CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001

For reporting on School Year 2010-11

OHIO



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011 PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2012

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

The ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2010-11 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PARTI

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

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

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

PART II

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

- 1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
- 2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
- 3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16**, **2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17**, **2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2010-11 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2010-11 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

OMB Number: 1810-0614
Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: X_Part I, 2010-11 Part II, 2010-11
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Ohio Department of Education
Address: 25 S. Front Street Columbus, OH 43215-4183
Person to contact about this report:
Name: Dr. Ardith M. Allen, Social Science Research Specialist, Office of Accountability
Telephone: 614-728-8054
Fax: 614-728-2627
e-mail: ardith.allen@ode.state.oh.us
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Stan W. Heffner, Superintendent of Public Instruction
<u>Friday, March 9, 2012, 1:19:29 PM</u> Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT PART I

For reporting on **School Year 2010-11**



PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011 5PM EST

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

At its June 2010 meeting, the State Board of Education made Ohio the seventh state to adopt the Common Core State Standards for English/language arts and mathematics. At that time, the State Board also adopted revisions to the academic standards for science and social studies. In March 2011, the State Board adopted model curricula aligned to the new standards for English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. The state plans to implement the new standards and model curricula fully by the 2014-2015 school year, which is coterminous with the completion of Ohio's next generation of assessments.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts and/or science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Pursuant to Ohio Revised Code §3301.0712, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor of Higher Education are to promulgate rules that make the following changes to Ohio's assessment system: 1) combine the reading and writing tests in grades 4 and 7 into a single English/language arts test, and make the reading tests in grades 3, 5, 6, and 8 English/language arts tests; 2) reduce the number of performance level descriptions from five to three for all state assessments; and 3) replace the Ohio Graduation Tests in reading, writing, science, mathematics, and social studies with a two-tiered college- and career-ready high school assessment system in which students have to meet requirements on: a) a nationally standardized assessment that measures readiness for college and careers; or b) a series of end of course exams that include options such as AP, IB, and ACT Quality Core in English/language arts, science, mathematics, and social studies. In November 2011, the State Board of Education selected the PARCC consortium for Ohio to join as a governing state. The Ohio Department of Education will be working on aligning the state requirements in Ohio Revised Code with the assessment system design of the PARCC consortium. Ohio is also committed to revising its current collection-of-evidence approach to alternate assessments and replacing it with an on-demand alternate assessment. The new assessment system is to be operational in the 2014-2015 school year.

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by	
section 1111(b)	20.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and	
ocal educational agencies are held accountable for the results	80.0
omments:	<u>'</u>

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

triat do not apply).	Used for Purpose
Purpose	(yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes_
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>No</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	No
mproving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	No
Other	No
Comments:	

1.2 Participation in State Assessments

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	941,098	934,505	99.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,400	1,381	98.6
Asian	16,174	16,111	99.6
Black or African American	149,537	146,188	97.8
Hispanic or Latino	31,645	31,139	98.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	703,116	700,696	99.7
Two or more races	39,226	38,990	99.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	142,341	140,355	98.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,916	17,646	98.5
Economically disadvantaged students	430,576	425,407	98.8
Migratory students	214	212	99.1
Male	482,511	478,718	99.2
Female	458,587	455,787	99.4

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	43,561	31.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	80,487	57.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,307	11.6
Total	140,355	
Comments:	•	·

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	946,430	940,128	99.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,417	1,398	98.7
Asian	16,381	16,267	99.3
Black or African American	150,493	147,336	97.9
Hispanic or Latino	31,957	31,468	98.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	706,608	704,298	99.7
Two or more races	39,574	39,361	99.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	143,065	141,128	98.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,113	17,738	97.9
Economically disadvantaged students	434,043	429,179	98.9
Migratory students	235	233	99.1
Male	485,281	481,649	99.3
Female	461,149	458,479	99.4

Comments: 1) Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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

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

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

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	44,441	31.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	80,374	57.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,307	11.6
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	6	0.0
Total	141,128	

Comments: 1) Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

2) New LEP students (<12 months) who took the ELP in lieu of the reading/language arts (RLA) assessment are counted as participating but have no RLA proficiency results to report in Section 1.3.2.

²⁾ New LEP students (<12 months) who took the ELP in lieu of the reading/language arts (RLA) assessment are counted as participating but have no RLA proficiency results to report in Section 1.3.2.

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	408,537	404,035	98.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	607	591	97.4
Asian	6,712	6,676	99.5
Black or African American	64,923	62,656	96.5
Hispanic or Latino	12,882	12,559	97.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	307,794	306,089	99.4
Two or more races	15,619	15,464	99.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	62,131	60,742	97.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,312	6,164	97.7
Economically disadvantaged students	178,271	174,838	98.1
Migratory students	73	72	98.6
Male	209,668	207,056	98.8
Female	198,869	196,979	99.0

Comments: Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,999	29.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	35,846	59.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,897	11.4
Total	60,742	
Comments:	·	

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	130,178	107,508	82.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	157	121	77.1
Asian	2,531	2,329	92.0
Black or African American	20,366	12,517	61.5
Hispanic or Latino	4,982	3,651	73.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	95,790	83,827	87.5
Two or more races	6,352	5,063	79.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	18,515	10,988	59.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,812	2,636	69.2
Economically disadvantaged students	64,129	47,036	73.3
Migratory students	37	24	64.9
Male	66,602	55,071	82.7
Female	63,576	52,437	82.5

Comments: Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	135,239	108,932	80.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	172	130	75.6
Asian	2,613	2,266	86.7
Black or African American	21,464	12,866	59.9
Hispanic or Latino	5,304	3,584	67.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	99,002	84,898	85.8
Two or more races	6,684	5,188	77.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,275	11,290	58.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,943	2,332	59.1
Economically disadvantaged students	67,747	47,766	70.5
Migratory students	57	27	47.4
Male	69,159	54,298	78.5
Female	66,080	54,634	82.7

