

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 2004-2005



**PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006**

**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 is also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

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

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 2006** , 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- o **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- o **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.
- o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- o **Performance Goal 5** : All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

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

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2004-2005 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 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (<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: 07/31/2006

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
 Part I, 2004-2005 Part II, 2004-2005

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Ohio Department of Education

Address:
25 S. Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4183

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Barry L. Bentley, Director, Office of Quality Assurance
Telephone: 614-728-7851
Fax: 614-752-1622
e-mail: barry.bentley@ode.state.oh.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Susan T. Zelman

Signature

Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART II

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

2.1.1 Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools

2.1.1.1 Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. 875

2.1.1.2 Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. 708

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following:

2.1.2.1 Total Number of Title I schools in the State 2049

2.1.2.2 Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State 1068

2.1.2.3 Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State 981

2.1.3 Title I, Part A Student Participation**Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups**

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups during the 2004-2005 school year. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

2.1.3.1.1 Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs 2004-2005 School Year

	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	73987
Limited English Proficient	12923
Homeless	3974
Migrant	827

2.1.3.1.2 Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group 2004-2005 School Year

	Number of Students Served
American Indian/Alaskan Native	808
Asian/Pacific Islander	3425
Black, non-Hispanic	177802
Hispanic	20429
White, non-Hispanic	266795

Multiracial = 16,498

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

2.1.3.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs during the 2004-2005 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level 2004-2005 School Year						
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0-2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Age 3-5	154	11499	36	0	11689	2.4
K	3460	50528	101	4	54093	11.1
1	15165	54080	263	22	69530	14.3
2	11954	53184	254	61	65453	13.4
3	8755	55021	212	67	64055	13.1
4	6719	53213	138	31	60101	12.3
5	3375	49301	128	36	52840	10.8
6	2075	38583	84	28	40770	8.4
7	1193	25045	25	46	26309	5.4
8	882	23218	23	97	24220	5.0
9	648	4762	1	733	6144	1.3
10	365	3831	0	240	4436	0.9
11	266	3517	0	96	3879	0.8
12	288	3131	0	133	3552	0.7
Ungraded	103	177	0	0	280	0.1
TOTALS	55402	429090	1265	1594	487351	100.0

2.1.3.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services - 2004-2005 School Year

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2004-2005 school year.

Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	22743
Reading/Language Arts	55402
Science	2987
Social Studies	5657
Vocational/Career	6622
Other (specify)	1297
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	297
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	1550
Other (specify)	1649

2.1.4 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs - 2004-2005 School Year

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2004-2005 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	87
Teachers	1516
Teacher Aides	265
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	10
Other (specify)	9

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)**2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following information:

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

1. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State 34

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

("Participating" means participating in all required core services and following any period of preparation.)

1. Total number of families participating 1047

2. Total number of adults participating

("Adults" includes teen parents.) 1083

3. Total number of adults participating who are limited English proficient 157

4. Total number of children participating 1626

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment

(A newly enrolled family means a family who is enrolled for the first time in Even Start at any time during the year.)

1. Number of newly enrolled families 942

2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants 977

3. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal poverty level 86.0

4. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED 86.0

5. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade 40.0

2.2.1.4 Percent of families that have remained in the program

(Include families that are newly enrolled and those that are continuing.)

1. From 0 to 3 months	<u>25.0</u>
2. From 4 to 6 months	<u>26.0</u>
3. From 7 to 12 months	<u>25.0</u>
4. More than 12 months	<u>24.0</u>

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State. States should report data if local projects are using the indicated measures and the state collects the data.

Indicator	Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator	Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal	Explanation of Progress
1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	TABE: TABE; BEST; CASAS	TABE: 726.0	TABE: 640.0	TABE: 88% of adults showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) program provides excellent adult basic services for all our Even Start programs in Ohio.
	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:
2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition	TABE: TABE; BEST; CASAS	TABE: 124.0	TABE: 113.0	TABE: 91% of adults showed significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition. In Ohio, we have focused professional development around ESOL populations and their specific teaching/learning needs.
	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:
3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	GED	19.0	13.0	68% of school aged adults earned a GED. Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) program provides excellent adult basic and GED services for our Even Start programs in Ohio.
	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED
4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	GED	210.0	141.0	67% of non-school aged adults earned a GED. Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) program provides excellent adult basic and GED services for our Even Start programs in Ohio.
	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED
5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Individual Growth and Developmental Indicators (IGDI) is the required measurement for Ohio	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: 162.0	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: 161.0	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: 99% of all children entering kindergarten achieved significant learning gains on measures of language development as assessed by the State's required tool.
6. The average number of letters	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask	Subtask:	Naming Subtask:	Naming Subtask	
	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask	Not available		The State of Ohio requires all of our Early Learning programs to assess using the Individual Growth and Developmental Indicator's tool.
7. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level	Ohio measured % of school aged children who are reading on grade level as determined by promotion to next grade level as per policy set by each Ohio school district.	269.0	265.0	98.5% of school-aged children are reading on grade level as determined by Ohio's measure. Ohio's stricter requirements for increased professional development have contributed to improved instruction for reading in the classrooms across the state.
	Please indicate source. Not available	Please indicate source. Not available	Please indicate source. Not available	Please indicate source. Not available
8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)
	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	571.0	482.0	84% of parents show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities. The increased focus on literacy in programming for the parenting education component and the PACT component has helped parents maintain focus in this area.

2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

Please complete the following tables for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program.

