

**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 2012-13**

**PENNSYLVANIA**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014**

**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:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2012-13 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

#### **PART I**

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

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013~~4~~, 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 200~~5~~6, 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 learnin
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school

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

#### **PART II**

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

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

### GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, 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 2012-13 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 2012-13 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2012-13 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2012-13		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Pennsylvania Department of Education		
Address: 333 Market Street Harrisburg, PA 17126		
		Person to contact about this report:
Name: Erin Oberdorf		
Telephone: 717-787-7135		
Fax: 717-787-8634		
e-mail: eoberdorf@pa.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Carolyn Dumaesq		
_____ Signature		Friday, March 7, 2014, 3:00:15 PM

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2012-13**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012  
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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

Response	Options
State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2012-13, 2014-15	2012-13, 2014-15	2012-13

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic content standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Pennsylvania moved to end of course standards in Algebra I, Literature, and Biology as the federal accountability measure in high school (grade 11) beginning in 2012-2013. For grade levels below the high school, the changes will affect grades 3-8 in 2014-2015. Part of the change involves moving from Reading to English Language Arts standards.

**1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

Response	Options
State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	2014-15

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Pennsylvania applied the Academic Achievement Standards in Algebra I, Literature and Biology for the end of course assessments used for federal accountability at the high school level beginning this year, 2012-2013. For grade levels 3-8 the academic achievement standards in Mathematics and English Language Arts will change in 2014-2015. Pennsylvania is a member of the NCSC consortia developing the new alternate assessment with alternate achievement standards and will use the new achievement standards in 2014-2015 in Mathematics and English Language Arts. Pennsylvania will develop its own alternate Science assessment and corresponding academic achievement standards.



**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

Response	Options
	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	2014-15

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Pennsylvania used the end of course assessments in Algebra I, Literature, and Biology for federal accountability at the high school level in grade 11 beginning in 2012-2013. For grade levels 3-8, Pennsylvania will change the assessments in 2014-2015 in Mathematics and English Language Arts. Pennsylvania is a member of the NCSC consortia developing the new alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards and will use the new assessments in 2014-2015 in Mathematics and English Language Arts. Pennsylvania will develop its own alternate Science assessment.

**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 2012-13, 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)	10.00
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 local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	90.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 2012-13 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).

Purpose	Used for 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	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
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	Yes
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	Yes
Improving 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	Yes
Other	No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

**1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	925,248	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,353	99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	32,472	99.6
Asian	S	31,837	99.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	635	≥99
Black or African American	S	136,438	98.4
Hispanic or Latino	S	81,987	98.9
White	S	653,466	99.4
Two or more races	S	18,827	99.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	150,840	98.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	24,521	98.9
Economically disadvantaged students	S	399,767	99.0
Migratory students	S	1,125	83
Male	S	474,822	99.1
Female	S	449,963	99.3

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments.

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	51,406	34.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	84,550	56.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	14,884	9.9
Total	150,840	////////////////////////////////////

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards is not applicable to PA. The alternate assessment (PASA) is based on the alternate achievement standards, but not on grade-level achievement standards.

**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	S	922,554	98.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,350	98
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	31,905	97.9
Asian	S	31,277	97.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	628	98
Black or African American	S	136,033	98.1
Hispanic or Latino	S	80,843	97.7
White	S	652,942	99.3
Two or more races	S	18,790	98.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	150,597	98.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	22,463	91.1
Economically disadvantaged students	S	397,841	98.5
Migratory students	S	926	69
Male	S	473,418	98.8
Female	S	448,681	99.1

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory and LEP groups is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments.

In regards to 1.2.3.1, PA doesn't provide ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts assessments for recently Arrived LEP Students

**1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments**

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	

**1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

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

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

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 ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	53,563	35.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	82,149	54.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	14,885	9.9
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	150,597	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards is not applicable to PA. The alternate assessment (PASA) is based on the alternate achievement standards, but not on grade-level achievement standards.		