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	. •	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: Science achievement assess	sments are given only in grades 5, 8, and 10	•	

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,916	104,725	78.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	210	165	78.6
Asian	2,423	2,186	90.2
Black or African American	20,987	11,455	54.6
Hispanic or Latino	4,813	3,124	64.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	98,280	83,133	84.6
Two or more races	6,203	4,662	75.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,213	10,427	51.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,257	1,843	56.6
Economically disadvantaged students	64,347	43,401	67.4
Migratory students	38	20	52.6
Male	68,156	53,130	78.0
Female	64,760	51,595	79.7

Comments: Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,831	112,378	84.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	210	179	85.2
Asian	2,396	2,199	91.8
Black or African American	20,963	13,729	65.5
Hispanic or Latino	4,788	3,626	75.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	98,269	87,554	89.1
Two or more races	6,205	5,091	82.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,221	12,659	62.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,162	2,054	65.0
Economically disadvantaged students	64,311	48,657	75.7
Migratory students	37	23	62.2
Male	68,118	56,261	82.6
Female	64,713	56,117	86.7

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned		Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: Science achievement assess	sments are given only in grades 5, 8, and 10	•	

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,811	89,550	66.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	184	106	57.6
Asian	2,468	2,080	84.3
Black or African American	20,999	7,833	37.3
Hispanic or Latino	4,574	2,400	52.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	99,607	73,491	73.8
Two or more races	5,979	3,640	60.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,449	7,920	38.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,737	1,120	40.9
Economically disadvantaged students	63,733	32,958	51.7
Migratory students	33	16	48.5
Male	68,594	46,009	67.1
Female	65,217	43,541	66.8

Comments: Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,744	99,928	74.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	184	125	67.9
Asian	2,443	2,082	85.2
Black or African American	20,971	10,684	50.9
Hispanic or Latino	4,559	2,880	63.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	99,608	79,893	80.2
Two or more races	5,979	4,264	71.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,430	9,309	45.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,651	1,210	45.6
Economically disadvantaged students	63,692	39,597	62.2
Migratory students	33	15	45.5
Male	68,578	49,563	72.3
Female	65,166	50,365	77.3

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,779	96,091	71.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	184	119	64.7
Asian	2,474	2,069	83.6
Black or African American	20,968	8,179	39.0
Hispanic or Latino	4,578	2,541	55.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	99,599	79,247	79.6
Two or more races	5,976	3,936	65.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,430	9,869	48.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,737	1,048	38.3
Economically disadvantaged students	63,684	36,159	56.8
Migratory students	33	16	48.5
Male	68,587	49,754	72.5
Female	65,192	46,337	71.1

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,904	103,830	78.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	218	155	71.1
Asian	2,178	1,965	90.2
Black or African American	20,936	11,633	55.6
Hispanic or Latino	4,391	2,911	66.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	99,579	82,994	83.3
Two or more races	5,602	4,172	74.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,299	9,290	45.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,283	1,192	52.2
Economically disadvantaged students	61,500	40,655	66.1
Migratory students	33	20	60.6
Male	68,087	52,295	76.8
Female	64,817	51,535	79.5

Comments: Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	133,080	115,024	86.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	219	181	82.6
Asian	2,209	2,060	93.3
Black or African American	20,922	14,877	71.1
Hispanic or Latino	4,383	3,431	78.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	99,729	89,692	89.9
Two or more races	5,618	4,783	85.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,294	12,410	61.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,200	1,380	62.7
Economically disadvantaged students	61,464	47,827	77.8
Migratory students	33	25	75.8
Male	68,177	57,173	83.9
Female	64,903	57,851	89.1

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned		Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: Science achievement assess	sments are given only in grades 5, 8, and 10	•	

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	134,003	101,132	75.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	206	142	68.9
Asian	2,297	2,056	89.5
Black or African American	21,072	10,742	51.0
Hispanic or Latino	4,369	2,784	63.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,718	81,640	81.1
Two or more races	5,341	3,768	70.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,403	8,369	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,118	1,007	47.5
Economically disadvantaged students	60,222	37,568	62.4
Migratory students	32	11	34.4
Male	68,586	51,099	74.5
Female	65,417	50,033	76.5

Comments: Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	134,153	104,656	78.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	204	160	78.4
Asian	2,291	2,008	87.6
Black or African American	21,087	12,070	57.2
Hispanic or Latino	4,358	2,979	68.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,863	83,375	82.7
Two or more races	5,350	4,064	76.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,418	8,911	43.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,037	907	44.5
Economically disadvantaged students	60,237	39,556	65.7
Migratory students	31	13	41.9
Male	68,690	51,228	74.6
Female	65,463	53,428	81.6

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned		Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	0	0	
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	0	0	
Female	0	0	
Comments: Science achievement assess	sments are given only in grades 5, 8, and 10		

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,341	99,110	74.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	194	142	73.2
Asian	2,080	1,818	87.4
Black or African American	20,305	9,596	47.3
Hispanic or Latino	4,121	2,567	62.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,678	81,495	80.9
Two or more races	4,963	3,492	70.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,936	8,150	40.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,861	830	44.6
Economically disadvantaged students	57,111	34,473	60.4
Migratory students	18	12	66.7
Male	68,302	51,105	74.8
Female	64,039	48,005	75.0

Comments: Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,355	113,422	85.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	195	163	83.6
Asian	2,044	1,859	90.9
Black or African American	20,341	14,346	70.5
Hispanic or Latino	4,114	3,215	78.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,696	89,629	89.0
Two or more races	4,965	4,210	84.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,958	11,060	55.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,798	976	54.3
Economically disadvantaged students	57,142	43,747	76.6
Migratory students	18	13	72.2
Male	68,333	56,349	82.5
Female	64,022	57,073	89.1

