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)		08/01/07
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools	98	62
Comments:		

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

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	10/06/07

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 Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) is a unitary system; meaning it is both SEA and LEA. Thus, PRDE's statewide system of support as well as its funds allocation process differs from other states and territories. It's statewide support system begins at the central level with a Title I Coordinator, seven Title I Program Officers that oversee the Title I programs in each one of the educational regions of the PRDE, the Title I support staff which provide fiscal as well as programmatic assistance, a Title I Technical Assistance Coordinator, and a School Improvement/SES/School Choice Coordinator. The PRDE also has a newly appointed Title I Committee of Practitioners which provides valuable feedback and recommendations in educational practices and policy. The statewide support system continues at the district level, with the local tier of support, which is comprised of the Title I Superintendent, Title I Coordinator and a local committee.

The statewide system of support integrates Title I initiatives, school improvement initiatives and supplementary services. Title I funds are allocated to schools via formula, and other funds such as 1003(a), 1119 and 1120 are also allocated via work plans to PRDE's academic programs for systemic initiatives or through a competitive processes to qualified service providers. The school improvement endeavors are coordinated by the School Improvement/SES Coordinator in the Office of Federal Affairs of the PRDE. School Improvement Funds target the areas of need identified by the Office of the Secretary of Academic Affairs through needs assessments, school organizational reports and standardized achievement data from schools in need of improvement. The needs assessments are analyzed and addressed through a systemic action plan. Currently the PRDE's most comprehensive initiative targeting school improvement issues relies on a resiliency model. A grant competition process is coordinated by the Office of Federal Affairs whereby a Request for Proposals (RFP) is established following the process and procedures established in the sub-granting manual of the Office of Federal Affairs. Qualified service providers selected through a proposal evaluation process provide services to targeted schools identified by the PRDE as priority based.

The PRDE Directors of Math, English, Spanish and Educational Technology in coordination with the Secretary of Academic Affairs identify the schools and districts' areas in need of improvement and establish a systemic course of action based on proven research based initiatives in each one of their core areas, in a concerted effort to maximize services and eliminate duplicity. These Core Academic Subject Directors in coordination with Superintendents and other district personnel identify through needs assessment studies, meetings, school visits, school organizational reports and academic achievement data from the PPAA "Prueba Puertorriqueña de Aprovechamiento Académico" the PRDE's standardized test, the areas of need in each of the schools and school districts. An integrated approach of professional development, technical assistance and ongoing support is provided to schools in need of improvement through strategic planning and research based strategies from experienced service providers. Currently schools in 4th, 5th and 6th year of school improvement are being targeted with school improvement funds.

The school improvement strategies selected by the PRDE encompass the provision of customized technical assistance and professional development that will build capacity of the district and school staff to improve schools and be informed by student achievement and other outcome related measures. Thus, professional development activities will be targeted towards effective analysis of student assessment and evaluation and revising instructional practices to reflect the integration of this data. Service providers with proven expertise and experience in these areas will be selected through a competitive process to provide services to LEA s districts and schools.

PRDE also promotes professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the statewide system of support and that it is informed by student achievement and other outcome related measures.

These strategies are already paramount to the PRDE's current systemic school improvement effort. This endeavors' main goal being the improvement of student academic achievement and helping schools attain Adequate Yearly Progress. The Systemic Initiative for School Transformation or (Iniciativa Sistémica de Transformación Escolar, ISTE) helped 58 schools exit school improvement in 2007. This initiative currently provides 100 schools in 4th year of program improvement professional development, technical assistance through a resiliency model that will help students achieve the academic standards and enhance teachers' knowledge and skills of effective instructional practices as well as school director's educational leadership skills. The PRDE currently serves approximately 95,851 students in 641 schools in school improvement through Supplementary School Services provided by 32 qualified local companies. The analysis conducted by the Office of the Secretary of Academic Affairs demonstrates that of the 51 schools that exited school improvement during school year 2007, 98% where in their first three years, reinforcing the theory that early intervention will most likely yield a successful outcome and attainment of AYP.

