

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE  
REPORT:  
Part II**

for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on  
**School Year 2002-2003**



**DUE JUNE 30, 2004**

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	ii
General Instructions and Timelines	vi
Cover Page for Submission	vii
Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)	1
William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)	5
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	10
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	21
Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)	22
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) Title II, Part A)	23
Enhancing Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)	24
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)	25
Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV, Part A)	27
21 <sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)	31
Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)	32
Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) (Title VI, Part B)	34
Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)	35

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States submitted to the Department on December 22, 2003, requested 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 NCLB. Through the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submissions and through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States have already submitted the following 2002-2003 school year data related to the five ESEA goals.

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

In Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States reported the percentage of students proficient or advanced in reading/language arts and mathematics, based on assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. States reported achievement data for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

- **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.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the following: (1) the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students; (2) English language proficiency (ELP) data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration; (3) Information on the total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s); (4) Information on the total number of students identified as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s); and (5) performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and the percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency.

- **Performance goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received "high-quality professional development;" and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year.

- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided baseline graduation rate and dropout rate data from the 2001-2002 school year for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

This Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2002-2003 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

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

Also, this report is limited to information that States should have available by Spring, 2004.

Consistent with these criteria, Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year does not request additional data for the programs listed below.

- Title I, Part D: Neglected or Delinquent - The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. This data will not be available in Spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report which will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.
- Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.
- Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants) – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented. Additionally, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application and in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year, States reported information related to teacher and paraprofessional quality, including the percentage of classes taught by high-qualified teachers, the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development, and the percentage of highly-qualified Title I paraprofessionals.
- Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology – The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.

- Title IV, Part B: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2003-2004 school year and beyond.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2002-2003 school year must respond to this Part II of Consolidated State Performance Report. Reports are due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**, and should reflect data from the 2002-2003 school year. If needed, States should include for each section an explanation of the data provided (e.g., data irregularities). Throughout the report, States should use their definition of a school year, unless noted otherwise.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to [conreport@ed.gov](mailto:conreport@ed.gov), or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

A State that submits only a paper report should mail the submission by express courier to:

Daisy Greenfield  
U.S. Department of Education  
Room 3E307  
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20202-6400

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 2.32 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E307, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

OMB Number: 1810-0614  
Expiration Date: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Barry Bentley

Telephone: (614) 728-7851

Fax: (614) 752-1622

email: [barry.bentley@ode.state.oh.us](mailto:barry.bentley@ode.state.oh.us)

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

Susan T Zelman, Superintendent of Public Instruction

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**I. Improving Basic Programs  
Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)**

**A. Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools**

1. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. 737

2. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. 481

**B. Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program**

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following:

- |   |              |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State                     | <u>2,060</u> |
| 2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State | <u>1,045</u> |
| 3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State  | <u>1,015</u> |

### C. Title I, Part A Student Participation

#### 1. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups

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

<b>Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs</b>	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	72,579
Limited English Proficient	11,370
Homeless	3,334
Migrant	858

<b>Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group</b>	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian or Alaskan Native	847
Asian	3,353
Black or African American	175,324
Hispanic or Latino	18,353
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	MD
White	277,479
Multiracial	12,646

## 2. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

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

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level						
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
<b>Age 0-2</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
<b>Age 3-5</b>	155	11,554	27	0	11,736	2.40
<b>K</b>	3,477	50,770	79	0	54,326	11.10
<b>1</b>	15,238	54,338	240	94	69,910	14.29
<b>2</b>	12,011	53,438	237	112	65,798	13.45
<b>3</b>	8,797	55,283	196	189	64,465	13.18
<b>4</b>	6,751	53,467	143	277	60,638	12.39
<b>5</b>	3,391	49,536	114	321	53,362	10.91
<b>6</b>	2,085	38,767	92	111	41,055	8.39
<b>7</b>	1,199	25,165	35	93	26,492	5.42
<b>8</b>	886	23,329	27	23	24,265	4.96
<b>9</b>	651	4,785	1	11	5,448	1.11
<b>10</b>	367	3,849	2	0	4,218	0.86
<b>11</b>	267	3,534	0	0	3,801	0.78
<b>12</b>	289	3,146	0	0	3,435	0.70
<b>Ungraded</b>	103	178	3	0	284	0.06
<b>TOTALS</b>	55,667	431,139	1,196	1,231	489,233	100.00