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132,227	90,004	68.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	195	128	65.6
Asian	2,068	1,665	80.5
Black or African American	20,262	7,151	35.3
Hispanic or Latino	4,118	2,189	53.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	100,624	75,749	75.3
Two or more races	4,960	3,122	62.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	19,899	7,339	36.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,855	518	27.9
Economically disadvantaged students	57,019	28,841	50.6
Migratory students	18	10	55.6
Male	68,247	47,145	69.1
Female	63,980	42,859	67.0

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	138,352	115,297	83.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	212	177	83.5
Asian	2,134	1,956	91.7
Black or African American	21,523	13,367	62.1
Hispanic or Latino	3,889	2,924	75.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	106,044	93,243	87.9
Two or more races	4,550	3,630	79.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,540	9,938	48.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,578	862	54.6
Economically disadvantaged students	54,365	38,984	71.7
Migratory students	21	19	90.5
Male	70,391	58,481	83.1
Female	67,961	56,816	83.6

Comments: Data for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students are included in the results for the Asian student subgroup.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	138,337	121,661	87.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	214	185	86.4
Asian	2,123	1,920	90.4
Black or African American	21,532	15,605	72.5
Hispanic or Latino	3,881	3,096	79.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	106,033	96,919	91.4
Two or more races	4,554	3,936	86.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,526	12,060	58.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,558	781	50.1
Economically disadvantaged students	54,366	42,856	78.8
Migratory students	20	12	60.0
Male	70,404	60,584	86.1
Female	67,933	61,077	89.9

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	138,029	103,867	75.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	212	151	71.2
Asian	2,134	1,825	85.5
Black or African American	21,426	10,072	47.0
Hispanic or Latino	3,863	2,338	60.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	105,866	86,247	81.5
Two or more races	4,528	3,234	71.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,413	8,455	41.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,572	504	32.1
Economically disadvantaged students	54,135	32,396	59.8
Migratory students	21	11	52.4
Male	70,222	53,337	76.0
Female	67,807	50,530	74.5

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Schools	3,628	2,174	59.9
Districts	613	311	50.7
Comments:	,	`	

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11 . Include only public Title I schools. Do <u>not</u> include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	AYP	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Title I School	# Title I Schools	IN 51 2010-11	ATP IN ST 2010-11
All Title I schools	2,270	1,202	53.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,428	596	41.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I			
schools	842	606	72.0
Comments:			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11
609	306	50.2
Comments:		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement Year 1, School Improvement Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)¹
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column must be completed* by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

Download template: Question 1.4.4.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer).

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	

Comments: Ohio is a Differentiated Accountability state, so the above-listed actions that are recommended for Corrective Action and Restructuring plans are implemented and measured differently from how they were prior to our Differentiated Accountability Model being approved and put into place in July 2008. Under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model, a district and all of its buildings are treated as one system to which appropriate improvement strategies are applied. The last school year for which building-level data on the implementation of Corrective Action and Restructuring strategies were collected is 2008-2009. Please see our response to Question 1.4.5.3 for additional detail.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring - Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	

Comments: Ohio is a Differentiated Accountability state, so the above-listed actions that are recommended for Corrective Action and Restructuring plans are implemented and measured differently from how they were prior to our Differentiated Accountability Model being approved and put into place in July 2008. Under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model, a district and all of its buildings are treated as one system to which appropriate improvement strategies are applied. The last school year for which building-level data on the implementation of Corrective Action and Restructuring strategies were collected is 2008-2009. Please see our response to Question 1.4.5.3 for additional detail.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- · District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State'ts Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if
 the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column <u>must be completed</u> by States that choose to list all districts
 or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that <u>list only</u> districts in improvement that receive
 Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data. Download template: Question 1.4.5.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer).

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2010-2011, 299 public districts, 1,037 public district buildings, and 159 community (aka charter) schools were identified for support under Ohio's Differentiated Accountability Model and were required to implement the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) using the tools developed by the State. All 299 public districts (100%), 676 of the 1,037 public district buildings (65.2%), and 154 of the 159 community schools (96.9%) received Title I funds for the 2010-2011 school year. The OIP is Ohio's strategy for ensuring a systematic and coherent approach for building the capacity of all districts and schools to improve instructional practice and student performance on a district-wide basis, and is a strategy for assisting districts to enact the Ohio Leadership Development Framework (OLDF). The OIP requires the intentional use of the following four-stage process, across which structures, tools, and people are connected, to help districts: 1) use data to identify areas of greatest need; 2) develop a plan to address areas of need built around a limited number of focused goals and strategies to improve instructional practice and student performance; 3) fully implement and monitor the degree of implementation of the plan; and 4) evaluate the effectiveness of the improvement process in changing instructional practice and impacting student performance. Selected districts also receive an on-site School Improvement Diagnostic Review (SIDR) from the State Diagnostic Team (SDT) to help them analyze their current practices against indicators of effective instructional practices.

The SIDR process is designed to gather qualitative data on behaviors and practices within the school setting that provide information beyond existing data. Current practices are measured against effective evidence- and research-based practices to identify areas of strength and areas needing improvement. The indicators of effective practice measured through the SIDR are organized around six Critical Areas of Performance: 1) Alignment with Standards; 2) Instructional Practice; 3) Environment and Climate; 4) System of Leadership; 5) Professional Development; and 6) Data Driven Decisions. The SIDR and SDT are part of a larger state system of support for low-performing schools. The State Support Team (SST) helps districts and buildings embed actionable SIDR findings into their improvement plans, and assists with implementing and monitoring changes in adult practices and student performance. Eight High Support districts and 42 buildings received the intensive SIDR in 2010-2011. These districts were selected based on past SIDR results and SST recommendations.

