

**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

ILLINOIS



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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 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: Illinois State Board of Education		
Address: 100 North First Street Springfield, IL 62777-0001		
		Person to contact about this report:
Name: David Hellwig		
Telephone: 217-782-3950		
Fax: 217-524-7784		
e-mail: dhellwig@isbe.net		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Christopher A. Koch		
		<u>Wednesday, April 16, 2014, 11:47:27 AM</u> Date
_____ Signature		

**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
	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	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	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	2013-14

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.

The Illinois State Board of Education proposes to adopt the Next Generation Science 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	2012-13	2012-13	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	2014-15
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2013-14	2013-14	2014-15
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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.

Illinois adopted the Common Core State Standards in June 2010 in mathematics and English/Language Arts. The Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) for grades 3-8 was modified to include items connected to the Common Core State Standards in 2013 and 2014. The Illinois Alternate Assessment (IAA) will incorporate items connected to the Common Core State Standards through the Common Core Essential Elements in 2014.

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.
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	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	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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.

Illinois will implement the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers assessments for the regular assessments in grades 3-11 and the Dynamic Learning Maps assessment for the alternate 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)	30.00
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	70.00
Comments: 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)	No
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	Yes
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	No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	No
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
Comments: 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	1,068,869	1,060,604	99.23
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,709	3,687	99.41
Asian or Pacific Islander	48,899	48,703	99.60
<i>Asian</i>	47,334	47,144	99.60
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	1,565	1,559	99.62
Black or African American	188,501	185,859	98.60
Hispanic or Latino	254,056	252,098	99.23
White	542,478	539,417	99.44
Two or more races	30,724	30,472	99.18
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	143,774	141,401	98.35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	75,329	74,761	99.25
Economically disadvantaged students	543,651	538,211	99.00
Migratory students	278	274	98.56
Male	546,891	542,108	99.13
Female	521,820	518,428	99.35

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

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	33,616	23.77
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	94,771	67.02
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,014	9.20
Total	141,401	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not offer alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards; therefore, Row #3 and Row #4 are not applicable to Illinois.

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	1,067,089	1,059,182	99.26
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,692	3,669	99.38
Asian or Pacific Islander	48,297	48,077	99.54
Asian	46,736	46,523	99.54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,561	1,554	99.55
Black or African American	188,405	185,925	98.68
Hispanic or Latino	253,404	251,480	99.24
White	542,090	539,195	99.47
Two or more races	30,699	30,464	99.23
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	143,767	141,472	98.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	73,495	72,762	99.00
Economically disadvantaged students	542,377	537,159	99.04
Migratory students	275	269	97.82
Male	545,919	541,299	99.15
Female	521,012	517,815	99.39

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

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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	33,642	23.78
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	94,795	67.01
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,035	9.21
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	141,472	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not offer alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards; therefore, Row #3 and Row #4 are not applicable to Illinois.

There are 717 LEP students included in Table 1.2.4 per the file specifications for C178, which populates tables 1.2.3 and 1.2.4: LEP students who have been in the U.S. fewer than 12 months and who took the English language proficiency assessment in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment are to be included in the file.

The 717 LEP students are not included in the section 1.3 Reading/Language Arts tables, per the file specifications for C188: LEP students who have been in the U.S. fewer than 12 months and who took the English language proficiency assessment in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment are not to be included in the file.

Of these 717 LEP students, 26 are also included in the number of Children With Disabilities (IDEA) participating in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

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	455,489	449,400	98.66
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,520	1,502	98.82
Asian or Pacific Islander	20,926	20,774	99.27
Asian	20,311	20,164	99.28
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	615	610	99.19
Black or African American	79,968	78,041	97.59
Hispanic or Latino	105,902	104,339	98.52
White	234,378	232,186	99.06
Two or more races	12,627	12,445	98.56
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	60,859	59,217	97.30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,079	24,663	98.34
Economically disadvantaged students	223,644	219,673	98.22
Migratory students	106	103	97.17
Male	232,541	229,031	98.49
Female	222,894	220,348	98.86

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	13,093	22.11
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	40,336	68.12
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,788	9.77
Total	59,217	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not offer alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards; therefore, Row #3 and Row #4 are not applicable to Illinois.

