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

IDAHO

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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

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

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Idaho State Board of Education

Address:
650 W. State St.
Boise, ID 83720-0037

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Tracie Bent

Telephone: 208-332-1582

Fax: 208-334-2632

e-mail: Tracie.Bent@osbe.idaho.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Mike Rush

_____   __Friday, March 7, 2008, 5:04:13 PM__
    Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

NoChild
LeftBehind

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.

No revisions or changes to reading/language arts or mathematics content standards taken or planned.

No real changes to the science content standards have been made but some adjustments in levels have been made because the test is offered only in grades 5 7 and 10. The adjustments were made to make the tested standards more articulated and complete.

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.

Since July 2006 ISAT tests in reading and mathematics have been developed to align with Idaho content standards. This effort was made in response to peer review, and Idaho's system is now approved.

Because of the many changes that have been made to the ISAT, the Idaho Alternate Assessment (fully approved by US ED in the spring of 2006)is now being reviewed and updated. Changes that will be made include: an update of content standards to reflect subjects by grade level rather than grade span, development of new test items to reflect greater alignment with grade level content standards, new performance level descriptors, new achievement standards,

and field tests. The current estimated timeline for full implementation is spring 2010.

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

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

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In accordance with guidance from the US Education Department, new achievement standards were set following the spring 2007 administration of the revised ISAT. All scores from that administration of the test were delayed in order to set new cut scores based on the new tests and the new performance level descriptors. Full implementation was accomplished in the 2006-2007 school year.

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

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Idaho piloted science tests for two years. Just as with the other tests that are a part of ISAT the science tests in grades 5, 7, and 10 were re-developed in alignment with the Idaho content standards. Work on the science test was parallel with the work done in the 2006-2007 school year for the other tests. The performance level descriptors were developed and cut scores set so that the test was fully implemented in the 2006-2007 school year. The science tests for the alternate test will be re-developed in the same schedule as the other subjects to be fully implemented by spring 2010. In the meantime the current alternate assessment has the approval of the US ED.

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.

Idaho piloted science tests for two years. Just as with the other tests that are a part of ISAT the science tests in grades 5, 7, and 10 were re-developed in alignment with the Idaho content standards. Work on the science test was parallel with the work done in the 2006-2007 school year for the other tests. The performance level descriptors were developed and cut scores set so that the test was fully implemented in the 2006-2007 school year. The science tests for the alternate test will be re-developed in the same schedule as the other subjects to be fully implemented by spring 2010. In the meantime the current alternate assessment has the approval of the US ED.

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	139405	138534	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	2144	2125	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2178	2165	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1502	1485	98.9
Hispanic	18993	18834	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	112190	111573	99.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	14028	13851	98.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8757	8683	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	58634	58224	99.3
Migratory students	2092	2067	98.8
Male	71715	71234	99.3
Female	67690	67300	99.4
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3453	24.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9341	67.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1057	7.6
Total	13851	
Comments: Correct Totals for tested IDEA students but getting warnings on counts not matching totals on prior page. Informed EDFacts of problem and they will have a fix.		

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	139405	138266	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2144	2124	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2178	2140	98.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1502	1471	97.9
Hispanic	18993	18634	98.1
White, non-Hispanic	112190	111548	99.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	14028	13852	98.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8757	8415	96.1
Economically disadvantaged students	58634	58019	99.0
Migratory students	2092	2020	96.6
Male	71715	71099	99.1
Female	67690	67167	99.2
Comments:			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4347	31.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8436	60.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1069	7.7
Total	13852	
Comments: Correct Totals for tested IDEA students but getting warnings on counts not matching totals on prior page. Informed EDFacts of problem and they will have a fix.		

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

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20054	17313	86.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	307	212	69.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	318	289	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	251	189	75.3
Hispanic	3001	2210	73.6
White, non-Hispanic	15835	14102	89.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2182	1461	67.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1480	921	62.2
Economically disadvantaged students	9471	7602	80.3
Migratory students	359	243	67.7
Male	10355	8891	85.9
Female	9699	8422	86.8

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

The Idaho State Academic Content Standards are minimum standards to be used by Idaho school districts to establish a level of academic achievement for all students. However, students with a significant cognitive disability (NCLB) are often unable to achieve these minimum standards set by the state even with modifications because of the severity of the impact their disability has on learning. Under the NCLB regulations, states may develop extended content standards aligned to their general education content standards that would be more appropriate to the academic program for these students with disabilities. However, these extended content standards must reflect grade level content to the extent possible but can be written as downward extensions.