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 *from which* students transferred for public school choice	0
Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice	0
Comments: To be implemented during SY 2007-2008.	

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	0
Who applied to transfer	0
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	0

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	No
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	No
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No
Comments: To be implemented during SY 2007-2008.	

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 0
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0
Comments:	

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

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

FAQs about public school choice:

a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.[3]

b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

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

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	643
Comments:	

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

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

FAQ about supplemental education services

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

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	220234
Who applied for supplemental educational services	105095
Who received supplemental educational services	104095
Comments:	

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	$
Comments: $112,374,828.00	

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 <u>by</u> teachers who are highly qualified <u>and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified</u> 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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All schools					
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools					
Low-poverty schools					
All elementary schools					
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools					
Low-poverty schools					
All secondary schools					

Comments: The Puerto Rico Department of Education was confident that the Student Information System (SIS) would be completely operational for the 2006-2007 school year. Since its implementation did not occur during the aforementioned timeframe, complete HQT classroom level data for 06-07 is not available.

PRDE had informed the intent of reporting in the CSPR the 48% of the classroom level data already entered into the SIS as of November 2007, despite the knowledge that it would not be used for national statistics.

However when the actual exercise of matching the data from the classroom data from the schools with the HQT 2007 Census, the current structure of the courses and schedules in the SIS System were not consistent with the CSPR reporting format so we were unable to proceed as planned.

The current estimated timeframe to have accurately report HQT using the SIS System is now March 31, 2008 as stated in the Compliance Agreement signed December 2007.

We have, however made excellent progress regarding HQT, namely regarding teacher certification. Of a total amount of teachers who are teaching core subjects (32,551), (31,073 = 95%) are certified in the subject they teach. Only 4% (1478) are not fully certified.

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> No Response </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.

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 though 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	
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	
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain)	
Total	

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)	
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain)	
Total	
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools		
Poverty metric used		
Secondary schools		
Poverty metric used		

Comments: The Puerto Rico Department of Education was confident that the Student Information System (SIS) would be completely operational for the 2006-2007 school year. Since its implementation did not occur during the aforementioned timeframe, complete HQT classroom level data for 06-07 is not available.

PRDE had informed the intent of reporting in the CSPR the 48% of the classroom level data already entered into the SIS as of November 2007, despite the knowledge that it would not be used for national statistics.

However, when the actual exercise of matching the data from the classroom data from the schools with the HQT 2007 Census the current structure of the courses and schedules in the SIS System were not consistent with the CSPR reporting format so we were unable to proceed as planned.

The current estimated timeframe to have accurate HQT data using the SIS System is now March 31, 2008 as stated in the Compliance Agreement signed December 2007.

We have, however made excellent progress regarding HQT, namely regarding teacher certification. Of a total amount of teachers who are teaching core subjects (32,551), (31,073 = 95%) are fully certified in the subject they teach. Only 4% (1478) are not fully certified.

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.

b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6   TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	**OLOI**
	Dual language			
	Two-way immersion			
	Transitional bilingual			
	Developmental bilingual			
	Heritage language			
	Sheltered English instruction			
1	Structured English immersion			
	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
	Content-based ESL			
	Pull-out ESL			
	Other (explain)			

Comments: Spanish is the instruction language use in the schools in Puerto Rico. We are unique by using Title III funds to ensure that all limited Spanish proficient "LSP" students improve their spanish-language skills. The information in table 1.6.1 refers to the Project: Teaching Spanish as a Second Language (Structured Spanish Immersion)under the PRDE Spanish Program.

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.	2149
Comments:	

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
English	2041

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: Spanish is the primary spoken language in Puerto Rico, and the response is shown for English.

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 underlined number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

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

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

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

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	2149
Not tested/State annual ELP	0
Subtotal	2149
LEP/One Data Point	2149
Comments: The "numbers" 2,149 are the correct assessment numbers for PRDE. Assessment numbers are over stated as they were obtained from students self assessment. This will be collected for SY 2008-2008.	

