

**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 2008-09**

**OHIO**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**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* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- 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 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) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **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.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

## **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 pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 18, 2009**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 12, 2010**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report  For  State Formula Grant Programs  under the  Elementary And Secondary Education Act  as amended by the  No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2008-09 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2008-09		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Ohio Department of Education		
Address: 25 S. Front Street Columbus, OH 43215-4183		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Dr. Ardith M. Allen, Social Science Research Specialist, Office of Quality Assurance		
Telephone: 614-728-8054		
Fax: 614-752-1622		
e-mail: ardith.allen@ode.state.oh.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Deborah S. Delisle, Superintendent of Public Instruction		
		Thursday, March 11, 2010, 11:38:04 AM
Signature _____		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2008-09**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT****STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* 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. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Ohio is scheduled to adopt the Common Core Standards for Mathematics and English/Language Arts and to adopt updated revisions to the Academic Content Standards for Science and Social Studies in June 2010. This will be followed by adopting model curricula aligned to the revised standards by March 2011. The revised standards and model curricula will be Web-based, incorporate 21st century skills into content, and include learning expectations, instructional resources, formative assessments and interdisciplinary applications. The deadline for effective implementation of the new standards and model curricula is scheduled for the 2013-2014 school year in order to give time to teachers for professional development, to districts for implementation and to the State for developing new assessments.

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

**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 and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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 as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities 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 assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Ohio is scheduled to complete the revision of the Academic Content Standards for Mathematics and English Language Arts in June 2010 and will follow by adopting model curricula aligned to the revised standards by March 2011. At that time Ohio will be revising the state assessments to align to the revised standards for these content areas. The Ohio Achievement tests for grades 3-8 will include adding the assessment of 21st century skills to the existing assessment. Ohio will also be combining our separate reading and writing assessments into a single English/Language Arts assessment. The timeline for this will be two years after the adoption of the model curricula (approximately 2013). The Ohio Graduation Tests are scheduled to be replaced by a 3-part system that will include a nationally standardized test, a series of end-of-course tests and a senior project. The timeline for the implementation of this change is also two-three years after completion of the model curricula (approximately the 2013-2014 school year).

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

#### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below 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 and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Ohio is scheduled to complete the revision of the Academic Content Standards for Science in June 2010 and will follow by adopting model curricula aligned to the revised standards by March 2011. At that time Ohio will be revising the state assessments to align to the revised standards for this content area. The Ohio Achievement tests in science for grades 5 and 8 will include adding the assessment of 21st century skills to the existing assessments. The timeline for this implementation will be two years after the adoption of the model curricula (approximately 2013). The Ohio Graduation Test in science is scheduled to be replaced by a 3-part system that will include a nationally standardized test, a series of end-of-course tests and a senior project. The timeline for the implementation of this change is also two-three years after completion of the model curricula (approximately the 2013-2014 school year).

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

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State 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 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 participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *ESEA*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities(*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	947,581	942,306	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,353	1,341	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,227	15,172	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	153,647	151,360	98.5
Hispanic	25,216	25,002	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	716,959	714,451	99.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	146,041	144,240	98.8
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	18,325	18,200	99.3
Economically disadvantaged students	388,580	385,324	99.2
Migratory students	327	326	99.7
Male	486,523	483,389	99.4
Female	461,058	458,917	99.5

**Comments:** 1) Multiracial student group: 35,158 enrolled, 34,960 participating, 99.4% participating.

2) Note: Students who repeat grade 10 may bring forward a prior year's achievement result without taking the test (participating) again.

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, and subtotal 1. 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.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in 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 participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	48,802	33.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	77,936	54.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	17,502	12.1
Total	144,240	

**Comments:** Note: Students who repeat grade 10 may bring forward a prior year's achievement result without taking the test (participating) again.

### 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 reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	952,720	947,548	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,362	1,350	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,410	15,260	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	154,799	152,629	98.6
Hispanic	25,491	25,236	99.0
White, non-Hispanic	720,170	717,786	99.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	146,750	145,024	98.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,505	18,144	98.0
Economically disadvantaged students	391,926	388,776	99.2
Migratory students	358	356	99.4
Male	489,237	486,126	99.4
Female	463,483	461,422	99.6

**Comments:** 1) Multiracial student group: 35,467 enrolled, 35,267 participating, 99.4% participating.

2) Note: Students who repeat grade 10 may bring forward a prior year's achievement result without taking the test (participating) again. First-year LEP students can participate via an English-language proficiency test without having a reading achievement test result.

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

### 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 reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	49,762	34.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	77,757	53.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	17,495	12.1
Total	145,014	

**Comments:** Note: Students who repeat grade 10 may bring forward a prior year's achievement result without taking the test (participating) again.

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	415,179	411,079	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	589	581	98.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,327	6,291	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	68,552	66,731	97.3
Hispanic	10,478	10,315	98.4
White, non-Hispanic	315,590	313,668	99.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	64,291	63,029	98.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,026	6,934	98.7
Economically disadvantaged students	161,287	158,767	98.4
Migratory students	140	140	100.0
Male	212,811	210,410	98.9
Female	202,368	200,669	99.2
<b>Comments:</b> 1) Multiracial student group: 13,636 enrolled, 13,486 participating, 98.9% participating.			
2) Note: Students who repeat grade 10 may bring forward a prior year's achievement result without taking the test (participating) again.			

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

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	21,223	33.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	34,216	54.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,590	12.0
Total	63,029	
<b>Comments:</b> Note: Students who repeat grade 10 may bring forward a prior year's achievement result without taking the test (participating) again.		