Technical Assistance: The technical assistance provided to districts identified for support included structured facilitation by personnel assigned from SSTs or Educational Service Centers (ESCs). These trained personnel work with districts and schools as follows:

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

Stage 1: Working with leadership teams using the OLDF tool to complete a needs assessment that identifies the most critical needs and probable causes based on data by supporting them to: 1) effectively summarize and analyze data sets; 2) understand/apply the Decision Framework (DF); 3) interpret key findings from the needs assessment; and 4) prioritize data-based critical problems in the creation of their needs assessment. A state-developed data warehouse makes relevant data needed for the DF process readily available to districts, buildings, and community schools.

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

Stage 3: Working with leadership teams to implement and monitor the degree of the focused plan's implementation by supporting them to: 1) establish and implement collaborative structures/processes/practices that support a culture of inquiry; 2) implement the plan systemically and systematically; and 3) monitor, using the Implementation Monitoring/Management (IMM) tool, the degree of implementation of the focused strategies and actions to gauge whether they are having the desired effects on changes in adult practice and student achievement, and make and report necessary corrections to the plan. The IMM, which is accessible through the CCIP, establishes expected levels of performance for both adults and students, assigns persons responsible, and monitors and communicates progress.

Stage 4: Working with leadership teams to evaluate the improvement process and make necessary changes to continually improve instructional practice and student performance by supporting them to: 1) evaluate plan implementation, impact, and changes needed; 2) report summative plan progress; and 3) modify instructional practice. Ohio has established several structures to ensure consistency in the design and delivery of ongoing training and development of regional facilitators assigned to support districts and buildings identified for support, which include a State-level Design Team and a quadrant lead structure. In addition to implementation of the OIP as a required intervention, districts identified for support are required to implement additional consequences/interventions under the Differentiated Accountability Model that are dependent on their level of support (i.e., High, Medium, or Low). Because Ohio's DA Model has been in place for three years, LEAs identified for support in each of those three years are required to select additional interventions beyond what is minimally required. The process for deciding upon these intervention choices is collaborative, and stakeholders include members of an LEA's leadership, Single Points of Contact (SPoCs) leading the SSTs in the state's sixteen regions, other trained regional facilitators, and other ODE consultants.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 as a corrective action)	

Comments: Ohio's Differentiated Accountability Model, adopted in July 2008, allows the state to implement an intervention model that distinguishes between those districts that require intensive intervention and those that are closer to meeting their student achievement goals. Under the Differentiated Accountability Model, Ohio treats districts and buildings as a system and stratifies districts into three risk categories (High, Medium, and Low Support) based on the aggregate percentage of student groups not meeting AYP, rather than on the amount of time that the district has not met AYP. These identified districts are provided with different options for interventions in addition to those required by federal law. As such, Ohio's 86 Corrective Action districts are not the focus of the State's intervention model; instead, our attention has focused on the districts identified under the new Differentiated Accountability Model.

In the 2010-2011 school year, Ohio identified 299 school districts, which included all 86 Corrective Action districts, across the three risk categories. Of these 299 districts, 31 were identified as needing High Support (including 26 districts in Corrective Action) and received full intervention from the State System of Support. All 31 High Support districts, as well as 54 Medium Support districts (16 of which were in Corrective Action) and 214 Low Support districts (44 of which were in Corrective Action), implemented the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) under the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model. This implementation of the OIP included: development of District Leadership Teams (DLTs), Building Leadership Teams (BLTs), and Teacher Based Teams (TBTs; a necessary but not sufficient component of the BLTs); use of the State's Decision Framework (DF) tool to complete a deep review of district-level data and create district and building needs assessments; development of focused improvement plans based on the district- and building-level needs assessments; and, if selected by the State, a review by the State Diagnostic Team (SDT). Plans were developed at the district and building levels in 2010-2011 for implementation in the 2011-2012 school year.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2010-11 data and the results of those appeals.

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

Comments: The deadline for submitting appeals for AYP, School Improvement, and District Improvement determinations was July 19, 2011. There were no districts or schools that submitted appeals to the state.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete 07/19/11

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2010-11.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

For SY 2010-11 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five <u>percent</u> of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) <u>evaluation</u> and <u>technical assistance</u> activities that your State conducted during SY 2010-11.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003(g) funds were used to support the following technical assistance and evaluation activities during the 2010-2011 school year:

Technical Assistance -

- Developing the Executive Principal Leadership Academy through a process consisting of meeting with various focus groups representing all stakeholders throughout the State of Ohio.
- Creating a Request for Proposals and selecting five SEA providers to assist schools with raising student achievement.
- Planning and development for the Office of Transforming Schools, including positions for a Director and four
 Transformation Specialists. This office serves as support to buildings implementing the components of their selected
 intervention model under Title I SIG. Additionally, the Transformation Specialists followed monitoring protocols to determine
 the schools' fidelity of implementation as well as their compliance.
- Planning and implementing technical assistance sessions for schools identified as low-performing to help them
 understand the components of each of the intervention models selected as well as giving them the opportunity to work with
 external partners. Once selected, the Principal and Building Leadership Teams (BLTs) were required to attend four
 technical assistance sessions. Additionally, 50 principals from the low-performing schools attended the Executive Principal
 Leadership Academy, which consisted of four two-day sessions.