The specific standards can be found on the following websites.

Language Arts: http://itcnew.idahotc.com/dnn/iaa/extendedstandards/languagearts/tabid/622/Default.aspx#documents

Math: http://itcnew.idahotc.com/dnn/iaa/ExtendedStandards/Math/tabid/639/Default.aspx

Science: http://itcnew.idahotc.com/dnn/iaa/ExtendedStandards/Science/tabid/643/Default.aspx

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	20017	16177	80.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	307	192	62.5

Asian or Pacific Islander	316	274	86.7
Black, non-Hispanic	246	176	71.5
Hispanic	2968	1861	62.7
White, non-Hispanic	15837	13382	84.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2182	1097	50.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1436	662	46.1
Economically disadvantaged students	9441	6840	72.5
Migratory students	353	179	50.7
Male	10335	8068	78.1
Female	9682	8109	83.8

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	19811	16230	81.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	311	209	67.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	303	262	86.5
Black, non-Hispanic	222	163	73.4
Hispanic	2841	1855	65.3
White, non-Hispanic	15772	13428	85.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2135	1180	55.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1497	833	55.6
Economically disadvantaged students	9124	6798	74.5
Migratory students	321	189	58.9
Male	10167	8357	82.2
Female	9644	7873	81.6

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	19760	15921	80.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	311	201	64.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	298	253	84.9
Black, non-Hispanic	219	162	74.0
Hispanic	2807	1702	60.6
White, non-Hispanic	15763	13303	84.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2134	1005	47.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1457	636	43.7
Economically disadvantaged students	9090	6504	71.6
Migratory students	312	157	50.3
Male	10142	7994	78.8
Female	9618	7927	82.4

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that

population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	20079	14659	73.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	326	183	56.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	332	264	79.5
Black, non-Hispanic	223	123	55.2
Hispanic	2768	1500	54.2
White, non-Hispanic	16083	12339	76.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2149	823	38.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1342	531	39.6
Economically disadvantaged students	8964	5647	63.0
Migratory students	318	152	47.8
Male	10311	7579	73.5
Female	9768	7080	72.5

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	20045	15739	78.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	326	211	64.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	329	268	81.5
Black, non-Hispanic	218	139	63.8
Hispanic	2740	1556	56.8
White, non-Hispanic	16087	13301	82.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2153	883	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1298	503	38.8
Economically disadvantaged students	8934	6144	68.8
Migratory students	316	143	45.3
Male	10298	7901	76.7
Female	9747	7838	80.4

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that

population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	19616	14666	74.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	322	193	59.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	308	254	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	223	123	55.2
Hispanic	2712	1398	51.6
White, non-Hispanic	15726	12444	79.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1958	686	35.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1222	441	36.1
Economically disadvantaged students	8529	5526	64.8
Migratory students	299	134	44.8
Male	9986	7363	73.7
Female	9630	7303	75.8

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	19571	15156	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	211	65.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	304	247	81.3
Black, non-Hispanic	221	156	70.6
Hispanic	2686	1462	54.4
White, non-Hispanic	15713	12815	81.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1960	737	37.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1178	411	34.9
Economically disadvantaged students	8497	5744	67.6
Migratory students	294	132	44.9
Male	9961	7503	75.3
Female	9610	7653	79.6

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that

population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	19856	13941	70.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	326	141	43.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	308	241	78.3
Black, non-Hispanic	209	113	54.1
Hispanic	2668	1303	48.8
White, non-Hispanic	16018	11902	74.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1910	563	29.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1212	390	32.2
Economically disadvantaged students	8048	4622	57.4
Migratory students	285	112	39.3
Male	10283	7234	70.4
Female	9573	6707	70.1

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	19823	15300	77.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	326	184	56.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	305	250	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	211	137	64.9
Hispanic	2650	1478	55.8
White, non-Hispanic	16004	12990	81.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1906	653	34.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1185	429	36.2
Economically disadvantaged students	8017	5287	66.0
Migratory students	275	128	46.6
Male	10260	7690	75.0
Female	9563	7610	79.6

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that

population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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

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

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	19970	14353	71.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	306	173	56.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	297	232	78.1
Black, non-Hispanic	183	103	56.3
Hispanic	2668	1356	50.8
White, non-Hispanic	16205	12264	75.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1859	550	29.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1076	353	32.8
Economically disadvantaged students	7990	4789	59.9
Migratory students	268	112	41.8
Male	10332	7421	71.8
Female	9638	6932	71.9