### 3. Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, A Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services</b>	
<b>Instructional Services</b>	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	16,541
Reading/Language Arts	65,561
Science	2,077
Social Studies	5,388
Vocational/Career	5,885
Other (specify) (1)	1,878
<b>Support Services</b>	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	432
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	1,203
Other (specify) Nutrition	1,365

(1) Preschool, Gifted, and Special Needs

### C. Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

<b>Staff Information for Title I, A Targeted Assistance Programs</b>	
	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	59
Teachers	1,665
Teacher Aides	291
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	15
Other (specify)	11

<b>II. William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)</b>
---

**A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following information:

**1. Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State**

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

**2. Even Start Families Served**

a. Total number of families served 1,242  
b. Total number of adults participating 1,262  
c. Total number of adults who are English language learners 87  
d. Total number of children participating 1,948

**3. Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment**

a. Number of newly enrolled families 1,242  
b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants 1,262  
c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal Poverty level 88%  
d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED 85%  
e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade 31%

**4. Percent of families that have remained in the program**

a. Less than 3 months 34%  
b. From 4 to 6 months 28%  
c. From 7 to 12 months 23%  
d. More than 12 months 15%

**B. State Even Start Performance Indicators**

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its performance indicators developed under section 1240 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Include all State indicators, as developed under section 1240, including both required and optional indicators. Provide any targets set, measures used and results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets or standards, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. For indicators with more than one year of available data, please note the data in the results column and include trend information in the assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

<b>Indicator</b> <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	<b>Target or Standards</b> <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
EXAMPLE: Adult achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving and numeracy	EXAMPLE: 75% of adult learners will make a grade-level gain over a program year	EXAMPLE: Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)	EXAMPLE: 2001-2002: 45% of adult participants met target  2002-2003: 50% of adult participants met target	EXAMPLE: Target was not met in 2002-2003, but positive movement toward target was seen between 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.	EXAMPLE: Information on participation showed that only 50% of adult participants stayed in the program for 12 months. Participants who remained in the program for at least one full year were more likely to meet target. Of participants who remained in program for one full year, 70% met target as compared to only 40% of participants who remained in program for less than 12 months.

### C. Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> Number of participants who have this goal	<b>Result</b> <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
A. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	75% of adult Even Start participants who have identified achievement in basic skills (i.e., reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving, and numeracy) as a primary or secondary goal will complete or progress toward this goal during the program year.	TABE BEST CASAS	877	734 participants  84%	Target MET	Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) program provides excellent adult basic and GED services for all our Even Start programs in Ohio.  Retention is an important factor, but Even Start did not collect separate retention data for this program year.
B. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics	NA Refer to performance indicator above: Ohio Even Start does not separate achievement in basic skills for adults into reading and mathematics.	NA Refer to performance indicator above.	NA Refer to performance indicator above.	NA Refer to performance indicator above.	NA Refer to performance indicator above.	NA Refer to performance indicator above: Ohio Even Start does not separate achievement in basic skills for adults into reading and mathematics.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
C. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition	NA Ohio Even Start Performance Indicators include LEP adults' progress data with non-LEP adults' progress data (see Indicator A above).	NA	NA	NA	NA Target MET in basic skills as described in Indicator A. above.	NA Ohio Even Start Performance Indicators include LEP adults' progress data with non-LEP adults' progress data (see Indicator A above).

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
D. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	NA Ohio Even Start separates data collected for parents 19 years old or younger who are enrolled in high school or middle school from data collected for parents 19 years old or younger who are out-of-school and working on a GED or diploma. So, we have data which differs from the requested data. Under "results," see the graduation rate of high school seniors enrolled in Even Start. Also, see Row E for the number of Even Start participants (all ages) who obtained a GED in this program year.	NA For high school seniors, assessments included those tests administered in each district along with the Ohio Graduation Exam.	NA At this time, Ohio Even Start collects the cumulative number of participants enrolled in high school and middle school along with the high school graduation rate.	NA The graduation rate for high school seniors enrolled in Even Start is 93%.	NA Ohio Even Start does not have a separate indicator for graduating seniors, but has exceeded the GED indicator rate of 40%.	NA See column labeled "Target."