Evaluation -

- A diagnostic review was completed at each identified school.
- Site visit reports prepared by the Transformation Specialists recorded each building's progress toward the implementation of all intervention model components and were shared with each building principal.
- Midyear internal reviews were conducted to assess the implementation of recommendations from both the diagnostic review and the site visit reports.
- A fiscal survey was conducted for all identified Title I SIG schools.
- Quarterly review reports were prepared by the Transformation Specialists and reviewed with each building principal and Building Leadership Team (BLT).
- Data on reporting metrics were received from each building principal and reviewed for quality and compliance.
- Monitoring visits were conducted in May, 2011, and a comprehensive report for each visit was prepared and reviewed with both the building principal and the district superintendent of each identified school.
- Renewal applications, guidelines, and rubrics were created and distributed to all schools eligible to receive Title I SIG funding for a second year.
- Applications were reviewed using the rubric and schools were renewed for a second year of funding with renewal conditions.
- Schools receiving renewal conditions are required to develop and implement a work plan for putting recommendations into
 place during the 2011-2012 school year.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2010-11 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The core work of the State Support Teams (SSTs), as referenced in Question 1.4.5.2, was primarily supported through State general revenue funds. Additionally, IDEA Part B discretionary dollars funded to SSTs supported facilitation, consultation, technical assistance, and professional development provided by the SST personnel working with districts and schools in improvement. These dollars supported more effective use of data, particularly subgroup data for students with disabilities, and the use of strategies to address district-identified needs as part of the OIP. IDEA Part D (State Personnel Development Grant [SPDG]) dollars were used to test the development of the process and related tools with selected cohorts of districts that were in improvement for not meeting AYP for students with disabilities.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice - Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	302,501
Applied to transfer	7,119
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	6,150
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 9,760,368

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	58

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and
 after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified
 and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

Comments:

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	228,481
Applied for supplemental educational services	31,816
Received supplemental educational services	22,776
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 41,228,216
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	
All classes	554,911	550,058	99.1	4,853	0.9
All elementary classes	279,908	278,545	99.5	1,363	0.5
All secondary classes	275,003	271,513	98.7	3,490	1.3

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

- b. How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. What is the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	59.9
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	15.4
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	7.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	17.7
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other = Elementary school classes taught by teachers not properly certified

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	•
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	46.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	26.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	17.4
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other = Secondary school classes taught by teachers not properly certified

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at <u>school-level data</u> when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools	·	·	
High Poverty Elementary Schools	70,129	68,745	98.0
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	76,182	76,055	99.8
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	53,687	52,266	97.4
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	87,013	86,738	99.7

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	74.2	31.6
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantagement	
Secondary schools	56.1	23.8
Poverty metric used	Economic Disadvantagement	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

- b. What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c. How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- d. Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

- Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language Instruction Educational Programs.pdf.
- 2. Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other programs include: after school English language tutoring, bilingual aide support, ESL summer school, in-class tutoring, inclusion with tutor support, and computer-based English language learning during intervention periods.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	38,312
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
	36,311
for this reporting year.	
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students	
Spanish; Castilian	14,496	
Somali	2,911	
Arabic	2,398	
German	973	
Chinese	801	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The next five most commonly spoken non-English languages in the State among all LEP students are Japanese (719 LEP students), Vietnamese (607 LEP students), French (465 LEP students), Russian (404 LEP students) and Twi (375 LEP students).

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	34,025
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,859
Total	35,884

Comments: The student count reported for Question 1.6.3.1.1 (i.e., 34,025 tested + 1,859 untested = 35,884 total) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled in Ohio schools during the ELP assessment window. The student count reported for Question 1.6.2.1 (38,312) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled at any time during the 2010-2011 school year. There are a significant number of enrolled LEP students who move out of state before the ELP testing window (e.g., children of migrant families), or who enroll after the ELP window.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	10,830
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	32.0
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	32,261
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,739
Total	34,000

Comments: The student count reported for Question 1.6.3.2.1 (i.e., 32,261 tested + 1,739 untested = 34,000 total) represents the total number of LEP students enrolled in Ohio Title III schools during the ELP assessment window. The student count reported for Question 1.6.2.2 (36,311) represents the total number of Title III LEP students enrolled at any time during the 2010-2011 school year. There are a significant number of enrolled LEP students who move out of state before the ELP testing window (e.g., children of migrant families), or who enroll after the ELP window.

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot	
be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	8,124

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

, , ,		Results		Targets	
		#	%	#	%
Making progress	16,28	33	67.5	18,816	78.00
Attained proficiency	8,719	9	27.0	8,719	27.00
Comments:					

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No_	
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No_	
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No_	
Comments: In Ohio, there are no languages in which native language assessments are given for ESEA accountability		
determinations.		

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)		
Comments: There are no languages in which native language assessments are given for ESEA accountability determinations for mathematics.		

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

determinations for science.

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

Language(s)		
Comments: There are no languages in which native language assessments are given for ESEA accountability determinations for reading/language arts.		
1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given		
In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for ESEA accountability determinations for science.		
Language(s)		

Comments: There are no languages in which native language assessments are given for ESEA accountability

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2,208	4,070	6,278
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

- 1. #Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
- # At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
- % Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
- 4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient	
4,419	4,049	91.6	370	
Comments:				

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

- 1. # Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
- 2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
- 3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
- 4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,421	4,238	95.9	183
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP(MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,853	1,518	81.9	335
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do <u>not</u> leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do <u>not</u> double count subgrantees by category.

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	285
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	124
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	147
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	223
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	258
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	9
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2009-10 and 2010-11)	26
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two	
consecutive years	12
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09,	
2009-10, and 2010-11)	22

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting <u>each</u> State-set target for <u>each</u> objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

- 1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled =** Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
- 2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program =** Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
- 3. **3114(d)(1)Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
12,111	4,642	41

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,450
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction	
educational programs in the next 5 years*.	580

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	209	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	151	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	88	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	47	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	105	
Other (Explain in comment box)	51	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	194	10,686
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	177	1,320
PD provided to principals	133	833
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	141	472
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	104	1,112
PD provided to community based organization personnel	15	175
Total	764	14,598

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Professional Development activities include:

- Aligning ESL with Response to Intervention (RTI);
- Legal Concerns and Implementation Strategies for Schools;
- Use of technology;
- Best Literacy Practices;
- English Language Development for Primary Level Amish Students;
- Building background knowledge and academic vocabulary strategies to increase content access;
- Communication with second language parents;
- Cultural Diversity;
- Hands-on resources for teachers and principals;
- ELL guide for regular education teachers; and
- Second Language Acquisition.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/10	07/15/10	14
Comments:		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: Ohio identified zero persistently dangerous schools for the 2010-2011 school year.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	84.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	74.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.8
Black, non-Hispanic	65.3
Hispanic	62.7
White, non-Hispanic	89.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	82.5
Limited English proficient	75.8
Economically disadvantaged	75.0
Migratory students	29.8
Male	83.0
Female	85.5
	·

Comments: 1) Multiracial student group: 78.3%.