**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	S	390,893	98.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	569	97
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	13,529	99.0
Asian	S	13,276	99.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	253	≥95
Black or African American	S	55,854	96.1
Hispanic or Latino	S	32,526	96.9
White	S	281,096	98.7
Two or more races	S	7,084	98.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	61,664	96.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	9,584	96.8
Economically disadvantaged students	S	159,788	97.3
Migratory students	S	460	98
Male	S	199,975	98.0
Female	S	190,762	98.3

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Science Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	26,022	42.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,805	48.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,837	9.5
Total	61,664	

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards is not applicable to PA. The alternate assessment (PASA) is based on the alternate achievement standards, but not on grade-level achievement standards.

**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.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for academic achievement data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

**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.

**1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months unless a state chooses to include these students. Do not include former LEP students.

**1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students 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	131,211	S	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	190	S	72
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,947	S	86.8
<i>Asian</i>	4,863	S	86.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	84	S	83
Black or African American	19,382	S	52.0
Hispanic or Latino	12,825	S	57.8
White	89,758	S	83.9
Two or more races	4,016	S	68.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	21,205	S	48.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,591	S	40.5
Economically disadvantaged students	61,152	S	62.7
Migratory students	171	S	36
Male	67,436	S	75.9
Female	63,729	S	76.7

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

## 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	130,796	S	72.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	189	S	70
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,843	S	82.2
<i>Asian</i>	4,759	S	82.2
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	84	S	80
Black or African American	19,355	S	49.4
Hispanic or Latino	12,629	S	52.2
White	89,680	S	80.6
Two or more races	4,009	S	65.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	21,155	S	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,209	S	29.9
Economically disadvantaged students	60,877	S	58.3
Migratory students	137	S	28
Male	67,194	S	69.3
Female	63,557	S	76.6

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

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	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science assessments are not given for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.			

## 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	130,890	S	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	S	73
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,837	S	87.3
Asian	4,758	S	87.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	79	S	84
Black or African American	19,670	S	51.9
Hispanic or Latino	12,196	S	57.8
White	90,570	S	84.3
Two or more races	3,299	S	70.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,264	S	48.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,827	S	33.5
Economically disadvantaged students	59,960	S	62.9
Migratory students	179	S	37
Male	66,994	S	76.7
Female	63,839	S	76.7

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

## 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	130,517	S	66.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	S	64
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,742	S	79.8
Asian	4,667	S	79.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	75	S	77
Black or African American	19,599	S	40.6
Hispanic or Latino	12,039	S	45.3
White	90,524	S	74.0
Two or more races	3,297	S	60.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,223	S	34.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,504	S	17.8
Economically disadvantaged students	59,679	S	49.7
Migratory students	158	S	29
Male	66,789	S	61.6
Female	63,673	S	70.9

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

## 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	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	130,598	S	78.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	S	79
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,831	S	84.4
<i>Asian</i>	4,753	S	84.5
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	78	S	81
Black or African American	19,602	S	50.1
Hispanic or Latino	12,163	S	56.0
White	90,387	S	86.9
Two or more races	3,305	S	72.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	22,146	S	53.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,814	S	27.6
Economically disadvantaged students	59,783	S	63.7
Migratory students	178	S	37
Male	66,848	S	76.9
Female	63,694	S	79.2
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.			

## 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	130,128	S	68.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	S	68
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,677	S	83.7
<i>Asian</i>	4,599	S	83.8
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	78	S	74
Black or African American	19,814	S	40.6
Hispanic or Latino	12,081	S	49.1
White	90,511	S	76.8
Two or more races	2,739	S	61
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	22,039	S	35.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,473	S	22.8
Economically disadvantaged students	58,989	S	52.7
Migratory students	169	S	23
Male	67,164	S	68.2
Female	62,901	S	69.0

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

## 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	129,759	S	60.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	S	65
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,594	S	74.0
<i>Asian</i>	4,516	S	74.0
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	78	S	69
Black or African American	19,785	S	33.5
Hispanic or Latino	11,902	S	38.9
White	90,445	S	68.7
Two or more races	2,733	S	53
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	22,001	S	25.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,158	S	10.9
Economically disadvantaged students	58,741	S	43.0
Migratory students	126	S	14
Male	66,965	S	56.3
Female	62,735	S	64.9

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science assessments are not given for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.			