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> Number of participants who have this goal	<b>Result</b> <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
E. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	40% of adult Even Start participants who have identified receipt of a secondary school diploma or Ohio High School Equivalence Diploma/GED as a primary or secondary goal will earn a secondary school diploma or Ohio High School Equivalence Diploma/GED during the program year.	GED test for those who are not enrolled in high school.	264	123 participants 47%	Target MET	Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) program provides excellent adult basic and GED services for all our Even Start programs in Ohio.  Retention is an important factor, but Even Start did not collect separate retention data for this program year.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
F. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development	NA Ohio's Performance Indicator measure progress for readiness, language development and literacy skills in children ages 0-5 years; we do not separate the K-eligible children in our data collection at this time. Ohio's indicator reads: 100% of children, ages 0-5, whose families have participated in Even Start for at least four months will demonstrate progress in reading and reading strategies as measured by the set of child observation scales called Measurement and Planning System (MAPS) found in the Galileo software package.	NA The data collected in Ohio Even Start measured progress for children 0-5 years old with the observational tool called MAPS/Galileo.	NA The data collected in Ohio Even Start showed 700 children 0-5 years old were assessed.	NA The data collected in Ohio Even Start showed 700 children 0-5 years old were assessed with MAPS/Galileo; our target is 100% to show progress. 95% showed progress.	Target NOT MET	Ohio's Performance Indicator measures progress in children ages 0-5 years; we do not separate the K-eligible children in our data collection at this time. Our target for progress for children ages 0-5 is 100%. 700 children ages 0-5 were assessed for literacy and language development and for reading readiness with an observational tool called MAPS/Galileo. 95% showed progress.  Target was not met due to the challenges of low attendance and retention rates for some families.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
G. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of reading readiness	NA Ohio's Performance Indicator measure progress for readiness, language development and literacy skills in children ages 0-5 years; we do not separate the K-eligible children in our data collection at this time. Ohio's indicator reads: 100% of children, ages 0-5, whose families have participated in Even Start for at least four months will demonstrate progress in reading and reading strategies as measured by the set of child observation scales called Measurement and Planning System (MAPS) found in the Galileo software package.	NA The data collected in Ohio Even Start measured progress for children 0-5 years old with the observational tool called MAPS/Galileo.	NA The data collected in Ohio Even Start showed 700 children 0-5 years old were assessed.	NA The data collected in Ohio Even Start showed 700 children 0-5 years old were assessed with MAPS/Galileo; 95% showed progress. Our target is 100% to show progress.	Target NOT MET	At 95%, the target of 100% was close to being met. (and included all children ages 0-5). Programs noted that the target was not met due to the challenges of low attendance and retention rates for a few families.  A State-developed Kindergarten Reading Readiness Test is being piloted in 2004-2005 in Ohio and will be implemented across the State in 2005-2006. Ohio Even Start plans to include this assessment tool in the Even Start performance indicators for 2005-2006.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> Number of participants who have this goal	<b>Result</b> <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
H. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level	For the 2002-2003 program year, Ohio Even Start measured reading on grade level by promotion rate due to Ohio's Fourth Grade Guarantee for this program year. The indicator reads as follows: 90% of children, grades 1 through 3, whose families are enrolled in Even Start from at least November 1 to June 1 of the program year are promoted as determined by school district policy.	Promotion is based on Ohio's proficiency test scores and policy set by each district.	146	136 children  93%	Target MET	Ohio has implemented a new teacher licensure requirement and has increased the number of professional development opportunities around best practices (SBRR), using data to plan interventions, and Ohio's new Pre-K to K English language Arts Content Standards. All of these factors have contributed to improved instruction.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
I. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities	Ohio divides the USDOE Indicator I as follows: <b>Ohio PI 9</b> - 75% of the parents who have participated in Even Start for at least four months within the reporting year will demonstrate at least 0.3 gain in supporting interactive literacy activities as indicated on the Parenting Education Profile. <b>Ohio PI 10</b> - 50% of the parents who have participated in Even Start for at least four months within the reporting year will demonstrate at least 0.3 gain in supporting children's learning in formal education settings as indicated on the Parenting Education Profile.	For both Ohio Indicators under USDOE Indicator I, the assessment tool is the Parenting Education Profile (PEP).	PI 9 (for interactive literacy activities): 566 parents  PI 10 (for supporting children's learning in formal education settings): 451 parents	PI 9: 468 parents or 83%  PI 10: 338 parents or 75%	Target MET  Target MET	Continuous improvement in professional development opportunities provided for educators by the State.  Increased focus on literacy in programming for the parenting education component and the PACT component (due to professional development provided by the State).  The assessment tool (PEP) has a clearly defined rubric for standardized reporting.