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	19943	17116	85.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	307	229	74.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	296	260	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	182	146	80.2
Hispanic	2642	1819	68.9
White, non-Hispanic	16206	14381	88.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1861	891	47.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1039	534	51.4
Economically disadvantaged students	7972	6185	77.6
Migratory students	259	134	51.7
Male	10318	8594	83.3
Female	9625	8522	88.5

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that

population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	19148	13972	73.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	227	136	59.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	299	244	81.6
Black, non-Hispanic	174	102	58.6
Hispanic	2176	1080	49.6
White, non-Hispanic	15934	12170	76.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1658	515	31.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	854	304	35.6
Economically disadvantaged students	6098	3689	60.5
Migratory students	217	104	47.9
Male	9800	7156	73.0
Female	9348	6816	72.9

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	19107	15087	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	138	61.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	292	240	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	174	127	73.0
Hispanic	2141	1181	55.2
White, non-Hispanic	15938	13134	82.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1656	586	35.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	822	269	32.7
Economically disadvantaged students	6068	4050	66.7
Migratory students	211	98	46.5
Male	9785	7464	76.3
Female	9322	7623	81.8

Comments: Migrant numbers have changed this year due to federal review of methodology of previous counts.

Some changes occurred in the number of LEP student due to the definitional change related to counting student who have exited the program.

Last year a single school had reported all students as American Indian, but actually no students in the school were in that

population. Current numbers reflect actual numbers in the field.

Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.

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	626	168	26.8
Districts	125	34	27.2
Comments: Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.			

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	377	88	23.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	100	15	15.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	277	73	26.4
Comments: Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.			

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
113	27	23.9
Comments: Proficiency targets went up significantly in this year. Reading target rose from 72% to 78%, and the math target rose to 70% from 60%.		

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.

School/District Improvement Planning Workshops

Four 2-day School/District Improvement Plan Writing Workshops were offered regionally in August and September, 2006. Based on Spring â€06 ISAT results, some Idaho schools who were identified as

Needs Improvement Year 1, Needs Improvement Year 2, and Corrective Action, brought a team of three or four staff members, including the chief administrator, to the training.

Schools and Districts received guidance on writing their plan as well as time to work on the plan with representatives from the SDE and other distinguished educators available to give guidance and support.

Participants were able to work on their own online plan via wireless technology made available. Support was targeted to schools/district as it related to their designation. Needs Improvement Year 1, Needs Improvement Year 2, and Corrective Action.

The plan writing workshop included the following elements:

- The technical aspects of entering the plan in the online tool, as well as,

- Additional training in planning for Continuous School Improvement that is specific to schol/district data

- SDE staff Specialists in Migrant, ELL, Family Involvement, reading and math interventions, Three Tier Model, etc. was available to assist teams in planning writing.

Over 400 teachers. principals and district administrators attended.

In addition to the School/District Plan writing workshops, the Title I and II co-sponsored the Principal Academy of Leadership.

This academy is offered to middle school principals serving in schools that have been identified as facing especially big challenges. In some cases, special conditions, such as restructuring, have allowed schools to appear as if they are meeting AYP, but a closer examination of data clearly demonstrates the challenges they are facing. Through the Academy principals have created network of middle school principals across the state. Four meetings each year focus on curriculum through Surveys of Enacted Curriculum and on instructional practice through an Idaho Academy Walk-Through; both are research-based models.

This was Year 2 of the Principal Academy of Leadership and the additional goals were:

- Develop specific action plans to improve teacher quality and student performance.

- Continue to work on their action plans, one-on-one with SDE staff and consultants and through conference calls and onsite visits

- Triangulate three sources of data to assist them in recommending specific professional development to improve teacher quality and improve student achievement

- Monitor the impact of professional development through Instructional Reviews and SEC surveys.

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	0
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	0
Comments: We did not have any schools in Corrective Action in 2006-2007.	

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	
Comments: We did not have any schools in Restructuring in 2006-2007	

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.

School/District Improvement Planning Workshops

Four 2-day School/District Improvement Plan Writing Workshops were offered regionally in August and September, 2006. Based on Spring â€˜06 ISAT results, some Idaho schools who were identified as

Needs Improvement Year 1, Needs Improvement Year 2, and Corrective Action, brought a team of three or four staff members, including the chief administrator, to the training.