## 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	133,795	S	72.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	S	64
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,666	S	86.5
<i>Asian</i>	4,569	S	86.6
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	97	S	81
Black or African American	20,151	S	48.1
Hispanic or Latino	12,298	S	53.1
White	93,949	S	80.3
Two or more races	2,434	S	64
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	22,563	S	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,378	S	25.5
Economically disadvantaged students	59,259	S	58.0
Migratory students	165	S	33
Male	68,757	S	71.4
Female	64,960	S	74.4

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the EL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

## 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	133,480	S	64.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	S	56
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,591	S	77.7
<i>Asian</i>	4,494	S	77.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	97	S	71
Black or African American	20,110	S	41.1
Hispanic or Latino	12,158	S	43.2
White	93,892	S	72.0
Two or more races	2,432	S	57
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	22,533	S	26.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,111	S	10.3
Economically disadvantaged students	59,033	S	48.2
Migratory students	139	S	23
Male	68,593	S	59.1
Female	64,809	S	70.5

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

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	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science assessments are not given for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.			



## 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	136,198	S	75.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	S	62
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,597	S	89.4
Asian	4,476	S	89.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	121	S	85
Black or African American	20,378	S	52.7
Hispanic or Latino	11,801	S	56.4
White	96,578	S	82.6
Two or more races	2,494	S	69
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,508	S	37.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,330	S	31.2
Economically disadvantaged students	58,661	S	61.5
Migratory students	157	S	38
Male	70,002	S	73.9
Female	66,078	S	77.8

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

## 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	135,846	S	69.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	S	60
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,525	S	81.7
Asian	4,404	S	81.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	121	S	74
Black or African American	20,329	S	45.8
Hispanic or Latino	11,632	S	48.3
White	96,525	S	77.1
Two or more races	2,488	S	63
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,470	S	30.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,046	S	14.1
Economically disadvantaged students	58,404	S	53.5
Migratory students	127	S	26
Male	69,833	S	64.9
Female	65,896	S	75.0

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

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	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science assessments are not given for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.			

## 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	135,602	S	73.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	210	S	67
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,348	S	86.8
<i>Asian</i>	4,259	S	86.8
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	89	S	85
Black or African American	20,236	S	50.3
Hispanic or Latino	11,815	S	53.4
White	96,636	S	79.9
Two or more races	2,228	S	65
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	22,377	S	34.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,389	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	57,115	S	58.0
Migratory students	159	S	31
Male	69,783	S	71.3
Female	65,718	S	75.1

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

## 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	135,194	S	76.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	210	S	69
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,265	S	85.9
<i>Asian</i>	4,176	S	85.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	89	S	85
Black or African American	20,166	S	57.6
Hispanic or Latino	11,651	S	58.0
White	96,556	S	83.0
Two or more races	2,219	S	73
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	22,334	S	38.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,108	S	22.2
Economically disadvantaged students	56,818	S	62.8
Migratory students	128	S	23
Male	69,575	S	71.8
Female	65,518	S	82.4

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

## 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	134,590	S	59.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	213	S	48
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,340	S	71.6
Asian	4,251	S	71.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	72
Black or African American	20,024	S	27.5
Hispanic or Latino	11,704	S	32.6
White	95,998	S	69.4
Two or more races	2,192	S	51
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	22,057	S	25.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,366	S	7.2
Economically disadvantaged students	56,516	S	39.6
Migratory students	161	S	13
Male	69,298	S	60.9
Female	65,192	S	58.3

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The sum of male and female may differ from the total sum because there were cases where no gender is given, so the total number should equal to the total number of male, the total number of female, and the total number of students who did not have a gender assigned to them.

**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	127,424	S	63.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	165	S	57
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,400	S	78.0
<i>Asian</i>	4,313	S	78.3
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	87	S	62
Black or African American	16,807	S	35.9
Hispanic or Latino	8,971	S	39.7
White	95,464	S	70.5
Two or more races	1,617	S	50
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,884	S	22.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,533	S	16
Economically disadvantaged students	44,631	S	44.3
Migratory students	126	S	17
Male	64,686	S	62.8
Female	62,738	S	64.7

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments.