### III. Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)

Please complete the following charts for the Title I, Part C program.

#### **General Data Reporting Information**

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2002-2003. The Reporting Period for these data is September 1, 2002, to August 31, 2003.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

## INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE I. POPULATION DATA

In Table I States are to report the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 – 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

<b>TABLE I. POPULATION DATA</b>	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out-of- school	Total
<b>A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN</b>																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	0	865	431	376	371	366	311	290	279	255	225	265	178	118	74	29	1,639	6,072
<b>B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES</b>																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"	0	207	109	86	102	105	86	74	67	72	53	63	42	31	12	13	355	1,477
<b>C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)</b>																		
1. Migrant Children who are LEP	0	59	159	146	146	140	115	97	72	55	39	42	22	5	5	4	135	1,241
<b>D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>																		
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	7
<b>E. MOBILITY</b>																		
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	383	184	155	162	166	146	127	129	112	92	103	72	48	23	16	644	2,562
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	224	129	97	113	110	84	79	82	78	71	88	44	36	33	7	550	1,825

<b>TABLE I. POPULATION DATA</b>		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out-of- school	Total
3.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	157	77	65	62	63	51	49	44	39	47	44	35	20	9	3	262	1,027
4.	Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months)	0	458	241	199	212	200	173	152	143	145	118	153	94	66	44	19	827	3,244

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS**

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

Include children who changed grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

<b>TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS</b>		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION</b> -- (Note: Data on the high school graduation <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> for migrant students has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																			
1.	Dropped out of school											*	*	*	*	*	*		*
2.	Obtained GED																		*
<b>ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT</b> -- (Note: The results of migrant students on State assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts have been collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																			

\*N/A Summer Program Impacted State

### **INSTRUCTION: TABLE III. G. MEP PARTICIPATION – REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR**

Table III G. asks for the statewide, *unduplicated* number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

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

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

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

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

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

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

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

<b>TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION</b>		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>G. PARTICIPATION—REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR</b>																			
1.	Served in MEP (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in any SWPs even if MEP funds are combined)	27	35	162	174	184	169	123	129	109	105	75	107	49	37	15	8	51	1,559
2.	Priority for Service	25	17	50	45	58	55	41	39	27	36	24	29	15	14	6	3	15	499
3.	Continuation of Service																		
4.	Any Instructional Service	0	0	112	141	132	119	89	83	79	77	60	88	37	28	9	4	31	1,089
5.	Reading Instruction	0	0	50	69	65	77	51	41	44	45	30	69	22	26	8	3	16	616
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	0	32	49	31	57	31	27	29	27	18	35	8	14	1	3	1	363
7.	High School Credit Accrual													23	5	5	1	0	34
8.	Any Support Service	27	33	131	122	135	118	83	99	69	77	47	59	29	22	9	7	42	1,109
9.	Counseling Service	0	0	7	1	7	2	3	3	0	10	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	39
10.	Any Referred Service	27	33	129	122	133	118	83	98	68	72	47	58	28	22	9	7	42	1,096