Schools and Districts received guidance on writing their plan as well as time to work on the plan with representatives from the SDE and other distinguished educators available to give guidance and support.

Participants were able to work on their own online plan via wireless technology made available. Support was targeted to schools/district as it related to their designation. Needs Improvement Year 1, Needs Improvement Year 2, and Corrective Action.

The plan writing workshop included the following elements:

- The technical aspects of entering the plan in the online tool, as well as,

- Additional training in planning for Continuous School Improvement that is specific to schol/district data

- SDE staff Specialists in Migrant, ELL, Family Involvement, reading and math interventions, Three Tier Model, etc. was available to assist teams in planning writing.

Over 400 teachers. principals and district administrators attended.

Districts benefited from support to schools within their district who participated in the Principal Academy of Leadership.

This academy is offered to middle school principals serving in schools that have been identified as facing especially big challenges. In some cases, special conditions, such as restructuring, have allowed schools to appear as if they are meeting AYP, but a closer examination of data clearly demonstrates the challenges they are facing. Through the Academy principals have created network of middle school principals across the state. Four meetings each year focus on curriculum through Surveys of Enacted Curriculum and on instructional practice through an Idaho Academy Walk-Through; both are research-based models.

2006-2007 was Year 2 of the Principal Academy of Leadership and goals included:

- Develop specific action plans to improve teacher quality and student performance.

- Continue to work on their action plans, one-on-one with SDE staff and consultants and through conference calls and onsite visits

â€¢- Triangulate three sources of data to assist them in recommending specific professional development to improve teacher quality and improve student achievement

- Monitor the impact of professional development through Instructional Reviews and SEC surveys.

Districts received additional support via on-site visits, and phone 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 Districts were in Corrective Action in 2006-2007. They were given support to write Corrective Action Plans in the event that they would not meet the AYP goals and need to implement a Corrective Action Plan for 2007-2008.	

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	8/6/07	8/6/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	6/28/07	6/28/07
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	30	4
Schools	87	14
Comments: For the most part schools appeal their AYP determinations, but in some instances districts appeal in order to impact the district wide determination. Schools are better able to accomplish the goal than districts.		

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	8/3/07

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 priorities for allocation of the 1003(a) School Improvement Funds were as follows:

Number of years not making AYP

Number of targets missed

We also determine whether there is a match between the AYP indicators and the plan, whether a comprehensive needs assessment is included in their plan, and the action strategies written to address the identified needs.

Professional Development,Curricular materials, and coaching that were Scientifically Researched Based and addressed the needs assessment were given priority.

The method for distributing the funds was done by a competitive grant process. Schools/districts received training in the fall with four state-wide workshops focused on writing their School Improvement Plan. Those who wanted to apply for the competitive grant were given additional instructions on how to submit the additional budget page and narrative. The School Improvement Grant applications were due on December 15, 2006.

A committee of SDE Title I directors and coordinators met collectively and read both the grant applications as well as the School Improvement Plans in our online tool. Grant applications received two readings and were rated.

Some grants were fully funded and other grants were partially funded using the rating system that matched AYP indicators to needs assessment and action strategies. Schools/districts had received training and information in the School Improvement Workshops to guide them in meeting these expectations.

In some instances, schools/districts were able to negotiate for changes to meet the expectations and receive all or partial funding of the plan.

The types of activities that were supported were focused on Professional Development, SBR Curricular Materials, and coaching models. Funding of salaried positions was restricted to coaches or positions the school/district could demonstrate that could be supported and sustained with state general account dollars within a year or two.

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	20
Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice	12
Comments: Most of our districts are rural districts and most of the options to transfer would have required an out of district transfer. Most of these transfers would have required an unreasonable amount of time and miles. It appears that choice was not considered a desirable option for most parents.	

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	31277
Who applied to transfer	40
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	24

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	No Response
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	No Response
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No Response
Comments: State does not collect this information at this time but will add for the 2007-2008 school year.	

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$
Comments: State did not collect this data for 2006-2007. The collection will be added for 2007-2008.	

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	
Comments: State did not collect this data for 2006-2007. The collection will be added for 2007-2008.	

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	19
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	10061
Who applied for supplemental educational services	255
Who received supplemental educational services	162
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$
Comments: State did not collect this data for 2006-2007. The collection will be added for 2007-2008.	