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	153,911	84,499	54.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	526	242	46.01
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,421	5,859	78.95
Asian	7,213	5,737	79.54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	208	122	58.65
Black or African American	26,754	8,399	31.39
Hispanic or Latino	38,921	15,794	40.58
White	75,188	51,238	68.15
Two or more races	5,045	2,945	58.37
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,407	6,601	32.35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23,941	7,017	29.31
Economically disadvantaged students	83,018	32,564	39.23
Migratory students	43	10	23.26
Male	78,892	43,976	55.74
Female	75,007	40,514	54.01

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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	153,548	90,295	58.81
American Indian or Alaska Native	524	260	49.62
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,274	5,725	78.70
Asian	7,067	5,602	79.27
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	207	123	59.42
Black or African American	26,735	10,882	40.70
Hispanic or Latino	38,772	16,522	42.61
White	75,139	53,609	71.35
Two or more races	5,048	3,273	64.84
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,403	5,683	27.85
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23,493	5,904	25.13
Economically disadvantaged students	82,765	35,989	43.48
Migratory students	41	9	21.95
Male	78,705	42,699	54.25
Female	74,831	47,586	63.59

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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			
<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			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not administer a science assessment at the grade 3 level.			

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	151,305	91,201	60.28
American Indian or Alaska Native	512	254	49.61
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,189	5,985	83.25
Asian	6,980	5,855	83.88
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	209	130	62.20
Black or African American	25,703	10,095	39.28
Hispanic or Latino	37,998	18,558	48.84
White	75,068	53,369	71.09
Two or more races	4,781	2,925	61.18
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,752	6,620	31.90
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,059	3,197	24.48
Economically disadvantaged students	80,467	37,105	46.11
Migratory students	38	14	36.84
Male	77,889	46,682	59.93
Female	73,410	44,518	60.64

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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	150,904	89,296	59.17
American Indian or Alaska Native	503	247	49.11
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,054	5,694	80.72
Asian	6,846	5,558	81.19
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	208	136	65.38
Black or African American	25,687	10,042	39.09
Hispanic or Latino	37,837	16,817	44.45
White	74,989	53,405	71.22
Two or more races	4,781	3,069	64.19
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,753	5,440	26.21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,613	1,808	14.33
Economically disadvantaged students	80,200	35,159	43.84
Migratory students	37	11	29.73
Male	77,667	43,485	55.99
Female	73,231	45,811	62.56

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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	150,878	121,899	80.79
American Indian or Alaska Native	512	381	74.41
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,172	6,569	91.59
<i>Asian</i>	6,963	6,388	91.74
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	209	181	86.60
Black or African American	25,585	16,223	63.41
Hispanic or Latino	37,899	27,775	73.29
White	74,892	66,952	89.40
Two or more races	4,769	3,968	83.20
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,677	12,078	58.41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,999	6,316	48.59
Economically disadvantaged students	80,215	57,196	71.30
Migratory students	38	18	47.37
Male	77,656	62,593	80.60
Female	73,216	59,305	81.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.			

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	151,178	89,868	59.45
American Indian or Alaska Native	554	281	50.72
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,956	5,764	82.86
Asian	6,745	5,621	83.34
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	211	143	67.77
Black or African American	26,350	9,790	37.15
Hispanic or Latino	36,993	18,172	49.12
White	75,745	53,072	70.07
Two or more races	4,509	2,764	61.30
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,743	6,071	29.27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,744	2,066	21.20
Economically disadvantaged students	79,302	35,787	45.13
Migratory students	38	10	26.32
Male	77,449	45,575	58.85
Female	73,712	44,289	60.08

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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	150,863	88,844	58.89
American Indian or Alaska Native	551	260	47.19
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,842	5,426	79.30
Asian	6,633	5,294	79.81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	209	132	63.16
Black or African American	26,332	9,891	37.56
Hispanic or Latino	36,896	16,219	43.96
White	75,661	54,175	71.60
Two or more races	4,510	2,847	63.13
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,746	5,025	24.22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,324	906	9.72
Economically disadvantaged students	79,098	33,972	42.95
Migratory students	37	7	18.92
Male	77,276	43,077	55.74
Female	73,570	45,763	62.20

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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 (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not administer a science assessment at the grade 5 level.			