General Data Reporting Information

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the **Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2004-2005**.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

Table 2.3.1.1 Population Data

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.1 (on the next page) requires you to report the statewide unduplicated number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 - 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

2.3.1.1 Population Data

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
1. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	0	652	318	314	277	255	241	198	211	177	197	194	120	95	45	11	1240	4545
2. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"		0	56	70	69	64	55	41	38	22	24	26	13	9	0	4	0	491
3. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																		
1. Migrant Children who are LEP		32	174	178	186	170	164	132	111	79	65	46	22	8	6	4	91	1468
4. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION																		
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6
5. MOBILITY																		
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	298	121	120	111	108	98	76	84	76	89	79	51	45	146		476	1852
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 - 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	181	102	75	67	78	60	54	54	39	41	46	33	25	155		496	1371
3. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 - 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	115	50	57	46	35	49	39	35	41	35	33	20	118	0		166	740
4. Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months; counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	115	69	68	59	61	65	51	50	36	53	56	42	36	136		95	875

2.3.1.2 Academic Status

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.2 asks for the statewide *unduplicated number of eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
1. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school completion <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																		
1. <i>Dropped out of school</i>																		
2. Obtained GED																		
2. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- (Note: The results of state assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts are collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, information on the number of eligible migrant students who participated in the state assessment will be collected below.)																		
Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment -																		
1. Reading/Language Arts)																		
Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts (State																		
2. Assessment)																		
Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment -																		
3. Mathematics)																		
Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State																		
4. Assessment)																		

Note: The requested information is not collected. Ohio is a receiving state. Our migrant families are here primarily in the summer which is when the focus of instructional services are concentrated. Students return to their home states for state assessments.

2.3.1.3.1 MEP Participation - Regular School Year

Table 2.3.1.3.1 (on the next page) asks for the statewide, unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. *DO NOT count migrant children served through a schoolwide program (SWP) where MEP funds were combined, in any row of this table.*

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Regular School Year Project. Enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a "referred" service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services. In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the regular school year.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds. (Do not count the number of service interventions per child).

2.3.1.3.1 MEP Participation - Regular School Year

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
PARTICIPATION - REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR																		
1. Served in MEP (with an MEP-funded Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in a SWP where MEP funds are combined)	1	5	130	129	130	106	109	80	71	56	48	50	28	11	10	4	27	995
2. Priority for Service		0	14	13	21	21	18	12	11	8	12	7	1	0	1	0	0	147
3. Continuation of Service		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Any Instructional Service	1	5	127	127	127	99	105	76	67	55	47	47	26	10	10	3	27	959
5. Reading Instruction	0	5	74	80	80	67	61	50	62	45	37	21	7	6	2	2	6	604
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	3	43	57	53	51	34	34	23	11	17	12	6	2	2	2	2	352
7. High School Credit Accrual													6	6	6	3	0	23
8. Any Support Service	1	1	92	85	89	71	73	51	52	34	33	38	20	9	7	4	19	679
9. Counseling Service	0	0	8	8	8	7	4	6	4	2	1	6	2	1	1	0	1	59
10. Any Referred Service	1	1	88	82	86	66	73	50	50	34	32	36	19	8	6	4	19	655

Note: The total for High School Credit Accrual includes 2 students below grade 9.

2.3.1.3.2 MEP Participation -Summer/Intersession Term

Instructions Table 2.3.1.3.2 (on the next page) asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a "referred" service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services . In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the summer term.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services . For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services . Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

2.3.1.3.2 MEP Participation-Summer/Intersession Term

		Ages																	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total			
		0-2	3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12								
PARTICIPATION-SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																								
1.	Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	212	319	189	181	160	152	150	117	104	91	95	89	60	45	9	7	532	2512					
2.	Priority for Service	0	0	25	27	27	23	23	21	17	11	16	17	11	7	0	2	0	227					
3.	Continuation of Service	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8					
4.	Any Instructional Service	0	82	148	134	125	118	106	86	64	48	47	39	26	11	4	5	85	1128					
5.	Reading Instruction	0	19	105	98	94	90	77	59	57	39	41	107	5	0	4	6	711						
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	19	100	97	94	90	77	59	35	27	16	15	10	4	0	4	1	648					
7.	High School Credit Accrual																	5	8	3	0	0	0	22
8.	Any Support Service	210	319	189	181	159	152	149	117	102	91	95	89	59	44	8	7	527	2498					
9.	Counseling Service	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3					
10.	Any Referred Service	210	319	160	161	133	132	130	99	92	89	90	83	53	42	7	7	519	2326					

Note: The total for High School Credit Accrual includes 6 students below grade 9.

2.3.1.4 SCHOOL DATA

Table 2.3.1.4 asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in those schools.

In the first column of Table 2.3.1.4, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children during the regular school year. Schools include public schools, alternative schools, and private schools (that serve school-age children, i.e., grades K-12). In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide

2.3.1.4. STUDENT ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 16	b. 1300
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 0	b. 0

2.3.1.5 MEP Project Data

2.3.1.5.1 Type Of MEP Project

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds (by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant) and provides services directly to the migrant child. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs in which MEP were combined in any row of this table.