**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	126,962	S	75.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	164	S	74
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,345	S	77.7
<i>Asian</i>	4,261	S	77.8
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	84	S	71
Black or African American	16,689	S	53.1
Hispanic or Latino	8,832	S	54.0
White	95,320	S	80.8
Two or more races	1,612	S	67
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,881	S	33.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,327	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	44,289	S	58.2
Migratory students	112	S	16
Male	64,469	S	70.3
Female	62,493	S	79.8

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The difference between math and reading figures for Migratory group is due to the fact that the ELL students who were in their first year of enrollment in US schools do not need to take the Reading assessments.

## 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	125,705	S	45.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	162	S	45
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,358	S	59.2
<i>Asian</i>	4,272	S	59.4
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	86	S	47
Black or African American	16,228	S	17.0
Hispanic or Latino	8,659	S	20.9
White	94,711	S	51.7
Two or more races	1,587	S	34
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,461	S	13.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,404	S	5
Economically disadvantaged students	43,489	S	25.5
Migratory students	121	S	6.6
Male	63,829	S	45.8
Female	61,876	S	44.4
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.4 CHARTER 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**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
Schools			
Districts			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator<sup>3</sup> based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
Schools	3,043	619	20.30
Districts	686	60	8.70

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Required Federal Reporting Measures:

Title I schools will be subject to federally-required designations. Title I schools may be designated as Reward: High Achievement, Reward: High Progress, Focus, Priority, or Undesignated based on meeting the federal requirements associated with each designation. Accountability reporting will include the All Students and the Historically Underperforming groups' results. These two groups, All Students and Historically Underperforming Students, are not a cohort but rather students in the school who meet the definition during the reported year. See <http://www.eseafedreport.com/> for more information.

<sup>3</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator<sup>4</sup> based on data for SY 2012-13. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools	1,845	302	16.40
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	893	57	6.40
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	952	245	25.70

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Required Federal Reporting Measures:

Title I schools will be subject to federally-required designations. Title I schools may be designated as Reward: High Achievement, Reward: High Progress, Focus, Priority, or Undesignated based on meeting the federal requirements associated with each designation. Accountability reporting will include the All Students and the Historically Underperforming groups' results. These two groups, All Students and Historically Underperforming Students, are not a cohort but rather students in the school who meet the definition during the reported year. See <http://www.eseafedreport.com/> for more information.

<sup>4</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator<sup>5</sup> based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator
497	46	9.30

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

<sup>5</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2012-13
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	13
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	8
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	2
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	8
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	33
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 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)	31
Reopening the school as a public charter school	6
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	28
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	43
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

No district chose "Takeover the school by the state". The data validation parameters exclude zeros for the file that is used to complete this section.

There were 43 schools in 20 districts that chose other major restructuring of the school governance. These districts chose more than one of the following:

- institute and fully implement a new curriculum,
- provide appropriate professional development for relevant staff,
- increase instructional time,
- extend the school year or school day for the school,
- provide a behavior support program
- reconfigure grades and restructure the internal organization of the school.



**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.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) has implemented many programs and strategies for districts identified for improvement or corrective action.

I. The Pennsylvania Standards Aligned System (SAS) is an online, collaborative product that identifies six distinct elements which, if utilized together, provide schools and districts a common framework for continuous school and district enhancement and improvement. SAS is accessible to administrators, educators, students, parents and the general public. The elements of the SAS are: Standards, Assessments, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources, and Safe & Supportive Schools.

- Pennsylvania's Standards describe what students should know and be able to do and increase in complexity and sophistication as students' progress through school. There are sixteen sets of standards in SAS. Assessment Anchors were developed to clarify the standards assessed on the PSSA and the Keystone Exams, which are end of course exams at the high school level. Assessment Anchors are designed to hold together or "anchor" the state assessment system and the curriculum/ instructional practices in schools. Anchors are further defined with Eligible Content. Eligible Content helps teachers identify the range of the content they should teach to best prepare their students for the PSSA and Keystone Exams.