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

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State 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 participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (*LEP*) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former *LEP* students.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	133,430	108,517	81.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	182	135	74.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,533	2,293	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	21,356	12,695	59.4
Hispanic	3,921	2,747	70.1
White, non-Hispanic	99,376	85,940	86.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	19,601	11,093	56.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,170	2,039	64.3
Economically disadvantaged students	59,838	42,056	70.3
Migratory students	50	36	72.0
Male	68,458	55,189	80.6
Female	64,972	53,328	82.1
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 6,058 tested, 4,706 proficient, 77.7% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	138,232	106,968	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	133	68.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,594	2,274	87.7
Black, non-Hispanic	22,543	12,613	56.0
Hispanic	4,179	2,607	62.4
White, non-Hispanic	102,364	84,605	82.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,329	10,747	52.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,021	1,725	57.1
Economically disadvantaged students	63,170	41,088	65.0
Migratory students	82	38	46.3
Male	70,969	53,159	74.9
Female	67,263	53,809	80.0
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 6,355 tested, 4,734 proficient, 74.5% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Science achievement tests are given only in grades 5, 8 and 10.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	132,219	103,739	78.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	159	75.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,229	1,974	88.6
Black, non-Hispanic	21,131	11,173	52.9
Hispanic	3,777	2,441	64.6
White, non-Hispanic	99,155	83,694	84.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,401	10,185	49.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,139	1,894	60.3
Economically disadvantaged students	58,470	38,389	65.7
Migratory students	48	27	56.2
Male	67,713	52,656	77.8
Female	64,506	51,083	79.2
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 5,715 tested, 4,297 proficient, 75.2% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	132,137	108,389	82.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	163	77.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,179	1,937	88.9
Black, non-Hispanic	21,113	12,917	61.2
Hispanic	3,748	2,602	69.4
White, non-Hispanic	99,169	86,202	86.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,399	11,424	56.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,845	1,838	64.6
Economically disadvantaged students	58,403	41,355	70.8
Migratory students	48	31	64.6
Male	67,665	54,177	80.1
Female	64,472	54,212	84.1
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 5,716 tested, 4,567 proficient, 79.9% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Science achievement tests are given only in grades 5, 8 and 10.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	132,661	82,725	62.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	189	106	56.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,278	1,882	82.6
Black, non-Hispanic	21,247	6,914	32.5
Hispanic	3,777	1,703	45.1
White, non-Hispanic	99,751	69,159	69.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,911	6,540	31.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,924	1,318	45.1
Economically disadvantaged students	57,754	25,979	45.0
Migratory students	54	22	40.7
Male	67,880	42,649	62.8
Female	64,781	40,076	61.9
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 5,416 tested, 2,960 proficient, 54.7% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	132,557	95,439	72.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	189	130	68.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,238	1,876	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	21,236	9,608	45.2
Hispanic	3,757	2,142	57.0
White, non-Hispanic	99,722	78,010	78.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,918	8,356	40.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,624	1,365	52.0
Economically disadvantaged students	57,720	32,746	56.7
Migratory students	54	30	55.6
Male	67,817	47,278	69.7
Female	64,740	48,161	74.4
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 5,412 tested, 3,671 proficient, 67.8% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	132,616	93,607	70.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	189	133	70.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,288	1,863	81.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21,238	7,815	36.8
Hispanic	3,774	1,979	52.4
White, non-Hispanic	99,714	78,309	78.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,903	9,939	47.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,920	1,333	45.6
Economically disadvantaged students	57,724	31,286	54.2
Migratory students	54	25	46.3
Male	67,847	48,592	71.6
Female	64,769	45,015	69.5
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 5,410 tested, 3,506 proficient, 64.8% proficient.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	131,672	99,088	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	145	78.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,010	1,790	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	20,806	9,876	47.5
Hispanic	3,501	2,153	61.5
White, non-Hispanic	100,158	81,558	81.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,310	8,224	40.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,465	1,388	56.3
Economically disadvantaged students	54,698	32,785	59.9
Migratory students	37	20	54.0
Male	67,975	50,738	74.6
Female	63,697	48,350	75.9
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 5,007 tested, 3,564 proficient, 71.2% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	131,844	107,219	81.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	142	76.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,012	1,820	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	20,810	12,424	59.7
Hispanic	3,482	2,461	70.7
White, non-Hispanic	100,334	86,403	86.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,324	10,283	50.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,214	1,446	65.3
Economically disadvantaged students	54,700	37,758	69.0
Migratory students	36	22	61.1
Male	68,106	53,398	78.4
Female	63,738	53,821	84.4
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 5,016 tested, 3,967 proficient, 79.1% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Science achievement tests are given only in grades 5, 8 and 10.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	133,445	99,232	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	182	132	72.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,129	1,902	89.3
Black, non-Hispanic	21,137	10,040	47.5
Hispanic	3,452	2,087	60.5
White, non-Hispanic	101,863	81,859	80.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,759	8,190	39.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,461	1,380	56.1
Economically disadvantaged students	53,194	31,205	58.7
Migratory students	51	32	62.8
Male	68,541	50,332	73.4
Female	64,904	48,900	75.3
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 4,678 tested, 3,212 proficient, 68.7% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	133,412	102,175	76.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	182	134	73.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,104	1,868	88.8
Black, non-Hispanic	21,152	10,863	51.4
Hispanic	3,433	2,167	63.1
White, non-Hispanic	101,867	83,684	82.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,761	8,377	40.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,205	1,170	53.1
Economically disadvantaged students	53,168	32,605	61.3
Migratory students	50	30	60.0
Male	68,527	49,748	72.6
Female	64,885	52,427	80.8
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 4,670 tested, 3,458 proficient, 74.0% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Science achievement tests are given only in grades 5, 8 and 10.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	136,522	96,411	70.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	179	123	68.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,045	1,744	85.3
Black, non-Hispanic	21,876	9,013	41.2
Hispanic	3,394	1,854	54.6
White, non-Hispanic	104,573	80,819	77.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,861	6,715	32.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,207	1,042	47.2
Economically disadvantaged students	52,685	27,734	52.6
Migratory students	49	26	53.1
Male	70,050	48,839	69.7
Female	66,472	47,572	71.6
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 4,453 tested, 2,856 proficient, 64.1% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	136,603	98,887	72.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	179	127	71.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,023	1,689	83.5
Black, non-Hispanic	21,903	10,666	48.7
Hispanic	3,383	2,001	59.2
White, non-Hispanic	104,660	81,347	77.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,886	7,161	34.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,943	899	46.3
Economically disadvantaged students	52,691	29,634	56.2
Migratory students	49	26	53.1
Male	70,094	46,913	66.9
Female	66,509	51,974	78.2
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 4,453 tested, 3,056 proficient, 68.6% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	136,476	85,642	62.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	178	104	58.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,058	1,579	76.7
Black, non-Hispanic	21,845	6,335	29.0
Hispanic	3,391	1,430	42.2
White, non-Hispanic	104,554	73,739	70.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	20,817	6,788	32.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,194	716	32.6
Economically disadvantaged students	52,611	22,525	42.8
Migratory students	49	22	44.9
Male	70,013	44,875	64.1
Female	66,463	40,767	61.3
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 4,448 tested, 2,454 proficient, 55.2% proficient.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	142,378	115,891	81.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	212	161	75.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,948	1,803	92.6
Black, non-Hispanic	23,808	14,092	59.2
Hispanic	3,180	2,211	69.5
White, non-Hispanic	109,595	94,793	86.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	21,398	8,768	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,834	1,076	58.7
Economically disadvantaged students	48,686	32,811	67.4
Migratory students	37	21	56.8
Male	72,785	58,773	80.8
Female	69,593	57,118	82.1
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 3,633 tested, 2,830 proficient, 77.9% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

