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

DELAWARE

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:

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

Address:
401 Federal St.
Dover, DE 19901

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Jeff Fleming

Telephone: 302-735-4140

Fax: 302-739-4221

e-mail: jfleming@doe.k12.de.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Valerie Woodruff

_____   __Wednesday, February 27, 2008, 9:03:15 AM__
      Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the period May 2004-July 2006, Delaware Department of Education curriculum staff, working in conjunction with local Delaware educators, local university staff, DSTP item writers, and nationally recognized standards review agencies accomplished a comprehensive review of standards in the areas of Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. As a result of these reviews, recommended reorganization of selected standards and grade level expectations were approved by Secretary of Education Valerie Woodruff. These approved changes were published during the 2006-07 school year, with changes made in Science and Mathematics at the standards level. These updated standards can be found on the DOE website, http://www.doe.k12.de.us/programs/ci/

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.

No revisions or changes to assessment made or planned.

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

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

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to contenct standards taken or planned.

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

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Since the year 2000, Delaware has assessed science at the end of four grade clusters; K-3, 4-5, 6- 8, and 9-11. Each administration includes embedded field test items. The assessments for the grade-clusters is also available in special versions Spanish, Braille, and large print. The Delaware alternate portfolio assessment (DAPA), an alternate based on alternate achievement standards, includes science.

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.

In the summer of 2006, Delaware developed content-based, grade level specific performance level descriptors for science. The Delaware Department of Education worked with national consultants, Delaware teachers, and content experts from throughout the state to explore and plan the procedure for developing the performance level descriptors. These content-based descriptions clearly depict what students are expected to know and be able to do at each of the five performance levels at the end of each grade cluster and reflect development skill progression across grade clusters at each performance level.

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	66032	65392	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	219	216	98.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1966	1952	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	22350	22059	98.7
Hispanic	6312	6258	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	35185	34907	99.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9638	9490	98.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2303	2293	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	26656	26388	99.0
Migratory students	29	29	100.0
Male	33913	33543	98.9
Female	32119	31849	99.2
Comments: All students tested differs by 64 students. This is the result of late updates to scores files combined with fixed participation files.			

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	917	9.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7897	83.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	676	7.1
Total	9490	
Comments: Assessment participation is a fixed file. Seven students must have some error or change in their record that makes this number field not match 1.3.1.		

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	66032	65092	98.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	219	215	98.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1966	1900	96.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22350	22008	98.5
Hispanic	6312	6107	96.8
White, non-Hispanic	35185	34862	99.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9638	9463	98.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2303	2271	98.6
Economically disadvantaged students	26656	26199	98.3
Migratory students	29	29	100.0
Male	33913	33385	98.4
Female	32119	31707	98.7
Comments: LEP participation improved; Migrant numbers are small and cause large changes in percentage. There are 32 students with errors or changes in their records that cause the All Students Tested to not match 1.3.2.			

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	990	10.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7797	82.4
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	676	7.1
Total	9463	
Comments: Assessment participation is a fixed file. Seven students must have some error or change in their record that makes this number field not match 1.3.2.		

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 S**TUDENT** A**CADEMIC** A**CHIEVEMENT**

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	9226	7101	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	36	27	75.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	289	271	93.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3243	2002	61.7
Hispanic	1020	728	71.4
White, non-Hispanic	4638	4073	87.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1267	647	51.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	579	403	69.6
Economically disadvantaged students	4190	2763	65.9
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	4825	3773	78.2
Female	4401	3328	75.6

Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

IDEA - A special education population was included in the Participation counts last year that was not valid. It is not included this year, which allows us to identify the large differences in the total numbers between 2006 and 2007 school years.

LEP - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

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	9181	7174	78.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	35	27	77.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	282	264	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3236	2115	65.4
Hispanic	993	725	73.0
White, non-Hispanic	4635	4043	87.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1264	734	58.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	577	391	67.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4159	2834	68.1
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	4799	3598	75.0
Female	4382	3576	81.6

Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

IDEA - A special education population was included in the Participation counts last year that was not valid. It is not included this year, which allows us to identify the large differences in the total numbers between 2006 and 2007 school years.