Pennsylvania developed PA Core Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics. The PA Core Standards incorporate the Pennsylvania Academic Standards. The Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies and Science/Technical Subjects will be appended to their respective PA Academic Standards.

- Assessment is a process used by teachers and students before, during, and after instruction to provide feedback and adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve student achievement. In Pennsylvania, the four types of assessment are summative, formative, benchmark, and diagnostic. Within the Assessment element, educators can locate information regarding Keystone Exams and graduation requirements. Educators can utilize the Assessment Creator and the appropriate Classroom Diagnostic Tool for use with their students.
- The Curriculum Framework specifies what is to be taught for each subject in the curriculum. Curriculum Frameworks include Big Ideas, Concepts, Competencies, Essential Questions, Vocabulary, and Exemplars aligned to Standards, Assessment Anchors and, where appropriate, Eligible Content.
- Instruction provides information on Teacher Effectiveness, the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching which includes Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction and Professional Responsibilities, instructional strategies, instructional resources and interventions. These resources focus on ensuring the right level of challenge, teaching based on the learning needs of each student, and implementing instructional strategies to increase student achievement.
- Materials and Resources provide quality, standards aligned materials and resources such as lesson plans, units, content resources, online resources, learning progressions, Voluntary Model Curriculum, featured content and Keystone Exam content such as the Algebra 1 resource center.
- The Safe and Supportive Schools element of SAS provides resources and exemplars to promote active student engagement in a safe and positive learning environment. Areas within the element include school engagement, school safety and school environment. In addition, Pennsylvania developed PK-12 Student Interpersonal Skills Standards.

II. PDE has established a comprehensive plan framework that guides schools through data and systems analyses, leading to the identification of systemic challenges that impede student achievement. Action plans are developed to eliminate or ameliorate those challenges based on research-proven method and practices, curriculum resources and professional development. The plan framework incorporates current thinking and PDE's priorities regarding continuous school improvement and outlines the phases vital to developing a results-focused continuous school improvement plan.

III. PDE established an ongoing technical assistance network in coordination with the 29 IUs for planning sessions with IU and school personnel to identify district needs, coordinate service delivery, etc. Professional development for school district staff from buildings is provided by IU staff. Each IU provides historical background of the district and school and assists in planning for the specific needs of each school in School Improvement or Corrective Action. Facilitation in areas such as data analysis/retreats, root cause analysis, customized data packet development, curriculum audits, on-going monitoring is provided.

VI. PDE provides support services through several Bureaus including:

- (1) Bureau of Assessment & Accountability which provides direction and technical assistance to schools and districts with regard to assessment and accountability programs; evaluates school/student progress, deficiencies and school performance and developments assessment anchors to better align curricula, instruction and assessment practices throughout the state; coordinate test development, administration, and reporting.
- (2) Bureau of Special Education which provides professional leadership and management in the provision of special education services and programs. The Bureau administers the special education contingency fund, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) funds. Staff provides technical assistance, consultation and advice to local education agencies to support them in meeting the requirements of state and federal special education requirements.
- (3) Bureau of Teaching and Learning which provides consultative and facilitative agency support in curriculum, instructional strategies and compensatory education. Major activities of the bureau include provision of curriculum and instructional materials and guidelines, provision and coordination of technical assistance and professional development to school districts, and administration of significant state and federal programs and projects such as Title 1. A primary responsibility of the Bureau is the administration of the online Standards Aligned System (SAS).

In addition, the Bureau of Teaching and Learning oversees an array of programs and services to all 500 districts, schools, families and communities to enable students to develop resiliency, stay in school, reach their full potential and succeed in life after high school graduation. The Bureau administers critically needed funding, technical assistance and support to more than 20 different initiatives, including: homeless children's education; safe and drug free programs; alternative and corrections education; teen parent projects; after school programs; migrant and refugee education; dropout prevention and education mentoring.

**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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 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 2012-13
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	2
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	3
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	2
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	3
Restructured the district	10
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2011-12 and beginning of SY 2012-13 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were 12 school districts in Corrective Action. Most of the districts chose more than one option.	