2) The Graduation Rate reported for migratory students has been verified as correct. Ohio has a small and unsteady population of migratory students, so fluctuations in these data across years are not unexpected. In the 2008-2009 school year, there were 16 out of 29 migratory students who graduated on time, resulting a Graduation Rate of 55.2%. However, in the 2009-2010 school year, there were 20 out of 67 migratory students who graduated on time, so the Graduation Rate dipped to 29.9%.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.3
Black, non-Hispanic	9.2
Hispanic	7.2
White, non-Hispanic	2.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4.6
Limited English proficient	3.5
Economically disadvantaged	6.2
Migratory students	6.1
Male	4.1
Female	3.7
Comments: Multiracial student group: 5.7%.	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	998	998
LEAs with subgrants	65	65
Total	1,063	1,063

Comments: The total includes operational public districts, educational service centers (ESCs), joint vocational school districts, charter school LEAs, and state agencies. The number of LEAs with subgrants includes 17 public district subgrantees, 3 ESC subgrantees, and 45 public districts served by the 3 ESC subgrantees.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not		
Kindergarten)	80	621
K	724	1,124
1	797	1,212
2	677	1,130
3	664	1,143
4	642	1,044
5	611	1,003
6	537	926
7	495	1,043
8	498	920
9	723	1,401
10	476	914
11	452	660
12	591	710
Ungraded	7	24
Total	7,974	13,875
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster		
care	704	5,065
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6,482	8,392
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	188	102
Hotels/Motels	600	316
Total	7,974	13,875
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,651
K	1,212
1	1,259
2	1,172
3	1,197
4	1,071
5	1,034
6	972
7	1,079
8	959
9	1,418
10	938
11	691
12	732
Ungraded	67
Total	15,452
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1,748
Migratory children/youth	1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,062
Limited English proficient students	177
Comments:	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths who were tested on the State *ESEA* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,362	815
4	1,109	713
5	1,029	529
6	945	635
7	926	487
8	887	575
High School	711	509
Comments:		

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,221	761
4	1,116	622
5	1,033	427
6	950	512
7	934	459
8	888	404
High Schoo	708	455
Comments		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	334
K	164
1	139
2	110
3	120
4	116
5	98
6	89
7	88
8	65
9	107
10	79
11	70
12	27
Ungraded	2
Out-of-school	390
Total	1,998
omments:	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 child count decreased by 9.6% from the previous year.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u> that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not	
Kindergarten)	150
K	110
1	95
2	64
3	70
4	73
5	57
6	46
7	43
8	32
9	40
10	24
11	19
12	5
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	66
Total	895
Comments:	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 child count decreased by 8.0% from the previous year.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2010-2011 Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count were generated using the Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2). OMSIS2 is a client/server management information system utilizing the FileMaker suite of hosted database tools. OMSIS2 is developed and maintained by the Tri-Rivers Educational Computer Association (TRECA), a non-profit entity providing K-12 educational technology services through a consortium of Ohio public school districts.

Ohio also maintains membership in the New Generation System (NGS) consortium. Historically, Ohio used the NGS system to generate unique ID numbers. These historical numbers are maintained as a backup to the unique ID numbers generated by OMSIS2 and by the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system. During the Category 1 and Category 2 counts, NGS is sometimes used as a reference source.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

SECTION I. Family Data - parent's/guardian's name, race, home language, current Ohio address, employer, residency date, school district arrival date, home base address, and home base school district;

SECTION II. Child Data - child's name, sex, birth date, birthplace, grade level, ID number, and multiple birth data;

SECTION III. Eligibility Data - former residence, new residence, qualifying arrival date (QAD), reason for moving, qualifying activity, and description/type of agricultural work household in which members are engaged; and

SECTION IV. Comments -

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

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

All LEA programs are required to fill out attendance forms and transfer documents for every eligible child that is served in their summer and fall programs. The information collected includes days enrolled, days present, and all education information (e.g., reading skills, math skills, and English language proficiency). Secondary credit information forms are also required for all 7th through 12th graders. The information gathered on these forms includes classes and credit hours in which a student participated. After these forms are completed, the Transfer Record Coordinator checks to make sure that the forms are complete, and the information is then entered into OMSIS2.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

OMSIS2 incorporates a FileMaker Pro client interface and a backend database hosted by the latest version of FileMaker Server Advanced. This not only affords programmatic record locking control, it also reduces the possibility of a simple clerical error causing major data loss. Some mass update capabilities exist, such as the ability to include up to six siblings on a single COE update. Multiple assessment records can be input simultaneously for a child, and a number of time-saving queries that are designed specifically around the data entry methods in use at OMEC are built into OMSIS2 and enhance

OMEC's capability by allowing for point-and-click field population.