2.3.1.5.1. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (All MEP Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 12	b. 758
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All MEP Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 0	b. 0
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 15	b. 1604
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (All MEP Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 4	b. 579

2.3.1.5.2 KEY MEP PERSONNEL

For each school term, enter both the actual number and *full-time-equivalent* number of staff that are paid by the MEP. Report both the actual number and FTE number by job classification. For actual numbers, enter the total number of individuals who were employed in the appropriate job classification, regardless of the percentage of time the person was employed. For the FTE number, define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. (For example, one regular term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days, one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year .) **Use only the percentage of an FTE paid by the MEP in calculating the total FTE numbers to be reported below for each job classification.**

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs where MEP funds are combined with those of other programs.

	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR (a)	FTE IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR 1 FTE = <u>185</u> Days (b)	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION (c)	FTE IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION 1 FTE = <u>30</u> Days (d)
2.3.1.5.2. KEY MEP PERSONNEL				
1. State Director	0	0	14	14
2. Teachers	12		88	88
3. Counselors				
4. All Paraprofessionals	6		79	79
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals				
6. Recruiters	1		14	14
7. Records Transfer Staff	2		12	12

Note: FTE Regular School Year Teachers = 6.4; FTE Regular School Year Paraprofessionals = 4.5; FTE Regular School Year Recruiters = .1; FTE Regular School Year Records Transfer Staff = 1.02; State director information includes local project directors

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

2.4.1 General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 1

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.

General Instructions for Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 Tables:

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year.

Instructions: State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all State Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including neglected programs, detention facilities, juvenile correction facilities, and adult correction centers.

In the second column, indicate the duplicated number of neglected or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students *more than once* if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program more than once during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the unduplicated number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. An unduplicated count is one that counts students *only once*, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

Note: Throughout Table I, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 3. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds for only one area, count it only once.

2.4.1.1 State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities

Facility/Program type	Number of facilities/ programs	Number of N or D students (Duplicated)	Average length of stay (days)	Number of N or D students (Unduplicated)
1. Neglected Programs				
2. Delinquent (Total)			NA	
2.1. Juvenile Detention				
2.2. Juvenile Corrections			315	
2.3. Adult Corrections				2
3. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: <u> 0 </u>				

2.4.1.2 Student Demographics

Report demographic data on neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 1. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

	Number in neglected programs	Number in juvenile detention	Number in juvenile correction	Number in adult correction
All Students			3248	3400
Race/ethnicity				
American Indian or Native Alaskan				
Asian or Pacific Islander				
Black, non-Hispanic				
Hispanic				
White, non-Hispanic				
Gender				
Male			2989	
Female			259	
Age				
5-10 years old			0	
11-15 years old			228	
16-18 years old			2057	
19 years and older			963	

Disaggregated totals by race/ethnicity, gender, and age will not necessarily add up to the "All Students" totals due to missing data.

Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, juvenile corrections and detention facilities, and adult correction facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

2.4.1.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes

1. Facility Academic Offerings	Number of Facilities/Programs		
	Number of Neglected Programs (a)	Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities (b)	Number of Adult Corrections Facilities (c)
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)		7	5
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)		7	2
3. Awarded GED(s)		7	7
2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes	Number of Students		
	Number in Neglected Programs	Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention	Number in Adult Corrections
1. Academic			
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>			
1. Earned high school course credits		2471	21
2. Were enrolled in a GED program		746	2475
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>			
3. Enrolled in their local district school			5
4. Earned a GED		302	513
5. Obtained high school diploma		60	3
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education		0	162
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education		0	159
2. Vocational			
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>			
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		0	578
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>			
2. Enrolled in external job training education		0	73
3. Obtained employment		0	476

Instructions: Academic Performance Tables

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 students in neglected programs, juvenile corrections/detention, or adult corrections who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004 , to June 30, 2005

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs **(N)**, students in juvenile corrections or detention **(JC)**, and students in adult corrections **(AC)**. As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for both the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more the one of these change categories

2.4.1.4 Academic Performance in Reading

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students								
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days			In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days			In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days		
	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)		143	1627		46	564		28	636
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.		143	277		15	209		6	127
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams		94	611		10	356		4	156
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams									
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams									
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams									
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams									
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams									

Note: These results are not a full representation for the entire state of Ohio due to the amount of missing data in the responses received.

2.4.1.5 Academic Performance in Math

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students								
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days			In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days			In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days		
	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)		59	1602		18	602		5	636
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.		59	283		18	162		5	205
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams		56	620		17	371		5	347
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams									
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams									
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams									
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams									
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams									

Note: These results are not a full representation for the entire state of Ohio due to the amount of missing data in the responses received.

2.4.2 General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 2

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, **defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.**

General Instructions For Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 Tables:

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year.

At-risk students are reported only in the facility/program and demographic counts. They are **not** reported in the outcome or academic performance tables.

Instructions: Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities And Students

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all Local Education Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including at-risk programs, neglected programs, detention facilities, and juvenile correction facilities.

In the second column, indicate the duplicated number of at-risk, neglected, or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students more than once if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program *more than once* during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the unduplicated number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. An unduplicated count is one that counts students *only once*, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

Note: Throughout this table, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 4. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds for only one area, count it only once.