**1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School**

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	142,420	120,354	84.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	210	176	83.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,937	1,733	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	23,821	16,376	68.8
Hispanic	3,176	2,331	73.4
White, non-Hispanic	109,635	96,705	88.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	21,398	9,893	46.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,654	941	56.9
Economically disadvantaged students	48,718	35,425	72.7
Migratory students	37	25	67.6
Male	72,778	59,870	82.3
Female	69,642	60,484	86.8
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 3,639 tested, 3,032 proficient, 83.3% proficient.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	142,005	107,984	76.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	151	70.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,945	1,652	84.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,649	10,871	46.0
Hispanic	3,150	1,897	60.2
White, non-Hispanic	109,417	90,825	83.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	21,309	9,072	42.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,820	754	41.4
Economically disadvantaged students	48,433	28,425	58.7
Migratory students	37	15	40.5
Male	72,561	56,182	77.4
Female	69,444	51,802	74.6
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group: 3,628 tested, 2,587 proficient, 71.3% proficient.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

**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, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	3,716	2,250	60.6
Districts	612	295	48.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	2,133	1,177	55.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,033	425	41.1
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,100	752	68.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

**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 2008-09. 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 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
608	290	47.7
<b>Comments:</b> The 608 total includes one district that is geographically located mostly in Indiana and is not evaluated for AYP in Ohio.		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**Note:** DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

#### 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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met 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 met 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 met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)<sup>1</sup>)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

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

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

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

**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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	62
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	38
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	11
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	58
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	44
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	14
Reopening the school as a public charter school	2
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	2
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	48
<b>Comments:</b>	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Ohio is a Differentiated Accountability state, so several districts found it slightly difficult to provide a straightforward answer to this question. Many districts chose the "Other major restructuring of the school governance" option and provided a short explanation. The following bullet listing contains categories of responses and the frequencies of their usage among the buildings that were in Restructuring Year 2 during the 2008-2009 school year.

- Adopted a new curriculum for the building - 21
- Consulted with an outside entity for strategies to increase overall student performance - 16
- Hired academic coaches to increase overall performance - 11
- Increased the amount of professional development currently offered - 9
- Began the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) - 6
- Increased overall instruction time - 5
- Opted for new leadership within the building - 4
- Reconfigured the administration of the building - 3
- Changed to a single gender building or classroom environment - 2
- Closed the building after the 2008-2009 school year - 2
- Developed a new performance evaluation system for current staff - 2
- Changed the grade span of the building - 1

Note: The frequencies above will not equal the number of buildings that have responded by selecting "Other major restructuring of the school governance." The number of responses above is higher because some buildings described multiple types of "other" major restructuring of the school governance.

## 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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met 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 met 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 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

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

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

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

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

In the space below, briefly 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.

In 2008-2009, 109 districts and 1,099 buildings (including 172 community schools) were in improvement under Ohio's Differentiated Accountability model and were required to implement the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) using the tools developed by the State. Each of the 109 districts (100%) and 745 of the 1,099 buildings (67.8%) received Title I funds. The OIP is Ohio's strategy for ensuring a systematic and coherent approach for building the capacity of all districts and schools to improve instructional practice and student performance on a district-wide basis, and is a strategy for assisting districts to enact Ohio's Leadership Development Framework (OLDF; [www.ohioleadership.org](http://www.ohioleadership.org)), which articulates essential practices for superintendents, district leadership teams (DLTs) and building leadership teams (BLTs). The OIP requires the intentional use of four-stage process, across which structures, tools and people are connected, to help districts: (1) use data to identify areas of greatest need; (2) develop a plan to address those areas built around a limited number of focused goals and strategies to improve instructional practice and student performance; (3) fully implement and monitor the degree of implementation of the plan; and (4) evaluate the effectiveness of the improvement process in changing instructional practice and impacting student performance. Selected districts also receive an on-site diagnostic review from the State Diagnostic Team to help them analyze their current practices against indicators of effective instructional practices.