LEP - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

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	9001	6782	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	23	18	78.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	294	267	90.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3016	1842	61.1
Hispanic	952	633	66.5
White, non-Hispanic	4716	4022	85.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1410	608	43.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	456	269	59.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3953	2517	63.7
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	4643	3510	75.6
Female	4358	3272	75.1
Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes. IDEA - A special education population was included in the Participation counts last year that was not valid. It is not included this year, which allows us to identify the large differences in the total numbers between 2006 and 2007 school years. LEP - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes. Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.			

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	8956	6968	77.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	23	20	87.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	283	264	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3002	1988	66.2
Hispanic	937	632	67.4
White, non-Hispanic	4711	4064	86.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1403	738	52.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	454	257	56.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3926	2625	66.9
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	4623	3494	75.6
Female	4333	3474	80.2
Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes. LEP - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.			

Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

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	9013	6828	75.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	35	28	80.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	285	268	94.0
Black, non-Hispanic	2915	1798	61.7
Hispanic	968	660	68.2
White, non-Hispanic	4810	4074	84.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1345	566	42.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	340	185	54.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3883	2499	64.4
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	4548	3414	75.1
Female	4465	3414	76.5

Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

IDEA - A special education population was included in the Participation counts last year that was not valid. It is not included this year, which allows us to identify the large differences in the total numbers between 2006 and 2007 school years.

LEP - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

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	8975	7224	80.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	35	31	88.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	273	258	94.5
Black, non-Hispanic	2915	2031	69.7
Hispanic	947	667	70.4
White, non-Hispanic	4805	4237	88.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1346	742	55.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	337	167	49.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3862	2682	69.4
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	4528	3465	76.5
Female	4447	3759	84.5

Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

IDEA - A special education population was included in the Participation counts last year that was not valid. It is not included this year, which allows us to identify the large differences in the total numbers between 2006 and 2007 school years.

LEP - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

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	9299	6822	73.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	25	17	68.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	261	245	93.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3166	1818	57.4
Hispanic	872	578	66.3
White, non-Hispanic	4975	4164	83.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1473	573	38.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	229	115	50.2
Economically disadvantaged students	3837	2325	60.6
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	4810	3545	73.7
Female	4489	3277	73.0

Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Hispanic - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

IDEA - A special education population was included in the Participation counts last year that was not valid. It is not included this year, which allows us to identify the large differences in the total numbers between 2006 and 2007 school years.

LEP - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

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	9250	6998	75.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	25	21	84.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	254	226	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3162	2000	63.3
Hispanic	842	575	68.3
White, non-Hispanic	4967	4176	84.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1470	599	40.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	218	93	42.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3804	2423	63.7
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	4789	3442	71.9
Female	4461	3556	79.7

Comments: LEP - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

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	9865	6461	65.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	31	22	71.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	294	269	91.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3368	1622	48.2
Hispanic	869	480	55.2
White, non-Hispanic	5303	4068	76.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1476	397	26.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	232	81	34.9
Economically disadvantaged students	3905	1981	50.7
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	5056	3270	64.7
Female	4809	3191	66.4

Comments: Hispanic - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

LEP - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

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	9830	7875	80.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	31	27	87.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	289	266	92.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3364	2368	70.4
Hispanic	849	591	69.6
White, non-Hispanic	5297	4623	87.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1472	625	42.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	231	103	44.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3880	2666	68.7
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	5038	3805	75.5
Female	4792	4070	84.9

Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Hispanic Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

LEP - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

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	10253	6248	60.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	29	14	48.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	284	242	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3565	1464	41.1
Hispanic	951	429	45.1
White, non-Hispanic	5424	4099	75.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1474	389	26.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	262	64	24.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4071	1812	44.5
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	5275	3271	62.0
Female	4978	2977	59.8
Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes. LEP Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes. Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.			