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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

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

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	2149
Not tested/State annual ELP	0
Subtotal	2149
LEP/One Data Point	2149
Comments: Only one test has been administered and collected for the 2,149 LSP students for SY 2006-2007. The next schedule test will be conducted in SY 2007-2008 (September, 2007 and April, 2008).	

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.	__Yes__
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	__No__
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress				N
No progress				
ELP attainment				Y
Comments:				

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

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

If a State does <u>not</u> 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" <u>and</u> "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				N
No progress		403		
ELP attainment	15.0	911	42.0	Y
Comments: See comments in 1.6.3.1.1.				

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	No
Comments:	

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

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

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

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> 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	0
MFLEP/AYP grades	0
Comments: PRDE will be working with a monitoring plan by 2007-08 for the Former LEP.	

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 <u>not</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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	220
LEP HS/Non-AYP	303
LEP other grades	
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

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

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: PRDE don't provide assessment test in the student native language.	

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	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
HS	0
Comments: See comments in 1.6.3.5.1	

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
Comments: See comments in 1.6.3.5.1	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

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
Comments:		

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
Comments: See comments in 1.6.3.4.3.		

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 MFLELP 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

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: Data is not available.

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

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: Data is not available.

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

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

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

1.6.4.2 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 all three Title III AMAOs	_ No _
Comments: The Assessment and Evaluation Committee for Title III is curently working with the redesign and adaptation of the "AMAO"(measurable objectives)wich will be in place on time for the next SY 2007-08 report.	

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 or programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	_ No _
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the underlined 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

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

Comments: Data is not available.

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	No Response	Multi-year	No Response
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	No Response	Formula	No Response

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

Comments: Data is not available.

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.	
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. Or number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	

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

Comments: Data not available. To be collected SY 2007-2008.

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	0	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	0	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	0	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	0	0
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	0	0
PD provided to principals	0	0
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	0	0
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	0	0
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	0	0
Total		0
Comments: Data not available for SY 2006-07. To be collected by SY 2007-2008.		

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 <u>intended school year</u>. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

<u>Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:</u>

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
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

The funds time period has been substantially sortened by subgranting the funds to the central level (LEP/Spanish) as a second language program. Funds are solicited through a work plan that establishes the services that will be provide.

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	4
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	96.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	96.6
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	95.4
Female	97.7
Comments: The graduation rate of 96.61% for 2005-2006 is correct. The difference of 10% of the previous year is due of incorrect data because the graduation and dropout rate were mistakenly transposed.	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	0.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	0.6
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	0.6
Female	0.5
Comments: The dropout rate of .6% for 2005-2006 is correct. The difference of 10% of the previous year is due of incorrect data because the graduation and dropout rate were mistankenly transposed.	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	0	0
LEAs with subgrants	1	1
Total	1	1
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)		
K		351
1		670
2		675
3		705
4		705
5		671
6		612
7		445
8		343
9		345
10		178
11		164
12		112
Ungraded		
Total		5976
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care		720
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)		5256
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)		
Hotels/Motels		
Total		5976
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	324
1	585
2	392
3	493
4	516
5	474
6	449
7	253
8	241
9	190
10	120
11	113
12	77
Ungraded	
Total	4227
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	0
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	615
Limit English proficient students	0
Comments:	

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

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

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

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	2
2. School Selection	1
3. Transportation	1
4. School records	1
5. Immunizations	1
6. Other medical records	0
7. Other Barriers	0
Comments:	

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	852	444
4	894	451
5	914	422
6	991	295
7	1530	586
8	1447	421
High School	1979	968
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	861	621
4	901	509
5	920	455
6	1001	433
7	1552	541
8	1475	521
High School	2042	819
Comments: The "number" 5976 is the correct number for PRDE Assessment Test. These are over stated as they were obtained from students self reporting. This will be corrected by SY 2008-2009.		

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: PRDE does not have Migrant Program.	

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: PRDE does not have Migrant Program.	

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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? <u>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.</u>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

<u>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.</u>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE does not have Migrant Program.

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

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