Technical Assistance. The technical assistance provided to districts in improvement status included structured facilitation by personnel assigned from state support teams (SSTs) or educational service centers (ESCs). These trained personnel work with districts and schools as follows:

Stage 0: Preparing district personnel to implement the OIP by supporting them to: (1) (re)establish a district leadership team (DLT) and building leadership teams (BLTs) in each school within the district, or a community school leadership team (CSLT); (2) develop a common understanding of the role of leadership teams in implementing the OIP; and (3) measure their team's level of practice against standards of effective practice as outlined in the OLDF using an electronic performance assessment.

Stage 1: Working with leadership teams in using the OLDF tool (i.e., the major tool at stage 1 of the OIP) to complete a needs assessment that identifies the most critical needs and probable causes based on data by supporting them to: (1) effectively summarize and analyze data sets; (2) understand/apply the decision framework; (3) interpret key findings from the needs assessment; and (4) prioritize data-based critical problems in the creation of their needs assessment. A state-developed data warehouse makes relevant data needed for the DF process readily available to districts, buildings and community schools. The DF is organized around the following four levels: (1) Level I: Student Proficiency: reviewing of student proficiency data across four years by grade level, building level/grade span, and disaggregated student groups to identify up to two content areas of greatest concern. Further analyses using subscale performance data are completed by the team only for those content area(s) identified as areas of greatest concern; (2) Level II: Instructional Management: answering essential questions in relation to each of the content area(s) of greatest concern identified under Level I. Essential questions focus on curriculum, assessment, instructional practices; educator qualifications, teacher and principal turnover; and the degree to which district professional development (PD) is aligned to problem areas, designed to promote shared work across the district/buildings, and effective in helping teachers acquire and apply needed knowledge and skills related to the improvement of instructional practice and student performance; (3) Level III: Expectations & Conditions: answering essential questions related to leadership; school climate (including student discipline occurrences, student attendance and mobility, students with multiple risk factors, and teacher and student perception); and parent/family, student, and community involvement and support; and (4) Level IV: Resource Management: answering essential questions related to resource management - defined as the intentional use of time, personnel, data, programmatic and fiscal resources. Responses to Levels II-IV are used to identify probable causes contributing the area(s) of greatest need identified in Level I.

Stage 2: Working with leadership teams to develop a limited number of focused district goals, strategies, and action steps based on data; and a limited number of focused building actions aligned with district goals and strategies by supporting them to: (1) develop focused SMART goals; (2) determine prioritized cause-and-effect relationships; (3) compose strategies for each goal; and (4) create actions that have the greatest likelihood of increasing student performance and improving instructional practices. These goals/strategies/actions form the basis of the district/school plan, which is formalized as part of each district's comprehensive continuous improvement plan (CCIP).

Stage 3: Working with leadership teams to implement and monitor the degree of implementation of the focused plan by supporting them to: (1) establish and implement collaborative structures/processes/practices that support a culture of inquiry; (2) implement the plan systemically and systematically; and (3) monitor, using the Implementation Monitoring/Management (IMM) tool, the degree of implementation of the focused strategies and actions to gauge whether implementation is having the desired effect on changes in adult practice and student achievement, and make and report necessary course corrections to the plan. The IMM was added to the CCIP in 2008-2009 and is used by teams to establish expected levels of performance for both adults and students, assign persons responsible, monitor, and communicate progress.

Stage 4: Working with leadership teams to evaluate the improvement process and make necessary changes to continually improve instructional practice and student performance by supporting them to: (1) evaluate plan implementation, impact and changes needed; (2) report summative plan progress; and (3) modify instructional practice and revise plan.

Ohio has established several structures to ensure consistency in the design and delivery of ongoing training and development of regional facilitators assigned to support districts and schools in improvement, which include a State-level Design Team and a quadrant lead structure. In addition to implementation of the OIP as a required intervention, districts in improvement status are required to implement additional consequences/interventions depending on their category of support (low, medium, high). For example, public school choice is required for all identified Title I funded buildings. Supplemental educational services (SES), likewise, is required for all Title I funded buildings identified and failing to make AYP for three or more years. Districts and buildings that remain in the same risk/support category and do not make significant progress (i.e., average increase in scores over the latest three years of assessments for each identified student group that, if maintained, indicates all students in identified groups will be proficient by 2013-2014) would be required to add an additional intervention once every three years.

**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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	
<p><b>Comments:</b> The Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model allows the state to implement an intervention model to distinguish between districts that require intensive intervention and those that are closer to meeting their student achievement goals. Under the Differentiated Accountability Model, Ohio treats districts and buildings as a system and stratifies districts into three risk categories (High, Medium and Low Support) based on the aggregate percentage of student groups not meeting AYP, rather than on the length of time that the district has not met AYP. These identified districts are provided with different options for interventions in addition to those required by law. As such, Ohio's 43 Corrective Action districts are not the focus of the state's intervention model; instead, our attention has focused on the districts identified under the new Differentiated Accountability Model.</p> <p>In 2008-2009 Ohio identified 290 school districts across all risk categories, which included all 43 districts in Corrective Action. Of these 290 districts, 23 (18 of which were in Corrective Action) were identified as needing High Support with full intervention from the State System of Support. All 23 High Support districts, as well as 49 Medium Support districts (14 of which were in Corrective Action) and 153 Low Support districts (11 of which were in Corrective Action), implemented the Ohio Improvement Process as required under the Differentiated Accountability Model. This implementation of the OIP included: development of district and building leadership teams; use of the state's Decision Framework tool to complete a deep review of district-level data and create district and building needs assessments; development of district- and building-level focused improvement plans based on the needs assessment; and, if selected by the state, a review by the State Diagnostic Team. The plans developed at the district and building level in 2008-2009 are being implemented this school year.</p> <p>The original sanctions for districts in Corrective Action under NCLB will be reinstated by the Ohio Department of Education for any district that does not provide consistent oversight of improvement efforts and/or fails to demonstrate significant district improvement.</p>	

**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 SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	0
Schools	6	2
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	07/30/09
---	----------

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2008-09.