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	10200	7965	78.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	29	23	79.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	277	257	92.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3557	2354	66.2
Hispanic	928	590	63.6
White, non-Hispanic	5409	4741	87.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1471	619	42.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	259	87	33.6
Economically disadvantaged students	4036	2645	65.5
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	5241	3942	75.2
Female	4959	4023	81.1
Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes. LEP Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes. Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.			

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	8671	4923	56.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	37	22	59.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	245	206	84.1
Black, non-Hispanic	2759	1002	36.3
Hispanic	621	263	42.4
White, non-Hispanic	5009	3430	68.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1038	253	24.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	192	65	33.9
Economically disadvantaged students	2524	985	39.0
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	4357	2533	58.1
Female	4314	2390	55.4

Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Asian or Pacific Islander - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Black/Non-Hispanic - This population will change from year to year due to the number of difference in students who may or may not have been promoted or a smaller number of students in this category for this particular grade.

IDEA - A special education population was included in the Participation counts last year that was not valid. It is not included this year, which allows us to identify the large differences in the total numbers between 2006 and 2007 school years.

LEP Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

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	8664	6097	70.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	37	27	73.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	242	196	81.0
Black, non-Hispanic	2751	1489	54.1
Hispanic	608	334	54.9
White, non-Hispanic	5026	4051	80.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1030	310	30.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	192	45	23.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2510	1334	53.1
Migratory students	<N	<N	
Male	4351	2948	67.8

Female	4313	3149	73.0

Comments: All Students - The percent change was 10.1% (we are doing better...)

American Indian/Alaska Native Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Asian or Pacific Islander - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Black/Non-Hispanic - This population will change from year to year due to the number of different in students who may or may not have been promoted or a smaller number of students in this category for this particular grade.

White/Non Hispanic Students - This population will change from year to year due to the number of difference in students who may or may not have been promoted or a smaller number of students in this category for this particular grade.

IDEA - A special education population was included in the Participation counts last year that was not valid. It is not included this year, which allows us to identify the large differences in the total numbers between 2006 and 2007 school years.

Economically Disadvantages Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

LEP Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Migratory Students - Due the small numbers of these students in the state of Delaware it will yield a wide variety of percentage or numbers changes.

Male Students - Black/Non-Hispanic - This population will change from year to year due to the number of different in students who may or may not have been promoted or a smaller number of students in this category for this particular grade.

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	193	136	70.5
Districts	19	13	68.4
Comments: small number changes yield large percentage changes. EDEN values are correct.			

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 <u>not</u> 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	99	81	81.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	81	65	80.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	18	16	88.9
Comments: EDEN values are correct. Small numbers - larger percentage changes.			

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
19	13	68.4
Comments: Small numbers - larger percentage changes. The three extra districts receiving funds are vocational districts, not visible by the Title I office in terms of allocations.		

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.

Title I schools in improvement receive support from the Delaware Educations Support System including:

* Written notification of AYP status and explanation of the accountability sanction

* Over $150000 in both 1003 and state improvement resources

* Direct Assistance from the school improvement work group - with support regarding the implementation of the sanctions use of resources and capacity building.

* Access to school improvement experts (facilitators); experts in research school improvement site management school leadership and reform to assist districts and schools in addressing issues such as curricular alignment schuedling strategy selection use of data and other areas to build capacity.

* Assistance in analyzing the overall school program via external monitoring and reporting

* DDOE staff members are assigned as contacts to each district and contacts assigned to schools specifically in the greatest need.

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	8
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	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	4
Comments: Some schools have selected a combination of strategies (ex: outside expert and implement new research-based)	

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)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	3
Comments:	

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.