When a student is identified in Ohio for the first time, the OMSIS2 data system generates a unique ID for that student called the OHID. If a student has been identified previously, then his/her new records are always entered using the student's existing OHID to avoid duplication. This check of the OMSIS2 system is accomplished before any record is entered into the system as new. When eligible students are first identified and entered into the database, they are all Category 1 students. They are not counted in Category 2 unless they also are eligible for and receive funded summer services.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

- Children who were between age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)
- Children who

 in the case of Category 2

 received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A query is run against the Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2) database described in Questions 1.10.3.1 and 1.10.3.2 to calculate the Category 1 child count. It identifies those students between ages 3 and 21 (as shown by the Student Identification Table) who have made a qualifying move within the past 36 months (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table) and who have also had a third birthday before the end date of the program in which they participated (as shown by the Educational Enrollment History Data Table, the Student Identification Table, and the Supplemental Program Information Table) or before the end of their residency in Ohio (we may reference an older sibling's enrollment information to determine this third criterion). A similar query that includes all of the above information is run to calculate the Category 2 child count, but it also has a summer service indicator. The fields used to run this particular query are SID.OHID, SID.LastName, SID.FirstName, ENR.OHID, SID.DeceasedDate, SID.GraduationDate, SID.BirthDate, ENR.LastQualifyingMove, ENR.EnrollmentDate, ENR.WithdrawalDate, ENR.OhioArrivalDate, and several flag fields that serve to exclude specific instances (e.g., children who turn three during the school year, but for whom no Ohio residency can be guaranteed except at the age of two). The database administrator (or the administrator's representative) at the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC) executes these queries and updates a series of flags in a specific order. Each September, a home visit is made to each student for whom a valid COE exists to determine if the student is still a resident in the State. This verification date is added to our database, and it serves as an indication that the student is eligible to be included in Category 1 for the new program year. All students added through a new COE during the program year are also counted, as described in Question 1.10.3.2.

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

Every student has a unique OHID number that ensures the child is only counted once. As part of the quality control process at OMEC, "new" students are double checked to ensure that they have not already been assigned a different OHID number. Some of the quality control criteria used to ensure the unique identity of a "new" child include surname, parent/guardian first names, alternate spellings of surnames, migratory histories of families with similar names, and date of birth.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count are generated using the same system, except for the particular differences previously described in Question 1.10.3.3.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Ohio uses many quality control procedures to review and ensure the accuracy of written eligibility information. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE), the Ohio Migrant Education Center (OMEC), and local migrant education projects assure accuracy at their levels. A standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) that conforms to Federal guidelines is used statewide in Ohio, and recruiters are trained on completion of the form at our annual recruitment conference. Quality control is assured at OMEC, where the Quality Control Specialist, the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator, and the State Transfer Record Coordinator again review the COE for correctness and completeness. The COE is entered into the database only after each of these people has approved it.

LEA recruiters, transfer record clerks, and project directors receive periodic updates on assistance, procedures, and guidelines for identification and recruitment. Annual recruitment trainings are held each spring to provide in-depth instruction on COE completion, and other meetings are called as needed. All recruiters receive a detailed handbook that provides them with eligibility criteria and COE completion guidance.

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

- 1) the eligibility criteria;
- 2) interview procedures;
- 3) monitoring for accountability; and
- 4) the role of the recruiter.

The COE is the primary tool for collecting the data that certify children to qualify for migrant services. Once completed and checked for accuracy, information from the form is entered into the state database, OMSIS2, and becomes the basis for Category 1 identification. COEs are checked for accuracy by the Quality Control Specialist and by verifying birth dates and names against the OMSIS2 database. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator also signs a statement that quality control is finished on the COE before it is checked for complete accuracy and input into OMSIS2. If a discrepancy occurs when it is received by the Transfer Record Coordinator, the Transfer Record Coordinator will then ask the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator to contact the recruiter to revisit the family. COEs identified as having possible errors are placed in a pending file until further explanation, documentation, and/or completion is received or achieved.

Recruiters resolve issues encountered on the COE forms by consulting the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and the State Transfer Record Coordinator. The State Director of Ohio's Migrant Education Program (MEP) provides assistance with questions requiring interpretation of Federal and State laws, regulations, or policies. The final quality control for all COEs is made at OMEC. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and the Transfer Record Coordinator review all data to ensure correctness of the written eligibility information. If there are any discrepancies on the COE, revisions are made on an addendum form that is attached to the COE. The appropriate LEA's migrant staff are then provided with a copy of the addendum form for their records. Once quality control procedures have been completed as described above, the Transfer Record Coordinator enters the record into the database. This is the final step in the COE data acquisition process.

The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator is responsible for a yearly review and update of quality control and COE completion procedures. These procedures are documented in our Identification and Recruitment Manual. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator also periodically evaluates the effectiveness of quality control and revises procedures, if necessary, to assure effective systems operation. Information from sessions at the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME) and Office of Migrant Education (OME) Conferences, as well as pertinent memos and regulations, are reviewed annually and used to update quality control as well as other identification and recruitment issues.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2010-2011 reporting year, Ohio conducted an internal prospective re-interview. A total of 100 COEs, covering the period from September 1, 2010 to the recruiter re-interview training date of July 29, 2011, were randomly selected from our state database (OMSIS2). The OMSIS2 system includes a feature that allows for a series of non-overlapping random samples of COEs to be identified as well as for audit (i.e., re-interview) procedures to be centrally controlled by OMEC. This feature was run on July 29, 2011 at 2:54 PM, one month before the end of the 2010-2011 reporting period, in order to generate a timely random sample that could be reviewed before too many families had left the state.