**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 2012-13 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to Pennsylvania having the ESEA Flexibility waiver approved, there are no longer AYP designations therefore there are no AYP designations to appeal.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete	

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA .

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.

1A.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2012 (SY 2012-13) 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: 4.00 %

---

!comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

The data for this question are reported through ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the ED Facts Reporting System (ERS). The ED Facts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) **and** technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2012-13.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Pennsylvania provides evaluative data for all schools identified for improvement using several different methods. The first is the online PSSA school and district report cards. These report cards provide each school and district with evaluative information regarding their students performance on the PSSA. Secondary evaluative information is provided to each school and district through the use of the state's Performance Index and PVAAS (PA's Growth Model). Finally, each school and district is given reports from eMetrix. All of these data reports are then used to assist schools in determining root cause, finding solutions and implementing a comprehensive school improvement plan. Technical assistance to schools and districts begins when all of these data sources are available. Each Intermediate Unit in PA serves as a support center for the schools and districts within their service area. IUs provide support for data analysis, training to determine root cause, and expertise in carrying out improvement strategies. Funds are used to support the statewide network of IU support as well as to provide conferences on data driven decision-making and regional workshops throughout the year on plan implementation. Finally, funds are used to provide schools in improvement with distinguished educators, leadership training and curriculum frameworks and resources necessary for improvement.

**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 2012-13 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.

---

Section 1003(g) funds and several other federal grants are used to supplement many of the state-funded supports to schools and districts in improvement. State funds are used to provide capacity building funds to each IU in order to support schools in improvement, distinguished educators, distinguished school leaders, leadership training, curriculum frameworks, school improvement toolkits and plan frameworks, regional trainings and statewide conferences in support of improvement.

---

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

<b>Public School Choice</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	164,810
Applied to transfer	4,454
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,312
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

<b>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>		<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice		\$ 589,555

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

<b>Unable to Provide Public School Choice</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	35

**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:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.



**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*.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	119,291
Applied for supplemental educational services	14,149
Received supplemental educational services	8,061
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

<b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 7,697,745
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	347,391	347,391	100.00	0	0.00
All elementary classes	53,191	53,191	100.00		
All secondary classes	294,200	294,200	100.00		

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.	Yes
---	-----

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.

Pennsylvania counts full day self-contained elementary classes as one class. PA uses unique departmentalized course codes for each core academic subject at the sixth grade level. Consequently, departmentalized sixth grade courses are counted multiple times.
---

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

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

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

<b>1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes</b>	
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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	0.00
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	17.60
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	9.70
Other (please explain in comment box below)	72.70
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2012-13 HQT/NHQT data were collected via PA Information Management System (PIMS). LEA's continued to experience a number of data reporting errors, including but not limited to uploading incorrect staff identifiers; errors in entering staff identification numbers (PPID); incorrect mapping of local courses to state level courses; not understanding the differences between certification and staffing requirements and demonstration of content mastery for teachers of record in core academic content areas. The department continued to work with LEA's to correct these errors; however, not all LEA's submitted data corrections required to generate accurate HQT/NHQT percentages. Additionally, a number of elementary special education teachers' records and charter school teachers who are not certified are required to be manually changed to HQ as a result of data system limitations. PA simply can not determine if the teachers are HQ or not. This is due to the fact that the LEAs are still experiencing difficulties reporting their teacher's assignments, not correcting their uploaded data as required, and mapping their assignments to correct state course id. The data is correct giving the limitation of the system. LEAs and especially a number of Charter Schools are not correcting their data before closing the collection to ensure that all of their core academic teachers are HQ.

<b>1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes</b>	
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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)	62.30
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	21.60
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	16.10
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2012-13 HQT/NHQT data were collected via PA Information Management System (PIMS). LEA's continued to experience a number of data reporting errors, including but not limited to uploading incorrect staff identifiers; errors in entering staff identification numbers (PPID); incorrect mapping of local courses to state level courses; not understanding the differences between certification and staffing requirements and demonstration of content mastery for teachers of record in core academic content areas. The department continued to work with LEA's to correct these errors; however, not all LEA's submitted data corrections required to generate accurate HQT/NHQT percentages. Additionally, a number of elementary special education teachers' records and charter school teachers who are not certified are required to be manually changed to HQ as a result of data system limitations. The percentages are reasonable because these percentages are for High and Low poverty quartiles are a subset of the total number of classes in PA. Thus, when dividing the number of HQT classes in High Poverty quartiles by the number of classes in that quartile, the percentage ebbs up a bit because the denominator is smaller. The same goes for low poverty percentages.