There are currently two (2) districts in improvement in Delaware. It should be noted that one of the districts New Castle County Vo-Tech made AYP last year and that both districts (NCCVT and Brandywine) made academic progress. As far as improvement status NCCVT is still in Year 1 and Brandywine is in Year 2. As a part of DESS The Delaware Education Support System the SEA has provided support to both Brandywine SD and new Castle County Vo-tech SD with their district improvement efforts. The actions include:

* Direct support with aligning strategic goals and their improvement plans

* Assistance with the development of the district improvement efforts (consolidated application funds)

* SEA representation and advisement on the district strategic planning committee (Brandywine)

* SEA representation and advisement on the School Support Team - District level support team (both Brandywine and NCCVT)

* The Assignment of school improvement facilitators/experts to assess district improvement processes improvement plans and program implementation (on an ongoing basis with feedback and support)

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: No district is in corrective action - this is not applicable	

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	10/01/07	08/01/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	10/01/07	06/25/07
Comments: AYP ratings were recalculated on 9/15/07 after summer school testing. Ratings changed for 11 schools however no sanctions changed.		

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	9	0
Comments:		

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

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	07/23/07

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 1003 (a) funds are to be targeted to the needs of identified student subpopulations as per Delaware's accountability system. The purpose of 1003(a)funds is to help districts and schools build their capacity to address the challenges that caused them to be identified for School Improvement. Allowable uses of School Improvement Grant funds include:

â€¢ Long range Planning

â€¢ Ongoing sustained Professional development

â€¢ Stipends for staff (and especially for HQT who attend professional development training) and consultants

â€¢ Costs associated with any instructional strategy designed to improve academic achievement

â€¢ Costs associated with meeting HQT requirements (Praxis II paraprofessional testing and support)

â€¢ Costs associated with strategies to address other barriers to achievement (poor attendance parental engagement etc.) as long as these costs are aligned with academic improvement goals.

â€¢ Costs associated with materials or resources that have a research base for addressing the root causes of targeted pupil academic needs.

The state has determined an amount for schools that receive Title I Part A and those that do not receive Title I A funds that are in improvement - the 1003(a) funds go only to Title I A schools but the state provides resources to non-Title I and Title I schools in improvement.. Upon notification of AYP status the school applies for their pre-determined grant award. The grant activities must supplement the revised school improvement plan. The SEA convenes a team of content and program specialists to review the activities suggests amendments and approve the grant.

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	3
Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice	4
Comments:	

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

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	3482
Who applied to transfer	129
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	129

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No
Comments: Within the 3482 eligible students it must be noted that 2 of the schools Positive Outcomes and Marion T. Academy are charter schools that attempted to enter into agreements with their neighboring districts and those requests were denied. Also Seaford Middle School is the only school in the district at its grade level and there were no other choice options. Due to its rural location no neighboring districts were receiving their children.	

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: This information is not collected	

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	2
Comments: 1) Seaford Middle School is the only middle school in Seaford School District - there are no other choice options and choice to another district is not practical due to the remote setting transportation limitations and space limitations in neighboring districts (which also have one middle school within their districts). it should be noted that Seaford Middle School also made AYP at the end of the 2005-2006 sy and was able to indicate that in their parental notification. After the 2006-07 sy Seaford MS made AYP and is no longer in improvement (this year 07-08). 2) Delcastle HS was in the SES Pilot and did not have to offer choice in year 1; their pupils were allowed per the pilot to select an SES provider if they desired.	

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	6
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	4885
Who applied for supplemental educational services	0
Who received supplemental educational services	495
Comments: Number who applied for services was not collected in SY2006-2007. It will be collected for SY2007-2008	

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	$ 0
Comments: We do not collect this data	

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	19745	17909	90.7	1836	9.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	881	814	92.4	67	7.6
Low-poverty schools	797	773	97.0	24	3.0
All elementary schools	3280	3158	96.3	122	3.7
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	2500	1953	78.1	547	21.9
Low-poverty schools	3945	3600	91.3	345	8.7
All secondary schools	16465	14751	89.6	1714	10.4
Comments:					

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	__Yes__

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.

Yes. Delaware counts elementary classes so that a full-day classroom equals one class.