#### 1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

*Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2008-09.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2008-09.
  - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

*States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2009.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2009.
  - In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the <b>mathematics</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	125,968	125,867
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	65,616	63,215
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	52.1	50.2
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	126,151	126,021
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	73,527	75,441
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	58.3	59.9
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did not make adequate yearly progress

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2008-09	133
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2008-09	54
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that <b>did not make adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2008-09	504
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
6 = Combo 1	Combination of strategies 1, 2, and 3	637	54	82	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective use of relevant data to identify areas of greatest need</li> <li>• Development of focused plans with a limited number of goals and strategies directly related to identified areas of greatest need</li> </ul>
5	Development of building leadership team	637	54	82	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective use of relevant data to identify areas of greatest need</li> <li>• Development of focused plans with a limited number of goals and strategies directly related to identified areas of greatest need</li> </ul>
<b>Comments:</b>						

Column 1 Response Options Box
1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

#### 1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Information about these strategies as part of implementation of the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) was shared through a variety of mechanisms. First, face-to-face meetings with partner organizations such as the Ohio Educational Service Center Association (OESCA), Ohio Federation of Teachers (OFT) and Buckeye Association of School Administrators (BASA) were held to share information and seek involvement in supporting the work. Partner organizations such as the ones listed above also include information about the OIP and related strategies on their Web sites. BASA has embedded the OIP, in combination with information about the work of the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council (OLAC), into its ongoing professional development for aspiring, new and veteran superintendents across the state. Similarly, the Ohio Association of Secondary School Administrators (OASSA) has revised its Web site to include a "spotlight on OIP" feature and also includes sessions on the work at association-sponsored conferences as well as regional meetings (i.e., zone meetings) for principals and other secondary-level administrators from all parts of the state. In addition to individual communication to districts in improvement, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shares information about the work in her communication with all districts in Ohio. In addition to information dissemination and conference activities, the strategies embedded within the OIP have been incorporated into online professional development modules available through the OLAC Web site, as have articles written about the work. A statewide summit held in spring 2009 featured district implementation of the OIP and lessons learned by districts in Ohio, and follow-up action forms and communities of practice sessions are planned for December 2009, March 2010 and June 2010.

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

#### 1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

##### 1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

**Comments:**

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

**1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools**

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

**1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance**

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003(g) funds were used to support the following technical assistance and evaluation activities: (1) funding state diagnostic team (SDT) reviewers and related costs; (2) funding training and start up costs for educational service center (ESC) personnel who completed training in the OIP and worked with districts and schools to implement the OIP; and (3) development of phase I of the Decision Framework tool Web application, which is the major tool used by all districts, buildings and community schools at stage 1 of the OIP.

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

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2008-09 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The core work of the state support teams (SSTs), as defined in section 1.4.5.2, was primarily supported through state general revenue funds. Additionally, IDEA Part B discretionary dollars funded to SSTs supported facilitation, consultation, technical assistance, and professional development provided by the SST personnel working with districts and schools in improvement. These dollars supported more effective use of data, particularly subgroup data for students with disabilities, and the use of strategies to address district-identified needs as part of the OIP. IDEA Part D (state personnel development grant) dollars were used to test development of the process and related tools with selected cohorts of districts that were in improvement for failing to meet AYP for students with disabilities.

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

### 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.

##### 1.4.9.1.2 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 to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	254,310
Applied to transfer	7,711
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,322

**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 under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 8,300,592

**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 to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

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

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	62

**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? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school 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.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 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*.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	184,996
Applied for supplemental educational services	29,306
Received supplemental educational services	19,789
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**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*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 30,750,689
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of 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 the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	570,872	560,802	98.2	10,070	1.8
All elementary classes	288,936	284,866	98.6	4,070	1.4
All secondary classes	281,936	275,936	97.9	6,000	2.1

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state uses departmentalized classrooms where each class is counted multiple times, once for each subject.
---

**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% 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. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is 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 the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

**1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified**

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note:** Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	68.6
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	12.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	7.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	11.6
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not properly certified.

	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)	40.9
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	32.9
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	16.2
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not properly certified.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

**NOTE:** No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, 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).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	72,746	68,768	94.5
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	77,105	76,784	99.6
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	54,881	52,821	96.2
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	85,289	84,842	99.5

**1.5.4** 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	70.0	26.1
Poverty metric used	Economic disadvantage	
Secondary schools	51.5	18.3
Poverty metric used	Economic disadvantage	

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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types 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/files/uploads/5/Language\\_Instruction\\_Educational\\_Programs.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	French, Mandarin, Somali, Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	French, Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Arabic, Cambodian, Chinese, French, Hindi, Russian, Somali, Spanish, Swahili, Vietnamese, Ukrainian
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Russian, Somali, Spanish, Ukrainian
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs provided the following descriptions of other services not captured by the list above:

- After-school ESL tutoring
- Newcomer Program for refugee and overage students provided intensive ESL and academic support
- In-class support (inclusion) with trained ESL teacher and/or instructional assistant
- Push-in: in-class coaching/tutoring and academic support
- Immersion in the regular (English) classrooms with assistance from pull-out bilingual (Spanish) tutor and individual tutoring

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	39,361
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

In the table below, provide the unduplicated 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.	38,059
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	15,822
Somali	3,378
Arabic	2,416
German	1,310
Japanese	1,045

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The current data element that Ohio collects is "Student's Native Language," which by current definition is the "native" or first language of the student. This is often the language spoken at home but should denote the primary language spoken by the student at the onset of speech. This definition does not necessarily correlate with the question asked. Therefore, as of 2009-2010, Ohio has begun to collect the "Student Home Language" element. Although the change has been made for 2009-2010, the data reported above use the same business rules as in years past.