### 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 [school-level data](#) when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

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
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	12,468	12,468	100.00
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	12,597	12,597	100.00
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	44,584	44,584	100.00
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	106,106	106,106	100.00

#### 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	50.70	16.60
Poverty metric used	Poverty metric used for each location, the percent of students considered to be low income is based on the poverty code field in the Student Snapshot template (number of poverty students/total number students). Separate quartiles are identified for elementary schools. Quartiles are numbered one through four, with Quartile one being the High Poverty schools and Quartile four the Low Poverty schools. Adjustments were made to ensure schools with the same percentage of low income enrollments fall into a single quartile.	
Secondary schools	54.20	33.80
Poverty metric used	Poverty metric used for each location, the percent of students considered to be low income is based on the poverty code field in the Student Snapshot template (number of poverty students/total number students). Separate quartiles are identified for secondary schools. Quartiles are numbered 1 through 4, with Quartile 1 being the High Poverty schools and Quartile 4 the Low Poverty schools. Adjustments were made to ensure schools with the same percentage of low income enrollments fall into a single quartile.	

**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:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Push-in ESL, Tutoring, Math Support, Parent/School interface, professional development, co-teaching, extended day, and summer programs.

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

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

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	52,054
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	49,859
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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	29,663
Uncoded languages	3,205
Chinese	2,173
Arabic	1,919
Nepali	1,865

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--



**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).

<b>All LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	48,318
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,374
<b>Total</b>	<b>49,692</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Section 1.6.2.1 comes from C141, which is a cumulative, year-end count of LEP students. Section 1.6.3.1.1 comes from C137, which is an unduplicated count of students enrolled during the testing window. The year-end, cumulative count will by definition be higher.</p> <p>This number reflects demographic errors related to PASecureIDs and attribution of students, including invalid PASecureIDs, incorrect student location codes, and incorrect/missing LEP indicators. Further modifications to business rules for warehousing the test file within our statewide information management system (PIMS), the addition of a second correction period, and the implementation of data quality edits to the PIMS system will decrease these errors going forward. A procedure for collecting reasons for non-participation at the student level is being implemented.</p>	

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

<b>All LEP Results</b>	<b>#</b>
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	15,375
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	31.80
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.</p>	

**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.

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>		<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		44,632
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		1,229
<b>Total</b>		<b>45,861</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Section 1.6.2.2 comes from C116, which is a cumulative, year-end count of Title III served LEP students. Section 1.6.3.2.1 comes from C138, which is an unduplicated count of students enrolled during the testing window. The year-end, cumulative count will by definition be higher.</p> <p>Title III First Time Tested should be 12,285 (the file is not filling in the report). This number reflects demographic errors related to PAsSecureIDs and attribution of students, including invalid PAsSecureIDs, incorrect student location codes, incorrect/missing LEP indicator, and incorrect/missing Title III indicators. Further modifications to business rules for warehousing the test file within our statewide information management system (PIMS), the addition of a second correction period, and the implementation of data quality edits to the PIMS system will decrease these errors going forward. A procedure for collecting reasons for non-participation at the student level is being implemented.</p>		

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 AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>		<b>#</b>
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.		0

**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:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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%).

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress	15,196	34.00	19,085	59.00
Attained proficiency	14,186	31.80	10,712	24.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

**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).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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)
Spanish
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.



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

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

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

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) 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
212	24	236
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
235	S	78	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
236	S	66	S

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for 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 MFLEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
80	S	56	S

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

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

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

<b>Title III Subgrantees</b>		<b>#</b>
Total number of subgrantees for the year		321
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs		296
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1		318
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2		318
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3		297
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs		0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2011-12 and 2012-13)		9
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2012-13 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years		5
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13)		2

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:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The state counted consortia members individually in 1.6.4.1.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	Yes
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Section 1.6.3.2.2 does not calculate AMAOs for accountability purposes. It collects Title III ELP results. C103 reports whether a state or district met AMAOs under Title III.	