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

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 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	57.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	7.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.0
Other (please explain)	17.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	50.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	27.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.0
Other (please explain)	12.0
Total	100.0
Comments: The other reasons are: (1) the teacher qualified for the certificate matching the NCLB content area of the class but the certificate had not been issued; or (2) the teacher had the appropriate content area certificate for the class but did not have the specialty certificate required for the class (such as the special education certificate or the bilingual certificate); or (3) the teacher was highly qualified in the content area of the class but did not have the specialty certificate required for the class; or (4) the teacher did not have the certificate required for the content area of the class and did not have the specialty certificate required for the class.	

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	57.2	28.0
Poverty metric used	Free/reduced lunch participation	
Secondary schools	46.9	21.9
Poverty metric used	Free/reduced lunch participation	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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**
332	Dual language	Spanish	72.5	27.5
0	Two-way immersion	N/A	0.0	0.0
661	Transitional bilingual	Spanish	10.0	90.0
352	Developmental bilingual	Spanish	0.0	0.0
0	Heritage language	N/A	0.0	0.0
0	Sheltered English instruction			
0	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
0	Content-based ESL			
0	Pull-out ESL			
0	Other (explain)			
Comments: The districts that provide the Developmental Bilingual Instruction did not enter into the state database the percent of Spanish used. Delaware will have the information for 2007-08.				

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 underlined 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.	6734
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
Spanish	5230
Creole	251
Chinese	148
Korean	108
Arabic	100

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

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	5399
Not tested/State annual ELP	103
Subtotal	5502
LEP/One Data Point	754
Comments:	

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	5386
Not tested/State annual ELP	103
Subtotal	5489
LEP/One Data Point	756
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 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.	___Yes__
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	83.0	2732	91.6	Y
No progress		249		
ELP attainment	83.0	4310	98.9	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 not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress	83.0	2732	91.6	Y
No progress		249		
ELP attainment	83.0	4308	98.9	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 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	Yes
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 underlined 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	499
MFLEP/AYP grades	366
Comments: The total number of MFLEP in EDEN (366) is incorrect and will be resubmitted in the near future. MFLEP/AYP grades is correct.	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

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

Grade	#
LEP K-2	3091
LEP HS/Non-AYP	704
LEP other grades	<N
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).	Yes
Comments: Delaware offers the state assessment in Spanish in mathematics.	

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

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

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

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

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

Grade	Language
3	Spanish
4	Spanish
5	Spanish
6	Spanish
7	Spanish
8	Spanish
HS	Spanish
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5.3 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	N/A
4	N/A
5	N/A
6	N/A
7	N/A
8	N/A
HS	N/A
Comments: Native language test is not provided in Reading Language Arts.	

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
997	390	39.1
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
0	0	0.0
Comments: Native language test is not provided in reading language arts.		

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
421	78	499
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of 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
344	294	85.5	50

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

Comments:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
337	307	91.1	30

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

Comments:

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

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

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees, who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	16
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	13
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	2
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	2
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	1
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	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	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 <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs.
Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting <u>each</u> State-set target for <u>each</u> objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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
966	154	4

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

Comments: Delaware had 4 districts that met the "significsnt increase" definition.

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	_Yes_	Multi-year	_No_
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	_No_	Formula	_Yes_

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

Comments:

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

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

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

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

Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	89
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.	89
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	150

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

Comments:

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

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

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Types of Professional Development Activity =** Subgrantee activities for professional development required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees =** Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants =** Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total =** Number of all participants in PD activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	14	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	12	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	7	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	7	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	11	
Other (Explain in comment box)	7	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	9	2035
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	5	390
PD provided to principals	7	90
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	5	59
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	10	292
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	5	16
Total		2882
Comments: District 15 - National ELL Conference in October and site visit to nearby district with high ELL population; Dist 17 - Providing Accommodations for ELL Students in Regular Classroom; Dist 23- Developing Spanish Proficiency Immigration and Student Behaviors; Dist 31- Meeting The Needs of Your ELL Students in the Classroom; Dist 32- Parent Workshops: Back to School Understanding Access Understanding DSTP; Dist 35- Kagan Instructional Strategies; Dist 36- SIOP Training Diversity Training		

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

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation =** Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees =** Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/$$ Distribution =** Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/07	08/01/07	30
Comments: Districts apply for Title III funds through the Consolidated Application. They can apply in either July August or September. They would receive the money within 30 days of the approval of the grant.		