**1.6.3 Student Performance Data**

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

**1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	34,665
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,013
Total	36,678
<b>Comments:</b> The student count reported for question 1.6.3.1.1 (36,678) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled in Ohio schools during the ELP assessment window. The student count reported for question 1.6.2.1 (39,361) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled at any time during the school year. A total of 2,683 students were not enrolled during the ELP testing window.	

**1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results**

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	3,398
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	10.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	33,571
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,878
Total	35,449
<b>Comments:</b> The student count reported for question 1.6.3.2.1 (35,449) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled in Ohio schools during the ELP assessment window. The student count reported for question 1.6.2.2 (38,059) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled at any time during the school year. A total of 2,610 students were not enrolled during the testing window.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	<b>#</b>
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	8,224

**1.6.3.2.2**

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	9,406	39.5	11,371	47.80
ELP attainment	1,216	5.1	2,282	9.60
<b>Comments:</b>				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
None
<b>Comments:</b>

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
None
<b>Comments:</b>

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
None
<b>Comments:</b>

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

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.

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

**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
339	22	361
<b>Comments:</b> These data were rechecked with the help of the Ohio Department of Education's IT Department, and it was verified that the number of students reported for Year Two is accurate. The total number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored throughout the State is 22. This number represents the sum of all former LEP students in their second year of being monitored that LEAs reported via Ohio's Education Management Information System (EMIS) for the 2008-2009 school year.		

**1.6.3.6.2** In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
263	236	89.7	27
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
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 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
263	239	90.9	24
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science 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 who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
132	108	81.8	24
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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**

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. 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.

**Note:** Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved 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	272
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	123
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	185
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	158
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	254
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	10
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	102
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	76
# - Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	0

**Comments:** In each of the figures in Table 1.6.4.1, consortia members were counted as individual subgrantees. Consortia members are considered as individual subgrantees solely for the purpose of AMAO calculations.

According to Ohio's Title III improvement plan submitted to and approved by the U.S. Department of Education, 2006-2007 is the first school year to be used in calculating the number of years that an LEA has not met a Title III AMAO, not the 2005-2006 school year. Consequently, the 2008-2009 school year is considered year three, rather than year four, for Ohio's Title III AMAO accountability purposes. For this reason, the number of subgrantees that have missed a Title III AMAO for four consecutive years as of the 2008-2009 school year is reported as zero.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

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

**1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs**

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

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

### 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

#### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated 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 under 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 language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

<b># Immigrant Students Enrolled</b>	<b># Students in 3114(d)(1) Program</b>	<b># of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants</b>
11,624	5,286	35

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note:** Section 3301(8) ð The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course ð (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.	1,653
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	581

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics 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 activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	193	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	167	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	99	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	53	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	101	
Other (Explain in comment box)	40	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	184	11,438
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	166	1,122
PD provided to principals	141	883
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	147	493
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	109	1,188
PD provided to community based organization personnel	27	425
<b>Total</b>	<b>771</b>	<b>15,549</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The total number of subgrantees (LEAs) is 272.

Other PD Topics include:

- Training for paraprofessionals in parental engagement and interpreting services
- Cultural Awareness for staff and students
- Professional Learning Teams with focus often on LEP student instruction
- Instructional strategies related to LEP students
- ESL Technology
- Differentiated Instruction related to LEP students
- Second language acquisition, acculturation, bi/multilingualism
- SBR interventions for LEP
- Pedagogical Instruction
- OIP training and research on site
- Culturally Responsive Practices district PD initiative last year

**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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/08	07/15/08	14
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**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	
<b>Comments:</b> There were zero schools in Ohio identified as "Persistently Dangerous" for the 2008-2009 school year.	

**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 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	84.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	69.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.4
Black, non-Hispanic	64.3
Hispanic	64.5
White, non-Hispanic	89.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	84.1
Limited English proficient	71.5
Economically disadvantaged	72.7
Migratory students	54.2
Male	83.4
Female	85.8
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group = 78.2%.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**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 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	4.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.8
Black, non-Hispanic	10.3
Hispanic	8.4
White, non-Hispanic	3.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4.8
Limited English proficient	6.0
Economically disadvantaged	6.7
Migratory students	22.6
Male	4.7
Female	4.0
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial student group = 6.6%.	

**FAQ on dropout rates:**

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

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	1,006	1,006
LEAs with subgrants	51	51
Total	1,057	1,057
<b>Comments:</b> The total includes operational public school districts, educational service centers (ESCs), joint vocational school districts, charter school LEAs and state agencies. The number of LEAs with subgrants includes 17 public district subgrantees, 3 ESC subgrantees, and 31 public districts served by the 3 ESC subgrantees.		

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	592
K	393	1,052
1	402	1,106
2	356	1,002
3	348	1,018
4	297	918
5	276	878
6	230	836
7	236	853
8	228	848
9	281	1,316
10	211	840
11	152	569
12	188	539
Ungraded	0	94
Total	3,598	12,461

**Comments:** Counts for LEAs With Subgrants include homeless students enrolled in any of 17 public district LEA subgrantees or any of 31 public district LEAs served by 3 ESC subgrantees.

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

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

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	441	5,409
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,846	6,754
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	73	49
Hotels/Motels	238	249
Total	3,598	12,461

**Comments:** Counts for LEAs With Subgrants include homeless students enrolled in any of 17 public district LEA subgrantees or any of 31 public district LEAs served by 3 ESC subgrantees.

### 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)	1,217
K	1,047
1	1,105
2	1,014
3	1,014
4	927
5	882
6	839
7	865
8	853
9	1,343
10	857
11	563
12	518
Ungraded	247
Total	13,291

**Comments:** Counts include homeless students served by any of 17 public district LEA subgrantees or any of 3 ESC subgrantees.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups 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	1,108
Migratory children/youth	1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,713
Limited English proficient students	253

**Comments:** Counts include homeless students served by any of 17 public district LEA subgrantees or any of 3 ESC subgrantees.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

**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.

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	20
Expedited evaluations	15
Staff professional development and awareness	19
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	19
Transportation	20
Early childhood programs	17
Assistance with participation in school programs	19
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	19
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	17
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	19
Coordination between schools and agencies	19
Counseling	14
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	16
Clothing to meet a school requirement	17
School supplies	20
Referral to other programs and services	19
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	13
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

These figures are for direct subgrantees only (20 maximum). We do not have figures for public districts served by ESC subgrantees.