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

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	Yes
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	2
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

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

**Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.**

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who only 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
16,536	4,900	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 educational 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) – The term ' Language instruction educational program ' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,625
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	690

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee 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 and 1.6.4.)
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.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	221
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	209
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	190
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	157
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	158
Other (Explain in comment box)	68

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	246	15,030
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	245	2,475
PD provided to principals	245	1,133
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	243	675
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	241	1,285
PD provided to community based organization personnel	240	1,935
Total	////////////////////	22,533

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other activities include Special Education and ESL Interface and Cultural Professional Developments.

**1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities**

This section collects data on State grant activities.

**1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process**

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

**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 2012-13 funds July 1, 2012, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2012, for SY 2012-13 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/2012	7/1/2012	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**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.

This process cannot be shortened to less than our current zero days.

**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/unsafechoice.pdf>.

<b>Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Persistently Dangerous Schools	6
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

This section collects data on homeless children and youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	63	13
LEAs with subgrants	715	715
Total	778	728

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 63 LEAs noted as non-subgrantees are NOT considered LEAs under McKinney Vento. They are either part-time technical schools or juvenile centers. If students do attend these schools/centers, they are identified (and reported) at their home LEA, not the part-time school or juvenile center. However, there are some instances where students attend the part-time school full time and no other LEA is listed for them. The 13 non-LEAs counted in 1.9 had identified students that only attended their facility, which is why they are counted in the non-subgrantee column. All other students that may have attended these facilities (63) are counted and reported with their [home] LEA in the subgrantee column. We count them this way because students who attend part-time technical schools may have their PSSA attributed to this school at the school level, but at the LEA level, their PSSA is attributed to their home LEA.

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)		519
K		1,697
1		1,846
2		1,720
3		1,565
4		1,454
5		1,458
6		1,329
7		1,307
8		1,264
9	2	1,452
10	9	1,147
11	5	1,087
12	13	1,358
Ungraded		3
Total	29	19,206

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The non-subgrantees (13) reporting students are part-time technical high schools and do not have any elementary grades. There were no ungraded students.

There are students that were identified as homeless by an LEA and have an age/grade category (1.9.1.1) but did not have a night time status reported (1.9.1.2). This would be true for non-subgrantees (29 vs 25) and subgrantees (19,206 vs 18,912).

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

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	6	5,764
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	16	11,719
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	1	234
Hotels/Motels	2	1,195
Total	25	18,912

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are students that were identified as homeless by an LEA and have an age/grade category (1.9.1.1) but did not have a night time status reported (1.9.1.2). This would be true for non-subgrantees (29 vs 25) and subgrantees (19,206 vs 18,912).

**1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled**

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	8	2,122
Migratory children/youth	1	901
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12	3,659
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1	1,498

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**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 Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	1,248
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,113
K	1,709
1	1,851
2	1,713
3	1,578
4	1,463
5	1,457
6	1,344
7	1,311
8	1,286
9	1,455
10	1,171
11	1,084
12	1,374
Ungraded	8
Total	22,165

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	2,333
Migratory children/youth	1,187
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,660
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,787

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students**

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

**1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youth who were tested on the State 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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3			1,355	612
4			1,269	490
5			1,243	393
6			1,136	425
7			1,103	473
8			1,046	531
High School			731	355

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Nosubgrantees are part-time technical high schools. Of the 5 grade 11 non-subgrantee students, none had assessment data.

**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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3			1,381	659
4			1,291	645
5			1,272	499
6			1,148	527
7			1,120	577
8			1,060	459
High School			733	252

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Nosubgrantees are part-time technical high schools. Of the 5 grade 11 non-subgrantee students, none had assessment data.

**1.9.3.3 Science Assessment**

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

Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3				
4			1,288	646
5				
6				
7				
8			1,053	288
High School			698	143

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are no science assessments in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.