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.

At this time there is no way to shorten the amount of time due to the budget processes and input into the state system. The process has worked fairly well up to this point. It allows districts the flexibility to apply in July August or September. Depending on how long it takes the districts to make revisions and the approval of all program managers the districts can receive the money within 30 days.

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

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

1.7   PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: Delaware did not have any persistently dangerous schools in 2006-07	

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	84.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	79.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	79.5
Hispanic	66.3
White, non-Hispanic	87.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	68.7
Limited English proficient	58.9
Economically disadvantaged	72.4
Migratory students	52.6
Male	81.5
Female	86.5
Comments: The total number of LEP graduates in 2006 (93)is half of what it was in 2005. The percentage is correct.	

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	5.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.9
Black, non-Hispanic	7.3
Hispanic	9.8
White, non-Hispanic	4.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5.2
Limited English proficient	7.8
Economically disadvantaged	5.1
Migratory students	1.9
Male	6.3
Female	4.6
Comments: The dropout rates for Delaware's sub-populations may fluctuate substantially from year to year because of the small numbers involved.	

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	9	9
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	19	19
Comments: While Charter schools are considered districts in certain areas, they are not included in this count.		

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

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0
K	48	120
1	47	144
2	50	128
3	32	122
4	25	139
5	28	115
6	22	91
7	24	121
8	26	154
9	34	136
10	18	76
11	<N	57
12	<N	64
Ungraded	0	0
Total		1468
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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	15	152
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	137	679
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	<N	0
Hotels/Motels	33	150
Total		982
Comments: LEAs WITHOUT Subgrants # of Homeless children that Primary Nighttime Residence is unknown = 189; LEAs with Subgrants # of Homeless children that Primary Nighttime Residence is unknown = 486.		

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)	<N
K	120
1	144
2	128
3	122
4	139
5	115
6	91
7	121
8	154
9	136
10	76
11	57
12	64
Ungraded	0
Total	
Comments: EDEN value will be corrected in the near future.	

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	17
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	282
Limit English proficient students	60
Comments: EDEN value will be corrected in the near future.	

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	6
2. Expedited evaluations	0
3. Staff professional development and awareness	1
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	2
5. Transportation	9
6. Early childhood programs	0
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	4
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	5
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	2
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	6
12. Counseling	6
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	4
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	6
15. School supplies	4
16. Referral to other programs and services	4
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
18. Other (optional)	6
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments: Services for 2006-07 are greatly under-reported by LEAs in Delaware. The issue has been addressed with LEA Liaisons. More accurate data will be reported in future reports.	

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	0
2. School Selection	0
3. Transportation	0
4. School records	0
5. Immunizations	0
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	110	64
4	113	62
5	93	53
6	80	45
7	101	46
8	125	71
High School	48	19
Comments: EDEN values will be corrected in the near future.		

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	111	60
4	115	67
5	93	48
6	79	42
7	101	32
8	126	39
High School	47	16
Comments: EDEN values will be corrected in the near future.		

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)	21
K	17
1	16
2	<N
3	<N
4	<N
5	<N
6	<N
7	<N
8	<N
9	<N
10	<N
11	<N
12	<N
Ungraded	17
Out-of-school	22
Total	185
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<div style="border:1px solid black;padding:8px;">

2006-07 Category 1 numbers were less due to one or more of the following contributing factors:

a. Loss of farmland

b. Closing of several migrant camps within the last 2 years

c. Existing camps have fewer numbers

d. 3-year eligibility ended and not enough new families were found who were eligible

e. Numbers are less due to not including poultry workers unless they are employed with a temporary agency. This is due to the lack of industrial surveys or data supporting jobs that are temporary.