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

**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.

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	7
School Selection	8
Transportation	11
School records	11
Immunizations	7
Other medical records	6
Other Barriers – in comment box below	4

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other barriers include required uniforms, maintaining attendance, finding an apartment or place to live and difficulties in identifying homelessness.

### 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 *ESEA* 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 *ESEA*.

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	463	247
4	408	249
5	431	180
6	379	205
7	336	156
8	346	131
High School	291	186
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

#### 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 *ESEA* 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	457	271
4	408	203
5	430	120
6	380	156
7	339	147
8	344	114
High School	288	163
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

## 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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 under Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	385
K	202
1	162
2	159
3	130
4	131
5	109
6	99
7	118
8	88
9	111
10	77
11	74
12	38
Ungraded	6
Out-of-school	782
Total	2,671

**Comments:** The Category 1 total count decreased 5.9% from the previous year.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

**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 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A
-----

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	159
K	132
1	98
2	100
3	78
4	79
5	61
6	46
7	49
8	41
9	32
10	21
11	13
12	5
Ungraded	4
Out-of-school	158
Total	1,076
<b>Comments:</b> The Category 2 total count decreased by 9.0% from the previous year.	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

**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 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

### 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 2008-2009 Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count were generated using the Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2). OMSIS2 is a client/server management information system utilizing the FileMaker suite of hosted database tools. OMSIS2 is developed and maintained by TRECA, a non-profit entity providing K-12 educational technology services through a consortium of Ohio public school districts.

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

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

On the Certificate of Eligibility (COE), the following information is gathered:

SECTION I Family Data - parent's/ guardian's name, race, home language, Ohio current address, home base address and home base school district

SECTION II Child Data - child(ren)'s name, sex, birth date, birthplace, grade level, USID number, date arrived in Ohio and date arrived in school district

SECTION III Eligibility Data - former address, new address, QAD, reason for moving, qualifying activity and description/ type of agricultural work household members are engaged in

SECTION IV Comments - eligibility/ educational

All LEA programs are required to fill out attendance forms and transfer documents on every eligible child who is served for their summer and fall programs. This information has the days enrolled and present, as well as all education information, which includes reading skills, math skills and English level proficiency. Secondary credit information forms are also required for all 7th through 12th graders. This information includes classes and credit hours that the student participated in. After these forms are completed, the records coordinator and data entry specialist check to make sure that the forms are completed and the information is input into OMSIS2.

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

Recruiters are responsible for the completion of the COE through a personal interview with the child's family. These data are generally collected beginning in May and ending in November for Ohio's seasonal qualifying work (i.e., a variety of vegetables, fruits, processing plants, greenhouses, etc.). Summer programs are held during the period of time between when a district ends school in the spring and when it starts school in the fall. This varies slightly from district to district, and these programs usually run from June to August. Our year-round and fall programs are held in districts during the school year as appropriate for their migrant populations.

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

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

When students are identified in Ohio for the first time, OMEC staff first checks the NGS system to see if they have been identified elsewhere. If they have, then Ohio uses the student's existing USID number as shown in the NGS system. This check of the NGS system is accomplished using the World Wide Web and NGS's password-protected system. A USID number is created on the NGS system if no number exists for a given student. If NGS has a number, that number is used. In all cases either the existing number or the number assigned to a student through the NGS system is the only number used in Ohio's database for students. When eligible students are first identified and entered into the database, they are all Category 1 students. They are not counted in Category 2 unless they also are eligible for and receive funded summer services.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A query is run against the database described above for Category 1 students. It identifies those students between ages 3 and 21 (as shown by the Student Identification Table) who have made a qualifying move within the past 36 months (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table) and have had a third birthday before the end date of the program in which they participated (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table, the Student Identification Table and the Supplemental Program Information Table) or before the end of their residency in Ohio (we may reference an older sibling's enrollment information to determine this third criterion). Another query is run for the Category 2 students that includes all of the above, but additionally has a summer service indicator. The fields used to run this particular query are SID.USID, SID.LastName, SID.FirstName, ED.USID, SID.DeceasedDate, SID.GraduationDate, SID.BirthDate, ED.LastQualifyingMove, ED.EnrollmentDate, ED.WithdrawalDate, ED.OhioArrivalDate and several flag fields that serve to exclude specific instances (e.g., children who turn 3 during the school year, but for whom no Ohio residency can be guaranteed except at the age of two). The database administrator or the administrator's representative at the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC) executes these queries and updates a series of flags in a specific order. Each September a home visit is made to each student for whom a valid COE exists to determine if the student is still resident in the state. This verification date is added to our database. It will serve as an indication that the student is eligible to be included in Category 1 for the new program year. All students added through a new COE during the program year are also counted, as previously described.

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

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

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

The COE is the primary tool for collecting the data that certify the children to qualify for migrant services. Once completed and checked for accuracy, information from the form is entered into the state database and becomes the basis for Category 1 identification. COE are checked for accuracy by LEA transfer record clerks, as well as project directors, before they are turned in to OMEC by checking past verification forms for eligibility and student records and verifying birth dates on the NGS system. The identification and recruitment coordinator also signs a statement that quality control is done on the COE before it is checked for complete accuracy and input into the Ohio database system. If a discrepancy occurs when it is received at the Records Office, the coordinator will then ask the identification and recruitment coordinator to contact the recruiter to revisit the family.

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

Recruiters resolve issues encountered on the COE forms by consulting the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and the State Transfer Record Coordinator.