2.4.2.1 Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students

Facility/Program type	Number of facilities/ programs	Number of at-risk or N or D Students (Duplicated)	Average length of stay (days)	Number of at-risk or N or D students (Unduplicated)
1. At-Risk Programs			NA	
2. Neglected Programs	40			
3. Delinquent (Total)	82		NA	
4. Juvenile Detention				
5. Juvenile Corrections				
6. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: <u> 0 </u>				

Instructions: Student Demographics

Report demographic data on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 2. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

2.4.2.2 STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

	Number in at-risk programs	Number in neglected programs	Number in juvenile detention	Number in juvenile correction
All Students	794		23723	1414
Race/ethnicity				
American Indian or Native Alaskan				
Asian or Pacific Islander				
Black, non-Hispanic				
Hispanic				
<i>White, non-Hispanic</i>				
Gender				
<i>Male</i>				
<i>Female</i>				
Age				
5-10 years old				
11-15 years old				
16-18 years old				
19 years and older				

Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table, items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, and juvenile corrections and detention facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

2.4.2.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes

1. Facility Academic Offerings	Number of Facilities	
	Number of Neglected Programs	Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)	8	32
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)	6	8
3. Awarded GED(s)	2	11
2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes	Number of Students	
	Number in Neglected Programs	Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention
1. Academic		
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>		
1. Earned high school course credits	385	1948
2. Were enrolled in a GED program	15	329
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>		
3. Enrolled in their local district school	287	4208
4. Earned a GED	11	155
5. Obtained high school diploma	22	63
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education	8	45
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education	8	32
2. Vocational		
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>		
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	26	5111
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>		
2. Enrolled in external job training education	35	57
3. Obtained employment	28	51

Instructions: Academic Performance Tables

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 students in neglected programs or juvenile corrections/detention who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005.

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs **(N)** and students in juvenile corrections or detention **(JC)**. As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for both the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more than one of these change categories.

2.4.2.4 Academic Performance In Reading

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students					
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days		In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days		In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days	
	N	JC	N	JC	N	JC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)	193	1729	171	249	124	222
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.	150	1005	122	81	78	56
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams	136	493	120	94	77	48
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams						

2.4.2.5 Academic Performance In Math

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students					
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days		In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days		In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days	
	N	JC	N	JC	N	JC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)	134	1756	142	221	104	179
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.	101	931	100	75	66	55
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams	90	423	108	103	60	56
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams						
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams						
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams						
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams						
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams						

2.5 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM (TITLE I, PART F)

2.5.1 Please provide the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in reading/language arts based on data from the 2004-2005 school year. 59.8

2.5.2 Please provide the percentage of CSR schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in mathematics based on data from the 2004-2005 school year. 62.6

2.5.3 How many schools in the State have or have been awarded a CSR grant since 1998? 316

2.6 ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY (TITLE II, PART D)

Funding Year: FY 2003

School Years: 2003-2004 AND 2004-2005

2.6.1 FY 2003 Program Information

State (Approved) Technology Plan (YES/NO)	Yes <u>X</u> No ___ (circle one)
Year last updated:	<u>2003</u> (year)
Date of State Approval:	<u>05/31/03</u> MM/DD/YY
Web Site Location/URL: <u>http://www.ode.state.oh.us/centers/state_tech_plan_matrix.pdf</u>	

State Program Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its EETT performance indicators based on data sources that the State established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement, as submitted in the Consolidated State Application. Indicate which of the three or combination of the three Title II, Part D goals relates to your State goals.

Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology Goals:

1. Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools.
2. To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.
3. To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.

Provide results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

For the purpose of completing the table below, please explain how your State defines the following:

2.6.2.1.1 Curriculum Integration

Curriculum Integration is the purposeful planning of strategies and learning experiences while utilizing educational technology to facilitate and enhance learning across key learning areas.

Adapted from Board of Studies - New South Wales, Australia

http://www.bosnsw-k6.nsw.edu.au/linkages/Guiding/guiding_intro.html#guiding1

2.6.2.1.2 Technology literacy

This means that basic or introductory technology concepts are addressed by Ohio's benchmarks and indicators in the K-2, 3-5, and 6-8 grade bands in order to achieve the NCLB goal. Ohio's Technology Academic Content Standards can be found in the Ohio Department of Education's Instructional Management System at:

http://ims.ode.state.oh.us/ODE/IMS/ACS/Content/technology_standards.pdf

2.6.2.2 Goals, Objectives, Targets

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p>Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p>	<p>Performance goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics. (Page 94)</p>
<p>Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p>	<p>Goal #1</p>
<p>Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p>	<p>Program Objective: 75% of all Ohio students will reach the minimum state performance standards for achievement in technology content standards. Program Objective: 75% of all Ohio students will reach the minimum state performance standards for achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>
<p>Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p>	<p><u>Performance indicator 1.1:</u> The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment. <u>Performance indicator 1.2:</u> The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment. <u>Performance indicator 1.3:</u> The percentage of schools that integrate technology into the curriculum areas of the curriculum alignment and instructional integration phase of the district's technology plans.</p>
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA</p>	<p><u>Indicators 1.1 and 1.2:</u> 4th grade - Reading 45%; Mathematics 63%; 6th grade - Reading 54%; Mathematics 57%. <u>Indicator 1.3:</u> The Technology Planning Tool (TPT) v3 was released in August, 2005. There will be baseline data in July, 2006.</p>
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p><u>Indicators 1.1 and 1.2:</u> 4th grade - Reading 49.3%; Mathematics 58%; 6th grade - Reading 64%; Mathematics 52%. <u>Indicator 1.3:</u> The Technology Planning Tool (TPT) v3 was released in August, 2005. There will be baseline data in July, 2006.</p>
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i></p>	<p><u>Indicators 1.1 and 1.2:</u> 4th grade - Reading 64%; Mathematics 66%; 6th grade - Reading 64%; Mathematics 65%. <u>Indicator 1.3:</u> The Technology Planning Tool (TPT) v3 was released in August, 2005. There will be baseline data in July, 2006.</p>
<p>Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p>	<p><u>Indicators 1 and 2:</u> No set target has been developed yet. The Ohio Department of Education is phasing in new achievement tests and cut scores have not been identified yet, therefore there are no set targets. <u>Indicator 1.3:</u> The Technology Planning Tool (TPT) v3 was released in August, 2005. There will be baseline data in July 2006.</p>
<p>Target</p>	<p><u>Indicators 1 and 2:</u> No set target has been developed yet. The Ohio Department of</p>