The actual automated randomization procedure as programmed into OMSIS2 and executed on July 29, 2011 is as follows:

- 1. A script called "COE Date Range Find" was run first, using the parameter of "Date of Interview In Range September 1, 2010 to present time (July 29, 2011, 2:54 PM)."
- 2. The resulting found set consisted of 488 COE records.
- 3. All 488 records were time-stamped with 2011_0729 2:54PM to indicate that they were part of this particular population group from which the sample equivalent to 20% of the size of the group would be selected.
- 4. The presence of the time stamp is to ensure future randomization. It prevents the 488 sampled COEs from being considered more than once, in the event that future samplings in the same date range might need to be generated later in the season to extend the sample size.
- 5. The 20% sample size was selected (the three possibilities are 10%, 20%. and 30%, from which the operator must choose one).
- 6. In the next part of the script, two random digits in the range from 0 to 9 were programmatically assigned to this sample. The actual randomly selected digits in this sampling were 2 and 3.
- 7. Because each unique COE number in OMSIS2 is machine-generated at the time the COE record is created, the last digit is random. Among the 488 COEs in this population, a sample size of 20% was expected to be approximately 97.6.
- 8. In the actual sample, 100 COEs in fact had a 2 or a 3 as the last digit, and so they were stamped programmatically with sequential Re-Interview Reference ID numbers ranging from 2011_R1_H01 through 2011_R1_H100.
- 9. Audit Control Reports, which consisted of Family Identifier forms, a brief listing, and a detail listing, were generated from the 100 random COEs.

After ensuring that there was no significant skewness present in the random sample (i.e., that all regions and individual recruiters were proportionally represented), the Family Identifier forms were distributed to the recruiters at the one-day training held on July 29, 2011 to be used in carrying out the prospective re-interview. These forms reference a portion of original COE data, but provide re-interviewers with just enough information to locate the families. The actual COEs are not shown to the re-interviewers, to ensure validity of the audit.

Progress of the re-interview was monitored from the OMEC office. The reviewers followed up on all 100 randomly selected COEs, resulting in 62 completed face-to-face re-interviews. A management review indicated that 100% of the families in the re-interview sample group were eligible for the Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program. Re-interviews of the remaining 38 names on the list were attempted but not completed due to family mobility.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Verification forms are printed annually and submitted to LEAs in the fall of each year to verify whether students are still here for the new program year's Category 1 child count. Directors verifying the accuracy of demographic data use these same lists. The lists are returned to OMEC for database updates when they are completed. Individual files are pulled at random during the winter months to be reviewed for accuracy.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Ohio Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS2) includes a number of companion fields to each date-type field accessed by the queries used for the annual report. These companion fields include a number of calculations and comparisons that help locate data that may require further review.

For example, each child record contains a birth date field and a current age field that are query-relevant. Each enrollment and service record contains a date of service or date of enrollment field, a residency date field, and a qualifying move date field that are also queryrelevant. One example of a companion field that is used during reporting uses the aforementioned query-relevant fields to calculate the age a student was at the time of residency and service. This produces a flag that is used to exclude, for example, current three year-olds who were three at the end of the reporting cycle, but not necessarily a

resident in Ohio anymore when their third birthday arrived. Such a child can be excluded from the Category 1 count. All three year-olds are examined using the companion calculation field in this way to separate those proven eligible from those who are not. Similar companion calculation fields exist that guard against incorrect date values being entered in the query-relevant fields.

Duplications are prevented through the use of a combination of FileMaker Pro 11 database features, including the extensive use of the "Go to Related Records" script command. Searches are initially performed in a related table while seeking funded services delivered during the current reporting period. From there the "Go to Related Records" script is run, resulting in a found set of students (not services). All counts for the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) are then generated from the Students table, where each student has only one grade level and one unique identifier, to ensure that no student can possibly be counted twice in any cell of any CSPR table.

Eligibility for Category 1 is first established for the majority of students using FileMaker Pro's "Constrain Found Set" tool repeatedly for each criterion that could possibly exclude a student from eligibility for the current reporting period. Students who definitely qualify based on this more rigorous screening compose the first group of students marked as qualifying. Students who also qualify, but whose eligibility for the current reporting period must be confirmed on a case-by-case basis, are excluded from this first group by the stringency of the initial queries. Instead, these students are individually marked as qualifying only after their record is carefully reviewed to confirm, for example, that their age definitely qualified them to be counted as eligible for the reporting period.

After all Category 1 eligibility has been marked, an export of data from the Student Table into an empty Reporting Table is executed. The Reporting Table contains many true-or-false fields that correspond to each category of the CSPR.

A database relationship links the Student Table to the Reporting Table on the key field OHID. By updating each of the Reporting Table's true-or-false fields directly from within the Student Table, and by doing so only after the Reporting Table already contains exclusively Category 1-eligible records, it is possible to know with great certainty that: 1) only eligible students are contained in any individual count; and 2) there is absolutely no duplication within counts.

Accuracy checks are finally performed, using the Reporting Table as a source and the Student Table as the destination for a "Go to Related Records" script. For example, this technique could be used to find instantly the exact group of students reported as being in the 7th Grade and also receiving Math instruction in the summer. This group can be scrolled through to verify that each student did in fact receive Math instruction, is in fact a 7th grader, and when and where each student received Math instruction.

The Reporting data is then preserved without changes, directly within OMSIS2, every year. Over time this collection of annual tables serves as an ongoing longitudinal data (or panel data) reference tool for management information.

The State Migrant Education Program Director collects all data from the queries listed in this document and reviews them for accuracy, reasonableness, and completeness. OMEC additionally provides the State Director with numbers from the previous years for identification and recruitment and for services provided, broken out by counties as identified and served. The State Director is therefore able to compare data from previous years as the CSPR is completed.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Sometimes a worker might be expected to fulfill various job responsibilities (e.g., thinning beats, harvesting cucumbers, transplanting tomatoes, etc.). If the one qualifying activity used on the COE does not match the qualifying activity collected during the re-interview, it may raise concern. Next year, the re-interviewers will be trained to list all of the qualifying work related to the qualifying move in question. If none of the work activities provided during the re-interview match the activity on the COE, then the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator will investigate these cases.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns to report at this time.