Ohio's MEP State Director provides assistance to questions requiring interpretation of federal and state laws, regulations and policies.

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

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

Once quality control procedures have been completed as indicated above, the Records Transfer Coordinator enters the record into the database. This is the final process in the COE data acquisition process.

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

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.

When we started the re-interview process, 100 names were randomly selected from our state database (OMSIS2). Our goal was to complete 50 total re-interviews. When we reached the 50th name on the randomized list, we discovered that a few re-interviews had been attempted, but the families could not be located because they had moved away. Therefore we went down the randomized list and continued to use replacements. A total of 75 re-interviews had been attempted by the time we had 50 completed re-interviews confirmed. Of these 50 completed re-interviews, all 50 were found to be eligible for the MEP.

#### Reasons for Non-Response:

A total of 75 interviews were attempted to meet our goal of 50 face-to-face re-interviews. Of the 25 people we could not find, 19 had already left the State. The remaining six people were visited at least three separate times and, although they were still in Ohio, they were never home when the recruiter drove out to see them. Recruiters were instructed to document the dates and times these visits were attempted directly on the re-interview form. Our recruiters were required to conduct at least three physical visits to the family's residence before we considered that re-interview unattainable.

#### Why the State Believes Sample Size was Sufficient to Provide an Early Warning to Eligibility Issues:

We believe that a re-interview sample size of 50 is adequate to provide an early warning to eligibility issues because previous use of 50 as the re-interview sample size has proved adequate for doing so, and because this sample size is sufficiently large to produce results that can be deemed statistically significant. Furthermore, our sample size was large enough to include at least one Certificate of Eligibility (COE) from each recruiter in the State. If this criterion had not been met, we would have increased the number of face-to-face interviews by increasing the randomized sample size until we had COE representation from all recruiters. However, this was not necessary.

#### Who Completed the Re-Interviews:

Our recruiters completed the re-interview process. The State Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Coordinator pulled recruiters from their assigned recruitment areas to re-interview families in areas of the state assigned to other recruiters.

#### What Instruments were Used:

Each recruiter was given a list of children from the randomized sample. The list contained only basic contact information for locating families: child's name, Ohio address, phone number and names of parents/guardians (no eligibility information was included). Recruiters were given blank re-interview forms to record interview responses. The blank re-interview forms looked similar to the COEs used by the recruiters for MEP eligibility. This similarity provided continuity in the eligibility questions used during the re-interview process. When the re-interview process was completed, the State ID&R Coordinator met with each re-interviewer individually to compare the information collected on the re-interview form to the information on the original COE filed in the OMEC office. Prior to this meeting, the re-interviewer never saw a copy of the COEs selected for the re-interview.

#### How Re-Interviewers were Trained:

The recruiters attended a half-day in-service training session at OMEC. Although the recruiters were already trained in the eligibility criteria as part of their ID&R training, we went over the guidance again since some of the qualifying activities in certain areas of the State vary. As part of their re-interview responsibilities, recruiters were trained on how to approach families about the re-interview initiative and to explain the importance of this process as a quality control tool. The recruiters were told that under no circumstances were they allowed to share re-interview responses with anyone except the State ID&R Coordinator.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Verification forms are printed annually and submitted to LEAs in the fall of each year to verify whether or not students are still here for the new program year Category 1 count. Directors verify demographic data accuracy using these same lists. Lists are returned to OMEC for data base updates when completed. Individual files are pulled at random during the winter months to review them for accuracy.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Duplications are prevented through the use of a combination of Filemaker Pro database features, including extensive use of the "Go to Related Records" script command. Searches are initially performed in a related table, seeking funded services delivered during the current reporting period, and from there the "Go to Related Records" script is run, resulting in a found set of students (not services). All counts for the performance report are then generated from the Student table, where each student has only one grade level and one unique identifier, to ensure no student can possibly be counted twice in any cell of any report table.

Category 1 eligibility is first established for the majority of students using Filemaker Pro's "Constrain Foundset" feature repeatedly for each criterion that could possibly exclude a student from eligibility for the current reporting period. Students who certainly qualify based on this more rigorous screening are the first group marked as qualifying.

Students who also qualify, but whose eligibility for the current reporting period must be confirmed on a case-by-case basis, were excluded

from this first group by the stringency of the initial queries. Instead, they are marked as qualifying one by one, only after their record is carefully reviewed to make sure, for example, that their age definitely qualified them to be counted as eligible for the reporting period.

After all Category 1 eligibility has been marked, an export of data from the Student table into an empty Reporting table is executed. The reporting table contains many true-or-false fields, which correspond to each category of the annual performance report.

A database layout links the Student table to the Reporting table. By updating each of the Reporting table's true-or-false fields directly from within the Student table, and only after the Reporting table already contains exclusively Category 1 eligible records, it is possible to know with great certainty that only eligible students are contained in any individual count and that there is absolutely no duplication.

Accuracy checks are finally performed, using the Reporting table as a source and the Student table as the destination for a "Go to Related Records" script. For example, this technique could be used to find instantly the exact group of students reported as being in the seventh grade and also receiving math instruction in the summer. The group can be scrolled to verify that each student did in fact receive math instruction, when and where the student received it, and that the student is in fact a seventh grader.

The Reporting table is then preserved without changes, and directly within OMSIS2, every year. Over time this collection of annual tables serves as an ongoing Longitudinal Data (or Panel Data) reference tool for Management Information.

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

In the space below, 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.

Improvements to the ID&R process as a result of this year's prospective re-interview are minimal. Two recruiters had a QAD discrepancy that was equal to or slightly greater than 30 days compared to what was collected by the re-interviewer. It is quite common for a parent to recall two varying QADs in two separate interviews. The later the interview from the date of arrival, the less accurate the parent is with the QAD. At the next training, however, recruiters will be strongly encouraged to take their time with this question and help their families pinpoint the exact date.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns to report.