### **INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE III. H. MEP PARTICIPATION –SUMMER/INTERSESSION TERM**

Table III H. asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

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

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

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

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

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

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

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

<b>TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION</b>		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>H. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION</b>																			
1.	Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	317	481	291	231	225	230	204	164	143	138	109	118	90	48	19	23	740	3,571
2.	Priority for Service	117	151	91	67	83	80	64	54	50	59	41	39	32	22	9	11	195	1,165
3.	Continuation of Service																		
4.	Any Instructional Service	5	138	202	188	175	167	138	109	84	71	48	54	39	21	7	7	97	1,550
5.	Reading Instruction	3	75	124	123	115	123	99	67	51	44	22	37	23	14	5	5	17	947
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	49	117	123	114	123	98	65	52	45	22	15	10	4	0	5	6	848
7.	High School Credit Accrual												1	0	1	0	0	0	2
8.	Any Support Service	316	467	288	226	224	227	204	164	142	138	107	116	89	48	19	23	740	3,538
9.	Counseling Service																		
10.	Any Referred Service	315	456	276	219	215	219	196	157	140	134	104	116	87	46	19	23	724	3,446

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA**

Table IV asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools and who received the special services noted below according to the descriptive categories.

In the first column of Table IV, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children. In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide.

<b>TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA</b>		
<b>I. STUDENT ENROLLMENT</b>	<b>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</b>	<b>NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED</b>
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	16	1,527
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	0	0

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. J. MEP PROJECT DATA – TYPE OF MEP PROJECT**

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs that were supported with MEP funds in any row of this table.

<b>TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA</b>		
<b>J. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT</b>	<b>NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS</b>	<b>NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED</b>
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Services Provided During the School Day Only)	4	766
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	0	0
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	14	1,756
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	18	2,399

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. K. MEP PROJECT DATA – KEY MEP PERSONNEL**

For each school term, enter the number of *full-time-equivalent* staff whose salaries are paid by the MEP. Report FTE units by job classification. Define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. For example, one regular term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days, one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs that combined MEP funds/services with those of other programs.

<b>TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA</b>		
<b>K. KEY MEP PERSONNEL</b>	REGULAR-TERM FTE 1 FTE = <u>185</u> Days	SUMMER-TERM /INTERSESSION FTE 1 FTE = <u>30</u> Days
1. State Director	.05	.05
2. Teachers	6.93	91.5
3. Counselors	MD	MD
4. All Paraprofessionals	12.7	80
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	0	10
6. Recruiters	1	8
7. Records Transfer Staff	2.4	8.5

**IV. Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth  
Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)**

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. These data will not be available in Spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report which will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.

**V. Comprehensive School Reform  
(Title I, Part F)**

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

## **VI. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) (Title II, Part A)**

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following teacher quality information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development;” and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

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

**VII. Enhancing Education through Technology  
(Title II, Part D)**

The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.

## **VIII. English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)**

States are not required to report any additional data for the 2002-2003 school year in this Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report. States reported data for the 2002-2003 school year for the Title III program in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application. Specifically, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application, States reported the information listed below.

1. A description of the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describing how the State's ELP standards:

- Address grades K through 12
- Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing
- Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006).

2. English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. ELP baseline data included all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

A. The ELP baseline data included the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

B. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State was reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
  - Describe how the composite score was derived;
  - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
  - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

3. Information on the total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

4. Information on the total number of students identified as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

5. Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. In September 2003, States provided performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Through the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year and future years and through the Biennial Performance Report for Title III, States will be required to report information similar to that reported for the September 2003 Consolidated State Application.

**IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act  
(Title IV, Part A)**

**General Instructions**

Words that appear underlined throughout (for example, "physical fighting") should be defined in accordance with State policy or based on the instrument the State uses to collect the information. States are asked to submit their definition of these terms.

If your State does not collect data in the same format requested on this form, the State may provide data from a similar question. If that occurs, please include a footnote for those data that explains the differences between the data requested on the form and the data the State is able to supply.