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	33127	23618	71.3	9509	28.7
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	2203	1599	72.6	604	27.4
Low-poverty schools	2154	1563	72.6	591	27.4
All elementary schools	9014	6391	70.9	2623	29.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	3969	2943	74.1	1026	25.9
Low-poverty schools	8773	5986	68.2	2787	31.8
All secondary schools	24113	17114	71.0	6999	29.0
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.	_No_

If the answer above is no, please explain:

At the time of this data collection this information was not separately reported. This has been changed for future reporting periods. Figures do not match due to the number of K-12 schools in Idaho. Special Ed. information has since been aggregated but is not available for this reporting year. Percentages are correct according to districts' reporting.

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.

At the time of this data collection this information was not separately reported. This has been changed for future reporting periods. Figures do not match due to the number of K-12 schools in Idaho. Special Ed. information has since been aggregated but is not available for this reporting year. Percentages are correct according to districts' reporting.

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 <u>not highly qualified</u>, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided <u>at each grade level</u> are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes <u>at a particular grade</u> 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 <u>for each grade</u> 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	88.4
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	8.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.8
Other (please explain)	
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)	57.8
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	33.9
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	8.3
Other (please explain)	
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	**Low-Poverty Schools** (less than what %)
Elementary schools	61.3	36.4
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	54.2	26.2
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	
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**
4	Dual language	Spanish		
4	Two-way immersion	Spanish		
10	Transitional bilingual	Spanish		
0	Developmental bilingual			
0	Heritage language			
28	Sheltered English instruction			
16	Structured English immersion			
5	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
25	Content-based ESL			
37	Pull-out ESL			
8	Other (explain)			

Comments: The percent of English and Spanish used in each bilingual program is not available this year to report as this information has not been collected before. Idaho will collect this information for the 2008 CSPR reporting.

Idaho considers 2-way Immersion and Developmental Bilingual as the same program.

"Other" above consists of academic support and study skills classes for the higher level LEP students particularly at the high school level.

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.	17262
Comments: 1.6.2.1 indicates a total of 17,262 LEP students who received Title III services. 1.6.3.1.2 indicates that a total of 16,151 students who were enrolled in Title III for the testing status. The 17,262 number comes from an annual data collection that the State has each district fill out by the end of the year. The number indicates the total number of LEP students served throughout the year, whether they've moved by the testing period or not. The number 16,151 is the number of students enrolled specifically at the time of testing each year, thus a point in time of February-April. This number would not reflect the total number of students served for that complete year. Idaho has decided to put different numbers in the CSPR to reflect that different perspective of time: a full year vs. a specific period.	

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	13366
Shoshone	283
Russian	279
Turkish	226
Serbo-Croatian	202

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: For LEAs that are unable to document the students' home language the "other" category is an option. As of spring 2007 there were 1205 students listed as "other."

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	16698
Not tested/State annual ELP	532
Subtotal	17230
LEP/One Data Point	5927

Comments: The number of non-tested students would include those students who were absent during the full testing window or who were withdrawn from school but had not been taken out of the testing database.

The LEP/One Data Point amount includes all new Kindergarten students tested (2408) as well as new students in any grade or students who moved and the unique identification number was not located.

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 underlined 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	15650
Not tested/State annual ELP	501
Subtotal	16151
LEP/One Data Point	5520

Comments: The number of non-tested students would include those students who were absent during the full testing window or who were withdrawn from school but had not been taken out of the testing database.

The LEP/One Data Point amount includes all new Kindergarten students tested (2408) as well as new students in any grade or students who moved and the unique identification number was not located.

1.6.2.1 indicates a total of 17,262 LEP students who received Title III services. 1.6.3.1.2 indicates that a total of 16,151 students who were enrolled in Title III for the testing status. The 17,262 number comes from an annual data collection that the State has each district fill out by the end of the year. The number indicates the total number of LEP students served throughout the year, whether they've moved by the testing period or not. The number 16,151 is the number of students enrolled specifically at the time of testing each year, thus a point in time of February-April. This number would not reflect the total number of students served for that complete year. Idaho has decided to put different numbers in the CSPR to reflect that different perspective of time: a full year vs. a specific period.

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	55.0	4707	43.7	N
No progress		9673		
ELP attainment	20.0	3317	23.2	Y

Comments: The number in no progress would include those LEP students with only one data point.