</div>

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 <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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)	<N
K	<N
1	<N
2	<N
3	<N
4	<N
5	<N
6	<N
7	<N
8	<N
9	<N
10	<N
11	<N
12	<N
Ungraded	17
Out-of-school	0
Total	47
Comments:	

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

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--This year's Category 2 numbers were less due to one or more of the following reasons:

a. the students' eligibility ending and not enough new students were found that were eligible to make up the difference;

b. mandatory summer school;

c. more students working.

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.

Delaware used NGS and Delaware's state database DELSIS for Category 1 and 2 for 2006-07 and the previous reporting year 2005-06.

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.

-- Category 1 student count was collected from COE's and Delaware's state database DELSIS (Delaware Student Information System) which keeps track of all students enrolled in Delaware schools. When the recruiter turns in a COE with school age children each migrant student is checked in DELSIS to verify that the migrant student is enrolled in the correct school. In the case of children who are 3-4 years of age or 18-21 years or younger and not attending school during that period and/or they don't have siblings who are in school the recruiter checks to make sure the child is still here. All migrant students including those who are younger than 3 are entered at the initial entry and periodic checks for children who are turning 3 years of age during the reporting period are done on an as needed basis. The process of determining our student count for category 1 is an on-going process. DELSIS only records children who are 3-4 years old when they are receiving services such as special education. NGS records all ages therefore both systems are used to determine student count for category 1. The COE would be used for the initial child count and DELSIS is used as a check for verifying category 1 child count. To further ensure accuracy for child count a manual check with school lists generated from NGS is also done on an on-going basis.

-- Category 2 - Delaware has two summer migrant programs. The recruiter uses referrals from schools and other agencies to verify identification of possible migrant students. The recruiter also makes initial contact with possible migrant families. The recruiter registers all migrant students that are eligible and new ones as families come into the state. At the end of the summer only programs the students that actually attend are counted. To verify that the number is correct a manual count by the recruiter and an NGS count are used to ensure accuracy. At the end of the summer migrant programs the programs turn in academic and health information. The student count for category 2 comes directly from those forms. This information includes attendance supplemental programs credit accrual and health data. DELSIS doesn't record the summer programs' data. A child count for summer programs is done in NGS with input such as attendance and supplemental program information.

Residence information is updated annually in all districts. When migrant students are enrolled for each school year each COE is checked in DELSIS. When students make a move the recruiter is given the information and she checks to determine whether or not the move was made because of changing jobs which would change both residency and the LQM date or the move didn't have anything to do with their job and then only the residency would change.

At the start of each school year each migrant student is checked in DELSIS to determine if they are still here and in school. For those who didn't attend school but remained here after 9/1 of the reporting year the recruiter verifies either that yes they were here after 9/1 or no they left before 9/1. A list of students is sent to each district early fall so they can verify enrollment in the school. Data for each child count is collected throughout the year in an on-going basis. The recruiter also makes a home visit or calls to verify any information on the COE when necessary.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The recruiter turns in COEs to the migrant data entry secretary who inputs the data into NGS. Data for child counts are checked for accuracy in DELSIS and then the necessary information is entered into NGS. DELSIS only keeps information on pre-school students who are being served in special programs. Only the school-age student data come directly from DELSIS. However all data on migrant children identified in Delaware are entered into the NGS system. DELSIS provides the school information and is used to crosscheck eligible migrant students which makes child counts more accurate. During the year the migrant data entry secretary requests reports from NGS to determine migrant students for the reporting period. This data is crosschecked with school lists to verify accuracy. At the end of the summer programs academic and health information are turned into the data entry secretary for submission into the NGS 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.

Category 1 and 2 are collected in the same way.

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.