<p><i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p>	<p>Education is phasing in new achievement tests and cut scores have not been identified yet, therefore there are no set targets.</p> <p><u>Indicator 1.3:</u> 50% of the districts will be increasing the target and focus for curriculum alignment and integration in the TPT v3 in reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>
<p>Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p><u>Indicators 1 and 2:</u> No set target has been developed yet. The Ohio Department of Education is phasing in new achievement tests and cut scores have not been identified yet, therefore there are no set targets.</p> <p><u>Indicator 1.3:</u> 50% of the districts will be increasing the target and focus for curriculum alignment and integration in the TPT v3 in reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>
<p>Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) <i>Target met</i> (2) <i>Target not met</i></p>	<p>Progress has been made; proficiency test results have increased from the first years. Individual districts within the competitive grant are seeing great gains in academic achievement. Full reports for each district can be found within the online portfolio, http://tlcf.osn.state.oh.us/eett/portfolio0506. There are lesson models, teacher tales, evaluation reports and student stories.</p> <p>Districts receiving formula dollars are also seeing gains as reflected in the state scores.</p> <p>The TPT has been completely redesigned in the 2005-2006 academic school year. The focus is on utilizing Edie Holcomb's five question planning framework. One of the five phases of the TPT stresses curriculum alignment and instructional integration. For each of the seven academic content areas, by grade band, districts outline the strategy for integrating educational technology into instruction. The first set of technology plans will be certified by June 30, 2006.</p>
<p>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</p>	<p>AYP data and Proficiency data. Achievement test data will be used in subsequent years once these tests have been fully implemented to replace Proficiency tests.</p> <p>Competitive districts also receive site visits with site visit protocol, and each recipient must have a local evaluation. Formula districts are monitored through the comprehensive continuous improvement plan, phone calls and selected site visits.</p> <p>Technology Planning Tool v3, phase 2 focuses on curriculum alignment and instructional integration. Each district states where they are in terms of integrating technology in each of the academic content areas, where they want to go, how they will get there, how they will measure this and how they will sustain focus and momentum.</p> <p>http://www.etech.ohio.gov/go/tpt.</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	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. (Page 95)
Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.	Goal #2
Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)	Program Objective: 75% of all Ohio students will reach the minimum state performance standards for achievement in technology content standards. Program Objective: 75% of all Ohio students will reach the minimum state performance standards for achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics.
Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)	<u>Performance indicator 2.1:</u> The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year. <u>Performance indicator 2.2:</u> The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1. <u>Performance indicator 2.3:</u> The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.
Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA	Data compiled by two grade bands: K-6 and 7-12. <u>Indicator 2.2:</u> 4th grade 45%; 6th grade 54%. <u>Indicator 2.3:</u> 4th grade 63%; 6th grade 57%.
Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i>	<u>Indicator 2.1:</u> K-6 64% LEP proficient; 7-12 57% LEP proficient. <u>Indicator 2.2:</u> 4th grade 49.3%; 6th grade 64%. <u>Indicator 2.3:</u> 4th grade 58%; 6th grade 52%.
Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i>	<u>Indicator 2.1:</u> K-6 70% LEP proficient; 7-12 70% LEP proficient. <u>Indicator 2.2:</u> 4th grade 64%; 6th grade 64%. <u>Indicator 2.3:</u> 4th grade 66%; 6th grade 65%.
Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i>	<u>Indicator 2.1:</u> K-6 75% LEP proficient; 7-12 75% LEP proficient. <u>Indicator 2.2 & 2.3:</u> No set target has been developed yet. The Ohio Department of Education is phasing in new achievement tests and cut scores have not been identified yet, therefore there are no set targets.
Target <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i>	<u>Indicator 2.1:</u> K-6 75% LEP proficient; 7-12 75% LEP proficient. <u>Indicators 2.2 & 2.3:</u> No set target has been developed yet. The Ohio Department of Education is phasing in new achievement tests and cut scores have not been identified yet, therefore there are no set targets.