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	153,666	91,917	59.82
American Indian or Alaska Native	562	265	47.15
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,963	5,731	82.31
Asian	6,743	5,609	83.18
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	220	122	55.45
Black or African American	27,241	10,241	37.59
Hispanic or Latino	37,004	18,356	49.61
White	77,466	54,540	70.41
Two or more races	4,389	2,773	63.18
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,619	5,365	26.02
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,839	1,573	17.80
Economically disadvantaged students	80,150	36,400	45.41
Migratory students	49	19	38.78
Male	78,378	45,662	58.26
Female	75,281	46,252	61.44

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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	153,339	90,535	59.04
American Indian or Alaska Native	561	264	47.06
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,829	5,428	79.48
Asian	6,609	5,303	80.24
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	220	125	56.82
Black or African American	27,270	10,995	40.32
Hispanic or Latino	36,841	17,316	47.00
White	77,410	53,690	69.36
Two or more races	4,387	2,831	64.53
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,633	4,677	22.67
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,405	975	11.60
Economically disadvantaged students	79,928	35,713	44.68
Migratory students	47	17	36.17
Male	78,194	42,473	54.32
Female	75,139	48,058	63.96

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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			
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			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not administer a science assessment at the grade 6 level.			

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	154,258	91,289	59.18
American Indian or Alaska Native	602	304	50.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,004	5,824	83.15
Asian	6,730	5,663	84.15
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	274	161	58.76
Black or African American	27,793	10,794	38.84
Hispanic or Latino	36,147	17,880	49.46
White	78,310	53,798	68.70
Two or more races	4,348	2,679	61.61
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,789	4,746	22.83
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,377	1,460	17.43
Economically disadvantaged students	78,747	35,282	44.80
Migratory students	40	9	22.50
Male	79,186	45,310	57.22
Female	75,066	45,976	61.25

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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	153,980	90,096	58.51
American Indian or Alaska Native	602	310	51.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,885	5,502	79.91
Asian	6,612	5,343	80.81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	273	159	58.24
Black or African American	27,831	11,273	40.51
Hispanic or Latino	35,986	17,291	48.05
White	78,279	52,983	67.68
Two or more races	4,341	2,724	62.75
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,821	4,329	20.79
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,956	821	10.32
Economically disadvantaged students	78,536	34,681	44.16
Migratory students	39	7	17.95
Male	79,040	42,837	54.20
Female	74,934	47,257	63.06

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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	153,779	121,450	78.98
American Indian or Alaska Native	599	437	72.95
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,991	6,374	91.17
<i>Asian</i>	6,718	6,158	91.66
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	273	216	79.12
Black or African American	27,695	17,154	61.94
Hispanic or Latino	36,050	25,821	71.63
White	78,067	68,128	87.27
Two or more races	4,324	3,510	81.17
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,699	9,858	47.63
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,338	2,944	35.31
Economically disadvantaged students	78,474	53,833	68.60
Migratory students	40	21	52.50
Male	78,955	60,851	77.07
Female	74,818	60,595	80.99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.			