When a COE is turned in by the recruiter each student is checked in DELSIS to verify the school grade race birth date for accuracy. Then the student is checked both in DELSIS and NGS to ensure child counts are correct. Each student is only counted once even if the student has attended several schools during the reporting year. Summer program child counts are done using the time period that the summer school programs are in operation. All data is entered in NGS and health data is added as applicable. The recruiter supplies the information when a student is either pre-school age or is not currently attending school. Delaware keeps a last qualifying move (LQM) date list. Both the migrant data entry secretary and the recruiter use the list to ensure only those migrant students who are currently eligible are counted. When a child turns three years of age they are counted if they are still here. Delaware only counts ages 3 to 21 years when their LQM date falls in the 3-year eligibility range.

Students who are residents are confirmed by the recruiter through home visits telephone calls to the family or school personnel. Sometimes a residency date will change but the LQM remains the same because the move wasn't for work purposes.

After the verification process is completed the count is pulled from NGS.

Delaware didn't have an intersession term for the reporting year of 2005-06 but had two summer programs. The two summer programs were held after the close of the regular school year. The child count for category 2 is done by requesting a report from NGS for students enrolled for that time period and school codes for the two sites which held summer migrant programs. The two summer migrant programs turn in forms which include attendance supplemental programs credit accrual and health screenings. Only students for category 2 who actually attended the summer migrant program are included in the category 2 child count.

To ensure that students are not previously enrolled under another name we do a crosscheck using birth date parent's name place of birth. A check for possible duplicates is done at the initial time of entering the child in NGS. When the recruiter turns in a COE a check is done in DELSIS using the mother's last name and father's last name to verify the information. Sometimes when the student was entered into DELSIS the mother's last name was used and sometimes the father's last name was used. The age and race are also checked. If a student has the same birth date the parent's name race grade and the school they are attending match then the data is entered in NGS. If there are discrepancies further follow-up is done by the recruiters or the migrant data entry secretary calls the schools. The recruiter makes contact with the families when there is a discrepancy. The migrant data entry secretary makes calls to schools to determine if the migrant student is attending their school and gets information to confirm the data.

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.

Category 1 and 2 are collected in the same way--NGS and DELSIS.

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

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The migrant data entry secretary checks all the sections on the COE and if there is anything that needs clarification the recruiter then returns to the family for further information and verification.

As previously described each student is checked in DELSIS to verify the school grade race and birth date for accuracy. Then the student is checked both in DELSIS and NGS to ensure child counts are correct. Each student is only counted once even if the student has attended several schools during the reporting year.

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.

Throughout the year migrant students are recruited and enrolled and school lists are updated. Students are checked in DELSIS to verify that the migrant students are in the correct schools. Then school lists are requested from NGS and comparisons are made to make sure the information is the same. The recruiter will then try to re-interview families periodically from the list to check the accuracy of the information on the COE. Typically it is 5% or about 10 families throughout the year. In 2006-07 5 families were completed and 5 were found eligible. In 2007-08 the plan is to verify 10 families.

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.

Throughout the year migrant students are recruited and enrolled and school lists are updated. Students are checked in DELSIS to verify that the migrant students are in the correct schools. Then school lists are requested from NGS and comparisons are made to make sure the information is the same. To ensure accuracy of students receiving services in the summer programs the staff of each program is required to keep a daily log. The log gives attendance and services provided to each student. On-site visits are made with random checks of students in attendance to crosscheck information validity. The school nurses assigned to each program also maintain a daily log providing information on children seen and reasons for the visit to the nurse's office as well as any action taken.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The accuracy of both categories 1 and 2 is done through COEs and communication between the recruiter and the migrant data entry secretary. In addition the summer programs submit records on students who attended days they attended supplemental programs and other pertinent information such as health screenings. Only students who have actually attended are counted. For category 1 checks on DELSIS and NGS are done to ensure that only eligible students are counted and school lists generated by the migrant data entry secretary are checked for accuracy. Residency as well as students actually enrolled in school are crosschecked

for accuracy and are only counted once for category 1 and category 2.

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.

Delaware will:

provide more training opportunities for the State recruiter and data entry secretary and summer migrant staff;

continue to improve the re-interview process to ensure accuracy of the COE information and eligibility of the migrant families; and

continue to improve the quality control procedures.

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.

Delaware has no concerns at this time.

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

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