<p>Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p>Indicator 2.1: K-6 80% LEP proficient; 7-12 80% LEP proficient.</p> <p>Indicators 2.2 & 2.3: No set target has been developed yet. The Ohio Department of Education is phasing in new achievement tests and cut scores have not been identified yet, therefore there are no set targets,</p>
<p>Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) <i>Target met</i> (2) <i>Target not met</i></p>	<p>Target met. LEP students' achievement has increased. Individual districts within the competitive grant are seeing great gains in academic achievement. Full reports for each district can be found within the online portfolio, http://tlcf.osn.state.oh.us/eett/portfolio0506. There are lesson models, teacher tales, evaluatino reports and student stories.</p> <p>Districts receiving formula dollars are also seeing gains as reflected in the state scores.</p>
<p>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</p>	<p>ELDA (English Language Development Assessment) for Indicator 2.1.</p> <p>State achievement tests for Indicators 2.2 & 2.3.</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p>Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p>	<p>Performance goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers. (Page 95)</p>
<p>Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p>	<p>Goal #3</p>
<p>Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p>	<p>Program Goal: 100% of all pre-service educators attending Ohio colleges and universities will be competent in technology usage upon entering Ohio classrooms.</p> <p>Program Goal: 75% of all current Ohio educators will take part in some type of professional development activities over the past 2 years that utilizes technology in instructional practice.</p>
<p>Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p>	<p><u>Performance indicator 3.1:</u> The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).</p> <p><u>Performance indicator 3.2:</u> The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development.</p> <p><u>Performance indicator 3.3:</u> The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.</p>
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA</p>	<p>No data in 2002-2003 for EETT competitive grant funds.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.1:</u> High Poverty 78%; all population 82%.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.2:</u> 73%.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.3:</u> 4.52%.</p>
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p>75% of all EETT teachers will receive technology professional development in 2003-2004.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.1:</u> High Poverty 84%; all population 87%.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.2:</u> 80%.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.3:</u> 25%</p>
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i></p>	<p>75% of all EETT teachers will receive technology professional development in 2004-2005.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.1:</u> High Poverty 90%; all population 92%.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.2:</u> 90%.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.3:</u> 50%.</p>
<p>Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p>	<p>75% of all EETT teachers will receive technology professional development in 2005-2006.</p>

	<p><u>Indicator 3.1</u>: High Poverty 100%; all population 100%.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.2</u>: 100% of teachers will receive high quality professional development.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.3</u>: 100%.</p>
<p>Target <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p>	<p>75% of all EETT teachers will receive technology professional development in 2006-2007.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.1</u>: High Poverty 100%; all population 100%.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.2</u>: 100% of teachers will receive high quality professional development.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.3</u>: 100%.</p>
<p>Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p>75% of all EETT teachers will receive technology professional development in 2007-2008.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.1</u>: High Poverty 100%; all population 100%.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.2</u>: 100% of teachers will receive high quality professional development.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.3</u>: 100%</p>
<p>Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) <i>Target met</i> (2) <i>Target not met</i></p>	<p>Target met. In addition, the State of Ohio has identified Educator Standards. Included in these standards are standards for technology. These can be found at http://esb.ode.state.oh.us/communications/standards.aspx.</p> <p>Individual districts within the competitive grant are seeing great gains in academic achievement. Full reports for each district can be found within the online portfolio, http://tlcf.osn.state.oh.us/eett/portfolio0506. There are lesson models, teacher tales, evaluation reports and student stories.</p> <p>Districts receiving formula dollars are also seeing gains as reflected in the state scores.</p>
<p>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</p>	<p>Local evaluation data and state level external evaluation data. Site visits, the creation of an online project portfolio tool following a site visit protocol, a local evaluation for each recipient. Formula districts are monitored through the comprehensive continuous improvement plan, phone calls and selected site visits.</p>

If for any reason you have modified or added Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets since submitting the State Consolidated Application, please indicate in the chart below.

Original Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	Modification or Additions
Goal #1	<p>Objective: Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools. The Ohio EETT project utilized a suite of vendor products in the learning management system (off-the-shelf courses content) and content development and management categories to assist educators and students in addressing the above goal.</p> <p>Indicator: The percentage of students utilizing web-based tools to measure increases in student achievement.</p> <p>Targets for these areas include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SY02-03 - no baseline data • SY03-04 - 30% of students in targeted sites using vendor products and tools to address academic achievement • SY04-05 - 40% of all students using vendor products to address academic achievement • SY05-06 - 50% of all students using vendor products to address academic achievement • SY06-07 - 60% of all students using vendor products to address academic achievement • SY07-08 - 75% of all students using vendor products to address academic achievement <p>Assessment of progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local and state level external evaluation data • Vendor data and tool implementation data <p>Measurement tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation reporting • Vendor reporting • Local assessments - short cycle assessments to address impact on achievement
Goal #2	<p>Objective: To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.</p> <p>Indicator: Percentage of teachers taking professional development on instructional integration and Technology Integration and Assessment Leadership Series (TIALS).</p> <p>Targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SY05-06 - 100% of all EETT grant recipients take professional development on instructional

integration. 25% of competitive EETT grant recipients participate in TIALS.

- SY06-07 - 100% of all EETT grant recipients take professional development on instructional integration. 30% of competitive EETT grant recipients participate in TIALS.
- SY07-08 - 100% of all EETT grant recipients take professional development on instructional integration. 35% of competitive EETT grant recipients participate in TIALS.

Assessment: The Ohio EETT project will utilize a combination of professional development strategies to address technology training for teachers. These strategies include:

- Vendor led professional development related to the installation and implementation of the selected vendor product
- State level professional development designed to address technology integration

In addition, an online course has been created, Technology Integration and Assessment Leadership Series (TIALS), to provide building teams to describe classroom implications from research about effectiveness of technology integration within education, understand how to align technology uses with a range in students' curricular needs, select and apply a digital curriculum design method appropriate to the classroom context, identify and apply strategies for deploying classroom-based assessment resources and methods for using feedback to inform instructional decisions and students' learning, identify and select a self-evaluation approach for assessing effectiveness of technology use in your particular context and document professional development activities and results with artifacts of practice.

Assessment of progress:

- Local and state level external evaluation data
- Vendor data and tool implementation data
- Course completion of TIALS

Measurement tools:

- Evaluation reporting
- Vendor reporting
- Local assessments - short cycle assessments to address impact on achievement
- Monitoring phone calls
- Rubrics from TIALS course and completion rate

See Program Goal #3 for additional targets related to this addition.