**A.** In the following chart, please identify each of your State indicators as submitted by the State in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application and provide the following:

- a. the instrument or data source used to measure the indicator
- b. the frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection
- c. 2002-2003 baseline data
- d. targets for the years in which your State has established targets

**A. 1 State Performance Indicators for Title IV, A - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Instrument/ Data Source</b>	<b>Frequency of collection and year of most recent collection</b>	<b>2002-2003 Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>
Decrease by 5% the # of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for ATOD use on school grounds by end of 2006/2007	Education Management Information System (EMIS)	Annually  2002-2003	12,242	2003-2004 <b>12,089</b>
				2004-2005 <b>11,936</b>
				2005-2006 <b>117,783</b>
				2006-2007 <b>11,630</b>
Decrease by 5% the # of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for fighting on school grounds by end of 2006-2007	EMIS	Annually  2002-2003	66,906	2003-2004 <b>66,070</b>
				2004-2005 <b>65,233</b>
				2005-2006 <b>64,397</b>
				2006-2007 <b>63,561</b>
Decrease by 5% the # of out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for possession of a weapons on school grounds by end of 2006-2007	EMIS	Annually  2002-2003	3,587	2003-2004 <b>3,543</b>
				2004-2005 <b>3,498</b>
				2005-2006 <b>3,454</b>
				2006-2007 <b>3,408</b>
Decrease by 3% the # of out-of-school suspensions for any reason by the end of 2006-2007	EMIS	Annually  2002-2003	239,282	2003-2004 <b>237,488</b>
				2004-2005 <b>235,693</b>
				2005-2006 <b>233,899</b>
				2006-2007 <b>232,104</b>
Decrease by 3% the # of expulsions for any reason by the end of 2006-2007	EMIS	Annually  2002-2003	6,852	2003-2004 <b>6,801</b>
				2004-2005 <b>6,749</b>
				2005-2006 <b>6,698</b>
				2006-2007 <b>6,646</b>
By the end of school year 2006-2007 no public school in Ohio will be designated as "Persistently Dangerous"	EMIS and Dept. of Youth Services	Annually  2003-2004	NA	2003-2004 <b>0</b>
				2004-2005 <b>0</b>
				2005-2006 <b>0</b>
				2006-2007 <b>0</b>

**A.2 Provide an explanation of the data provided in the table (A.1).**

The Data are based on out of school suspensions or expulsions for all students k-12.

Example

$$12,242 - 5\% = 11,630$$

$$12,242 - 11,630 = 612$$

$$612/4 = 153$$

$$12,242 - 153 = 12,089 \text{ (03-04)}$$

$$12,089 - 153 = 11,936 \text{ (04-05)}$$

$$11,936 - 153 = 11,783 \text{ (05-06)}$$

$$11,783 - 153 = 11,630 \text{ (06-07)}$$

**B.** In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students. States should use their definition of elementary, middle, and high school and provide those definitions in the report.

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

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	28,219	2,392
Middle	21,314	699
High School	18,833	822

**2. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession**

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	1,500	2,392
Middle	1,016	699
High School	1,224	822

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

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	74	2,392
Middle	225	699
High School	1,157	822

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

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	250	2,392
Middle	1,189	699
High School	3,485	822

**C. Describe the outcomes of the State’s efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts.**

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

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

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

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

**X. 21st Century Community Learning Centers  
(Title IV, Part B)**

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

## XI. Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)

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

**Title V** Statewide activities are focused mostly on statewide parent involvement activities. The activities include the following:

- Parent Academy Train the Trainer, Feb. 2004;
- Closing the Achievement Gap conference, May 2004;
- Special Parent Academy Train the Trainers for Action for Children and Ohio School Counselors Association;
- Support of Governor's Summer Reading Challenge through community and faith-based networks.

In addition we have a contract to implement a grassroots outreach to community and faith-based organizations.

The success of these initiatives is creating support for a budget proposal for the 2006-07 budget, which the Department is recommending in its budget proposal to the State Board and then to the legislature.

**B.** The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including: (1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2002-2003 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area <sup>1</sup>	Number of LEAs that used <b>20%</b> or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: <b>Student Achievement in Reading and Math</b>	529	242	MD
Area 2: <b>Teacher Quality</b>	372	160	MD
Area 3: <b>Safe and Drug Free Schools</b>	10	2	MD
Area 4: <b>Increase Access for all Students</b>	290	127	MD
Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).			