The numbers differ because Idaho used Title III data, rather than all LEP student data, so please replace with the following data. The numbers for the results should be changed in 1.6.3.2.2: "Making Progress"- 4,707 and 43.70%, and "ELP Attainment" - 3,317 and 23.21%. Idaho counts ELP "Attainment" as also "Making Progress", therefore the directions for "No Progress" indicate that it should be the subtotal of 1.6.3.11 (17,230) minus "Making Progress". That number would then be 12,523, however this would include students not tested becuase they moved, or were withdrawn, etc. Therefore, Idaho believes that the Tested/State annual ELP # in 1.6.3.1.1. should be used instead of the subtotal. That would make the "No Progress" number be: 11,991.

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

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

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

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

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
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 <u>unduplicated</u> count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:

1. **Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**
   - Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
   - Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.
2. **Total MFLEP =** State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.
3. **MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	3667
MFLEP/AYP grades	2065
Comments: In 1.6.3.4.3 Idaho understood the directions to require the total # of MFLEP students, not just those served in Title III districts. If 1.6.3.4.3 only requires the Title III MFLEP, then the total MFLEP should be 3667 instead of 3897 (which was the number in the original submission) in 1.6.3.4.3.	

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

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

Grade	#
LEP K-2	6066
LEP HS/Non-AYP	2105
LEP other grades	0
Comments: The LEP HS/Non-AYP includes 9 11 and 12th grades. There are no other grades to report in the other category.	

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

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

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

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

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

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

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

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

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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 <u>native language</u> version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** Number of students tested through the <u>native language</u> version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

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

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State *NCLB* Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One =** Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two =** Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total =** Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2038	1629	3667
Comments: In 1.6.3.4.3 Idaho understood the directions to require the total # of MFLEP students, not just those served in Title III districts. If 1.6.3.4.3 only requires the Title III MFLEP, then the total MFLEP should be 3667 in 1.6.3.4.3.		

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2057	1556	75.6	501

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
2056	1595	77.6	461

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	37
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	20
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	19
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	17
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
Comments: Spring 2008 testing will enable Idaho to determine which LEAs did not meet AMAOs for 2 consecutive years. Idaho implemented a new English language proficincy test and new AMAOs in spring 2006. Therefore, the spring 2007 English language proficiency assessment provided the second data point for LEAs in order to calculate one year of meeting/not meeting AMAOs. The LEAs that did not meet AMAOs for 2 consecutive years will be determined by the spring 2008 assessment. As the previous assessment and new NCLB compliant assessment were not compatible, Idaho followed OELAs recommendation to require LEAs that received Title III funds in the past 5 years but did not meet AYP for the LEP subgroup to send a letter to parents of LEP students indicating such.	

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

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

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <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
3499	3358	17

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

Comments:

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	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.	1219
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	1242
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	120

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 <u>additional</u> teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do <u>not</u> include the number of teachers <u>currently</u> 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	35	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	32	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	34	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	34	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	25	
Other (Explain in comment box)	37	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	35	3105
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	36	489
PD provided to principals	34	307
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	31	345
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	31	840
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	8	582
Total		5668
Comments: The "other" would include professional development specifically aimed at improving instruction for LEP students which differs slightly from professional development aimed at teaching instructional strategies for LEP students.		

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

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/06	07/30/06	30
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Idaho uses a quarterly cash balance report process for the request of monthly federal funds. Each LEA is required to submit a report on the 15th of July October January and March. Payments are made shortly after the 15th for each of these months and on the 1st day of the 2nd two months. Therefore funding is made available immediately to LEAs and is distributed monthly.

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

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	88.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
Comments: Idaho has in place a data collection system that allows calculation of the graduation rates for all subgroups. The system requires 4 years of this subpopulation data collection. Idaho will be able to report graduation rates disaggregated by subgroups following the 06-07 school year. For 05-06, Idaho's calculated high school completion rate was 88.04%. The comparable figure for 06-07 will be available following the completion of the school district-level appeals process that will close in January 2007.	

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	2.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
Comments: Idaho has in place a data collection system that allows the State to calculate the annual event dropout rates for all subgroups. Idaho will be able to report annual event dropout rates disaggregated by subgroups following the 06-07 school year. For 05-06, Idaho's calculated annual event dropout rate was 2.66%. The decrease in Idaho's dropout rate as compared to SY 0405 and SY 0506 has been declining over the last 5 years, as district have made a greater effort to track students.	

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 **H**OMELESS **C**HILDREN AND **Y**OUTHS **P**ROGRAM

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	118	117
LEAs with subgrants	9	9
Total	127	126
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0
K	50	101
1	56	117
2	58	118
3	52	114
4	48	97
5	39	90
6	45	103
7	32	77
8	41	70
9	27	88
10	50	106
11	35	86
12	74	101
Ungraded	0	0
Total	607	1268
Comments: IDAHO did not collect Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) or Ungraded counts in SY 0607 or prior years. Idaho will revise it's data collection to collect this information starting with SY 0708.		