2.7 SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)

2.7.1 Performance Measures

Instructions: In the following chart, please identify:

- o Each of your State indicators as submitted in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application;
- o The instrument or data source used to measure the indicator;
- o The frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection;
- o The baseline data and year the baseline was established; and
- o Targets for the years in which your State has established targets.

2.7.1 Performance Measures

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
Decrease by 5% the # of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for ATOD use on school grounds by end of 2006-2007 school year.	Education Management Information System (EMIS)	Frequency: <u>Annually</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2004-2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>12,089</u> 2004-2005 <u>11,936</u> 2005-2006 <u>11,783</u> 2006-2007 <u>11,630</u> 2007-2008 <u>11,485</u>	2003-2004 <u>12,850</u> 2004-2005 <u>11,831</u> Baseline: <u>12,242</u> Year established: <u>2002-2003</u>
Decrease by 5% the # of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for fighting on school grounds by end of 2006-2007 school year.	EMIS	Frequency: <u>Annually</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2004-2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>66,070</u> 2004-2005 <u>65,233</u> 2005-2006 <u>64,397</u> 2006-2007 <u>63,561</u> 2007-2008 <u>62,767</u>	2003-2004 <u>63,600</u> 2004-2005 <u>58,464</u> Baseline: <u>66,906</u> Year established: <u>2002-2003</u>
Decrease by 5% the # of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for possession of a weapon on school grounds by end of 2006-2007 school year.	EMIS	Frequency: <u>Annually</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2004-2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>3,543</u> 2004-2005 <u>3,498</u> 2005-2006 <u>3,454</u> 2006-2007 <u>3,408</u> 2007-2008 <u>3,366</u>	2003-2004 <u>3,575</u> 2004-2005 <u>3,318</u> Baseline: <u>3,587</u> Year established: <u>2002-2003</u>
Decrease by 3% the # of out-of-school suspensions for any reason by end of 2006-2007 school year.	EMIS	Frequency: <u>Annually</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2004-2005</u>	2003- 2004 <u>237,488</u> 2004- 2005 <u>235,693</u> 2005- 2006 <u>233,899</u> 2006- 2007 <u>232,104</u> 2007- 2008 <u>230,634</u>	2003- 2004 <u>237,792</u> 2004- 2005 <u>213,231</u> Baseline: <u>239,282</u> Year established: <u>2002-2003</u>
Decrease by 3% the # of expulsions for any reason by end of 2006-2007 school year.	EMIS	Frequency: <u>Annually</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2004-2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>6,801</u> 2004-2005 <u>6,749</u> 2005-2006 <u>6,698</u> 2006-2007 <u>6,646</u> 2007-2008 <u>6,597</u>	2003-2004 <u>10,162</u> 2004-2005 <u>10,424</u> Baseline: <u>6,852</u> Year established: <u>2002-2003</u>
By end of school year 2006-2007 no public school in Ohio will be designated as "Persistently Dangerous."	Ohio Department of Youth Services and EMIS	Frequency: <u>Annually</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2004-2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>0</u> 2004-2005 <u>0</u> 2005-2006 <u>0</u> 2006-2007 <u>0</u> 2007-2008 <u>0</u>	2003-2004 <u>0</u> 2004-2005 <u>0</u> Baseline: <u>0</u> Year established: <u>2002-2003</u>

2.7.2 Suspension and Expulsion Data

Instructions: In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students for each of the underlined incidents.

Please also provide the State's definition of an elementary, middle, and high school, as well as the State's definition of each of the incidents underlined below.

(If your State does not collect data in the same format as requested by this form, the State may provide data from a similar question, provided the State includes a footnote explaining the differences between the data requested and the data the State is able to supply.)

School Type	State Definition
Elementary School	Grades K-5
Middle School	Grades 6-8
High School	Grades 9-10

Note: In Ohio there is no one definition for elementary, middle or high school. Since data are available by grade level, for the purpose of the Title IV portion of this report the above indicated grade ranges will be used to provide answers for the following questions.

2.7.2.2 The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.

State definition of physical fighting: Fighting/Violence is mutual participation in an incident involving physical violence.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	14562	2353
Middle	26070	686
High School	15832	976

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	73	2353
Middle	483	686
High School	649	976

Note: The number of LEAs reporting column uses school buildings as the unit of analysis.

2.7.2.3 The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession

State definition of weapons: Ohio has two weapons classifications. For the purpose of this report they have been added together. Firearm - A firearm is any weapon which will, is designed to, or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive; the frame or receiver of any such weapon; any firearm, muffler or firearm silencer; or any machine gun. This includes zip guns, starter guns, and flare guns. Weapon other than a firearm - A weapon, device, instrument, material, or substance, animate or inanimate, that is used for, or is readily capable of causing death or serious bodily injury, except that such a term does not include a pocket knife with a blade of less than 2 1/2 inches in length.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	749	2353
Middle	983	686
High School	777	976

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	65	2353
Middle	174	686
High School	195	976

Note: The number of LEAs reporting column uses school buildings as the unit of analysis.

2.7.2.4 The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

State definition of alcohol-related: Use, possession, sale or distribution of intoxicating alcoholic beverages.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	13	2353
Middle	240	686
High School	1147	976

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	0	2353
Middle	10	686
High School	50	976

Note: The number of LEAs reporting column uses school buildings as the unit of analysis.

2.7.2.5 The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

State definition of illicit-drug related: Use, possession, sale or distribution of any controlled drug other than prescription medication that has been administered in accordance with the district's policies.