**B.1** Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2002-2003, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. 72

**B.2** Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2002-2003. 30

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

**XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)  
(Title VI, Part B)**

**A. Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)**

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2002-2003 school year.  
9

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

1. LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2002-2003 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	14
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	12
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	10
Parental involvement activities	11
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	9
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	11
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0

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

After a district has participated in either of the REAP grant programs (SRSA or RLIS) for three years, the Department will examine whether or not the district is making adequate yearly progress. (For many districts, the third year of participation is the 2004-05 school year.) If the *district* is not making adequate yearly progress, it may continue to participate and receive funds only to the extent that the funds are used to carry out the requirements of section 1116 of the ESEA.

County	IRN	Ohio REAP FY03 Rural Low Income School	2003 AYP	2004 Status
Adams	061903	Adams County/Ohio Valley Local SD	N	At Risk
Ross	049494	Adena Local SD	Y	OK
Medina	048462	Black River Local SD	Y	OK
Scioto	049593	Bloom-Vernon Local SD	Y	OK
Highland	047613	Bright Local SD	Y	OK
Jefferson	047787	Buckeye Local SD	Y	OK
Guernsey	043695	Cambridge City SD	N	At Risk
Ross	043745	Chillicothe City SD	N	At Risk
Tuscarawas	043778	Claymont City SD	N	At Risk
Brown	046037	Eastern Local SD	Y	OK
Pike	049122	Eastern Local SD	N	At Risk
Athens	045914	Federal Hocking Local SD	N	At Risk
Gallia	065680	Gallia County Local SD	N	At Risk
Scioto	049619	Green Local SD	Y	OK
Ross	049502	Huntington Local SD	N	At Risk
Meigs	048520	Meigs Local SD	N	At Risk
Scioto	049627	Minford Local SD	Y	OK
Athens	044446	Nelsonville-York City SD	N	At Risk
Scioto	044461	New Boston Local SD	Y	OK
Perry	044479	New Lexington City SD	N	At Risk
Tuscarawas	045542	Newcomerstown Ex.Village SD	Y	OK
Noble	048900	Noble Local SD	Y	OK
Scioto	049635	Northwest Local SD	N	At Risk
Jackson	047761	Oak Hill Union Local SD	Y	OK
Ross	049510	Paint Valley Local SD	Y	OK
Allen	045781	Perry Local SD	Y	OK
Scioto	044669	Portsmouth City SD	N	At Risk
Brown	046078	Ripley-Union-Lewis-Huntington Local SD	N	At Risk
Pike	049130	Scioto Valley Local SD	N	At Risk
Wayne	050583	Southeast Local SD	N	At Risk
Meigs	048538	Southern Local SD	N	At Risk
Perry	049064	Southern Local SD	N	At Risk
Monroe	048652	Switzerland of Ohio Local SD	N	At Risk
Lawrence	047969	Symmes Valley Local SD	Y	OK
Athens	045922	Trimble Local SD	N	At Risk
Scioto	049643	Valley Local SD	N	At Risk
Vinton	050393	Vinton County Local SD	N	At Risk
Scioto	049650	Washington-Nile Local SD	Y	OK
Pike	049148	Waverly City SD	N	At Risk
Jackson	045021	Wellston City SD	N	At Risk
Pike	049155	Western Local SD	N	At Risk

**XIII. Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)**

**A. State Transferability of Funds**

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2002-2003 school year? NO

**B. Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds**

1. Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2002-2003 school year. 114
2. In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program</b>	<b>Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	<b>4</b>	<b>47,824.00</b>
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	<b>14</b>	<b>102,392.31</b>
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	<b>11</b>	<b>408,239.20</b>
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	<b>36</b>	<b>2,039,874.74</b>
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	<b>66</b>	<b>1,278,583.10</b>

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>FROM</u> eligible program</b>	<b>Total amount of funds transferred <u>FROM</u> eligible program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	<b>88</b>	<b>3,341,318.33</b>
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	<b>26</b>	<b>89,349.00</b>
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	<b>29</b>	<b>134,852.82</b>
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	<b>20</b>	<b>311,393.20</b>

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