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

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	67	168
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	439	825
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	30	142
Hotels/Motels	21	82
Total	557	1217
Comments: There were unknown counts of 50 of Homeless Children/Youths for LEAs Without Subgrants and 51 of Homeless Children/Youths for LEAs With Subgrants.		

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)	130
K	63
1	92
2	79
3	78
4	75
5	71
6	83
7	65
8	67
9	63
10	94
11	77
12	76
Ungraded	<N
Total	
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	54
Migratory children/youth	37
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	198
Limit English proficient students	126
Comments:	

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

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

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

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

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	2
2. School Selection	1
3. Transportation	3
4. School records	1
5. Immunizations	2
6. Other medical records	0
7. Other Barriers	1
Comments: Idaho collected Immunizations and Other medical records as one category in SY 0607. The counts for 5. Immunizations reflects Immunizations and Other medical records combined. Idaho will collect these categories separately starting with SY 0708.	

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	59	39
4	53	29
5	48	31
6	29	12
7	41	30
8	43	32
High School	102	59
Comments: Did not use the pre-population. The counts used are from the State Homeless data collection which for SY 0607 more accurately report the assessment information for the Homeless category. Also the High School counts include grades 9 and 10.		

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	60	42
4	52	28
5	48	25
6	30	13
7	42	22
8	44	<N
High School	101	29
Comments: Did not use the pre-population. The counts used are from the State Homeless data collection which for SY 0607 more accurately report the assessment information for the Homeless category. Also the High School counts include grades 9 and 10.		

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)	849
K	473
1	529
2	449
3	428
4	394
5	408
6	372
7	374
8	352
9	357
10	260
11	247
12	176
Ungraded	115
Out-of-school	225
Total	6008
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.

Idaho's child count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. More families are settling permanently in their home base and other families whose eligibility has expired are no longer seeking and/or obtaining qualifying work. Furthermore, issues surrounding immigration has made it more difficult to find and recruit eligible families as they choose to remain isolated and private out of fear. Lastly, another impact of the immigration issues is that less migrant families are moving to the state of Idaho.

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)	205
K	206
1	225
2	176
3	192
4	163
5	149
6	120
7	90
8	54
9	23
10	18
11	16
12	<N
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	11
Total	1654
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.

Idaho's child count has decreased from last year by 10% or more due to the changing circumstances of our migrant families. More families are settling permanently in their home base and other families whose eligibility has expired are no longer seeking and/or obtaining qualifying work. Furthermore, issues surrounding immigration has made it more difficult to find and recruit eligible families as they choose to remain isolated and private out of fear. Lastly, another impact of the immigration issues is that less migrant families are moving to the state of Idaho.

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

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Idaho State Migrant Student Information System has been in use for close to 5 years now. The system was built by contract/in-house resources and is a secure web application using SQI 2005 to house data. The system generates and compiles reports using SQL queries on the Student level information. The system was used to compile and report Idaho's Category 1 and 2 Migrant counts for SY0607 and SY0506.

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

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Idaho uses the school Districts Migrant project liason group of 8 regionals, 1 Migrant data administrator at the State level, and IT management (Federal Data Manager Programmer Project Manager) at the State level to collect and manage the child count data. The Migrant system collects Student Demographic Details Student Enrollment Details (Movement history) Current Services Being Provided (Regular Services and Summer services) Test Scores Secondary Grades and Credits and Immunizations on active students enrolled in the State's MEP program. Each year the system is rolled over and all students are re-qualified and re-certified by the regionals and districts for accurate counts. The rollover process occured in January 2007 for SY 05-06 and in November 2007 for this SY 06-07. Prior to the rollover, regionals are required to verify migrant student information and reconcile Migrant student counts with each district. There are district reports in the system that the regionals and each MEP district uses them to verify student counts and student data.

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 Migrant data administrator enters new students and uses search and identity search functions in the system to insure that the student does not exist in the system already. If the student does not exist in the system, the data administrator enters the new student using the COE and adds an enrollment history record for the current location of the student. If the student exists, the data administrator manages the enrollment history record for that student and updates Student Demographic Details and Student Enrollment Details as needed. If there is a duplicate, IT management is contacted with specific instructions for removing duplicate information. Regionals update all student information as needed but do not have the ability to add new students with their log in - they must contact the Migrant data administrator and request adding new students or for removal of duplicate information. Regionals and Districts use the district reports to validate counts. IT management uses the same reports and queries to organize the child counts for all reporting purposes.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not Applicable

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.