SUSPENSIONS		Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	92		2353
Middle	1029		686
High School	2643		976

EXPULSIONS		Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	4		2353
Middle	155		686
High School	337		976

Note: The number of LEAs reporting column uses school buildings as the unit of analysis.

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

Instructions: Section 4116 of ESEA requires that each State provide information pertaining to the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts. Please describe your State's efforts to include parents in these activities.

Parents play a vital role in the education of Ohio's children. In fall 2002, the Department formed a Parent Advisory Council to provide a much needed connection between Ohio parents, their children and the Department.

Members, who represent Ohio's diversity in school type (rural, suburban, urban), income, race/ethnicity and geographic location, serve a two-year term.

They attend bi-annual meetings where they not only learn about what is happening in education in Ohio, but also provide feedback and input on new products and materials for families.

Throughout the year, they review materials and serve as resources for families in their communities.

The Ohio Department of Education has three workshops for families. All the workshops are free and two hours in length. Parents and members of community organizations are trained to host the workshops for families in their community.

The first workshop is about reading and its importance to the success of children.

The second workshop is about Ohio's new academic content standards - what children are expected to know and be able to do from kindergarten through 12th grade.

The third workshop is on Ohio's School Climate Guidelines and how a safe and supportive learning environment is important to the success of children.

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS(TITLE V, PART A)

2.8.1 Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

1. The Office of Field Relations' primary purpose is to support the success of Regional School Improvement Teams (RSIT). RSITs' daily work involves providing assistance to districts for school improvement. It is critical that these teams, comprised of some 100 people, are closely linked to guide their ongoing work. With the use of technology, it has become more efficient to bring together this group of people through virtual rather than in person mechanisms. The laptops will facilitate the group's connection with Columbus via e-mail, voice-over IP, online meetings, instant messaging, and other such time- and money-saving communications

2. Parent Academy Training of Trainers – Purpose: Train parents, educators, and community members as facilitators of the Department's Parent Academy workshops focused on student academic achievement.

2.8.2 The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including: (1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2004-2005 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area [1]	Number of LEAs that used 20% or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: Student Achievement in Reading and Math	644	325	
Area 2: Teacher Quality	294	144	
Area 3: Safe and Drug Free Schools	18	7	
Area 4: Increase Access for all Students	231	108	
Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).			

Note: Data for total number of students served column are not available.

2.8.3 Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2004-2005, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. 98

2.8.4 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2004-2005. 49

2.8.5 Indicate the percentage of Title V funds, including funds transferred from other programs into Title V that LEAs used for the four strategic priorities.

[1] In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)

2.8.6 Indicate the percentage of LEAs that completed needs assessments that the State determined to be meaningful and credible. 100.0

Data are not available for Section 2.8.5.

2.8.7 Describe how decisions were made regarding the local uses of funds.

Each LEA submits a district plan with the funding application. The Ohio Department of Education's web based electronic tool is the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP).

The CCIP LEA plan includes a data driven needs assessment. All approved LEA applications are awarded based on evidenced needs in the needs assessment. Funding decisions are made by the LEA based on the data driven evidenced needs in relation to the Title V allowable activities. Goals, performance measures and strategies in the district plan are aligned by the LEA to the Title V program budget.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B)

2.9.1 Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2004-2005 school year. 11

2.9.2 Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)

2.9.2.1 LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2004-2005 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	3
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	8
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	8
Parental involvement activities	3
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	2
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	11
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1

- 2.9.2.2** Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

There were 8 **RLIS REAP Districts** that didn't meet AYP:

- Bright Local (Highland)
 - Cambridge City (Guernsey)
 - Meigs Local (Meigs)
 - Northwest Local (Scioto)
 - Portsmouth City (Scioto)
 - Southern Local (Meigs)
 - Trimble Local (Athens)
 - Western Local (Pike)

According to SEC.6224.Accountability.(e)Determination Regarding Continuing Participation-

- (1) after the third year that a local educational agency or specially qualified agency in the State receives funds under this subpart, and on the basis of the results of the assessment described in subsection (d)—
 - (A) in the case of a local educational agency, determine whether the local educational agency made adequate yearly progress, as described in section 1111(b)(2); and
 - (B) in the case of a specially qualified agency, submit to the Secretary information that would allow the Secretary to determine whether the specially qualified agency has made adequate yearly progress, as described in section 1111(b)(2);
- (2) permit only those local educational agencies or specially qualified agencies that made adequate yearly progress, as described in section 1111(b)(2), to continue to receive grants under this subpart; and
- (3) permit those local educational agencies or specially qualified agencies that failed to make adequate yearly progress, as described in section 1111(b)(2), to continue to receive such grants only if the State educational agency disbursed such grants to the local educational agencies or specially qualified agencies to carry out the requirements of section 1116.

Note: REAP Guidance reference for RLIS Accountability is Section III-D.

The 8 RLIS districts who did not meet AYP may continue to receive RLIS funds (which applies to the FY06 RLIS allocation) only if the LEA agrees to use the funds to carry out the requirements of section 1116 of the ESEA.

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2004-2005 school year?
No

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds

2.10.2.1 Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2004-2005 school year. 85

2.10.2.2 In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	12	46341
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	5	73389
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	4	127140
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	40	2817258
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	30	563472

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds FROM eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred FROM eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	51	3365447
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	30	82836
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	26	85362
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	14	93955

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.

2.11 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS(TITLE IV, PART B)

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.