Children are counted if they reach 3 years old by the end of the eligible period 8/31/2007 for SY 0607 and if they are not older than 21 at the start of the eligible period 9/1/2006 for SY 06-07. This is done currently by queries when the reports are generated and compiled.

The district reports automatically do not display children whose QA date generates an eligibility date that does not fall into the range of 9/1/2006 to 8/31/2007 for SY 06-07.

Students are activated for the SY 06-07 by the regionals/Migrant data administrator if they are active as a resident or student for at least one day from 9/1/2006 to 8/31/2007 for the SY 06-07.

In conclusion, District reports do not display students who are not activated for the current school year and where the EOE data is out of range for SY 06-07.

Summer students are marked on the same student record and cannot be included again in the regular school year count. The district reports include validation for Summer and Regular year students and their services.

There is only one age/grade category for each student, and the State queries return counts based on this fact to insure that migrant student counts are compiled only once per grade.

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.

Not Applicable

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.

Before students are entered into the system or existing students' information is updated, the IMEP migrant data administrator looks through each new COE to ensure that all necessary information is provided by checking each qualifying activity to make sure that it is valid with time of year that the move was made and that it is an activity done in the area that the move was made to. The data administrator then enters the data from the COE into the Idaho computerized data system. The regional coordinators update the existing student data for their assigned districts to maintain records and re-qualify eligible students. When a question or concern of possible duplication arises, regional coordinators contact the State migrant data administrator for resolution. The State migrant data administrator compares the COE data to what is in the computerized data system and makes any necessary changes or deletions so that the child count is accurate.

The Idaho Migrant Education Program (IMEP) has a statewide COE. Regional recruiters and district family liaisons determine student eligibility by interviewing the parents, guardians, or other responsible adult(s) of potential migrant students. In addition, regional recruiters and family liaisons interview the person directly if he or she is self eligible for the migrant education program. Because the IMEP has not had a consistent State Coordinator for over a year, we have not had the manpower or director to ensure that quality control is taking place. It has been done through Title I-C district program reviews. We are aware that this is not enough and have therefore, begun the process of establishing protocol for how we will do quality control of eligibility. We recently had ID&R Training provided by Merced Flores and Salvador Arraiga of the MERC. We will require districts to do an annual review of 20% of their COEs and will ask districts to re-interview a sampling of their families via phone or face-to-face. The State will conduct random field audits and will also review 20% of the state COEs on an annual basis.

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.

No re-interviewing was done in the SY 2006-07 academic year due to a changing administration and loss and change of migrant personnel. Currently, the IMEP has an acting coordinator and will not have a full-time coordinator until June of 2008.

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.

The districts and regional coordinators work together to re-certify and re-qualify students throughout the year. They have district reports (in real time) that both district staff and regional coordinators have access to view. Updates to student information can only be updated by the regional coordinators or the State Migrant administrators as needed, in real time. This allows for checks and balances that only eligible children are being served and counted for the State MEP Program.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State Migrant Coordinator verifies with Regional Coordinators that all child counts were done accurately and met the OME criteria for eligibility. Next, the migrant data administrator reports to the State Migrant Coordinator on the data entry of eligible COEs and any corrections and/or deletions of non-eligible students. Finally, the State Migrant Coordinator and data administrator collaborate with the EDFacts Coordinator to go over final child counts and all pertinent information so that accuracy is ensured.

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

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

Describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Idaho Migrant Education Program (IMEP) has taken steps to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations. Regional Coordinators will be re-trained in ID&R processes. District personnel working with the Migrant Program will also be trained in ID&R to ensure consistency across all programs. The State Migrant Coordinator will go on identification and recruitment visits to monitor that regional coordinators and district personnel involved in eligibility determinations are following the OME criteria and guidelines for qualifying a student for the migrant program. COEs will be continually verified and collaboration with the EDFacts Coordinator will help maintain accuracy of student eligibility.

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

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

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A concern Idaho has about the accuracy of the reported child counts is the timeline and understanding of districts in providing the necessary and accurate information needed to report correct numbers to OME. Also, Idaho is concerned with having a more efficient means of data collection and reporting to enable districts to spend more time helping the children in the MEP.

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

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