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	151,535	89,489	59.06
American Indian or Alaska Native	540	275	50.93
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,558	5,415	82.57
Asian	6,249	5,238	83.82
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	309	177	57.28
Black or African American	27,254	10,225	37.52
Hispanic or Latino	34,643	17,775	51.31
White	78,414	53,369	68.06
Two or more races	4,045	2,417	59.75
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,239	4,494	22.20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,475	1,477	19.76
Economically disadvantaged students	75,538	33,899	44.88
Migratory students	41	13	31.71
Male	77,885	44,924	57.68
Female	73,639	44,560	60.51

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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	151,258	90,591	59.89
American Indian or Alaska Native	534	284	53.18
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,415	5,086	79.28
Asian	6,107	4,921	80.58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	308	165	53.57
Black or African American	27,290	11,059	40.52
Hispanic or Latino	34,511	16,952	49.12
White	78,380	54,655	69.73
Two or more races	4,044	2,540	62.81
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,265	4,325	21.34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,067	750	10.61
Economically disadvantaged students	75,356	34,081	45.23
Migratory students	40	11	27.50
Male	77,733	42,999	55.32
Female	73,513	47,587	64.73

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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			
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			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not administer a science assessment at the grade 8 level.			

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	144,751	75,418	52.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	391	176	45.01
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,612	4,991	75.48
<i>Asian</i>	6,484	4,920	75.88
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	128	71	55.47
Black or African American	24,764	5,564	22.47
Hispanic or Latino	30,392	11,181	36.79
White	79,226	51,673	65.22
Two or more races	3,355	1,828	54.49
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,852	3,794	21.25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,326	411	12.36
Economically disadvantaged students	60,989	19,592	32.12
Migratory students	25	8	32.00
Male	72,429	39,139	54.04
Female	72,313	36,276	50.17

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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	144,573	79,444	54.95
American Indian or Alaska Native	388	194	50.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,573	4,700	71.50
<i>Asian</i>	6,445	4,628	71.81
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	128	72	56.25
Black or African American	24,744	7,410	29.95
Hispanic or Latino	30,345	11,483	37.84
White	79,166	53,641	67.76
Two or more races	3,346	2,010	60.07
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,825	4,193	23.52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,187	234	7.34
Economically disadvantaged students	60,897	21,757	35.73
Migratory students	25	6	24.00
Male	72,321	38,078	52.65
Female	72,243	41,362	57.25

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

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	144,743	71,964	49.72
American Indian or Alaska Native	391	180	46.04
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,611	4,577	69.23
<i>Asian</i>	6,483	4,509	69.55
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	128	68	53.12
Black or African American	24,761	4,730	19.10
Hispanic or Latino	30,390	9,549	31.42
White	79,227	51,115	64.52
Two or more races	3,352	1,806	53.88
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,841	4,148	23.25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,326	269	8.09
Economically disadvantaged students	60,984	17,215	28.23
Migratory students	25	6	24.00
Male	72,420	38,379	53.00
Female	72,314	33,580	46.44

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Several test participants were not included in the Illinois Student Information System; therefore, there is no demographic information available for these students.

The percentages are lower than the previous year's report because the cut score was reset in 2013.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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	3,767	598	15.87
Districts	863	62	7.18

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Beginning in 2013, Illinois raised the performance cut scores in reading and math to align with the college- and career-ready expectations. In addition, the AMO targets were raised from 85 in 2012 to 92.5 in 2013.

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 indicator³ 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			
Districts			

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

³ 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	2,413	313	12.97
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,384	142	10.26
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,029	171	16.62

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Beginning in 2013, Illinois raised the performance cut scores in reading and math to align with the college- and career-ready expectations. In addition, the AMO targets were raised from 85 in 2012 to 92.5 in 2013.

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 indicator⁴ 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			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

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

⁴ 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
833	55	6.60

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct number of districts that received Title I funds in SY 2012-13 is 832.

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 indicator⁵ 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

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

⁵ 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	237
Extension of the school year or school day	45
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	31
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	24
Replacement of the principal	29
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	68
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	52
Comments: 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)	9
Reopening the school as a public charter school	21
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	12
Takeover the school by the State	7
Other major restructuring of the school governance	359
Comments: 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.

Implementing any other restructuring of the school's governance that makes fundamental reform in: a) governance and management, and/or b) financing and material resources, and/or c) staffing.

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 Illinois State Board of Education has established a statewide system of support for school districts that do not make AYP. If a school district does not make AYP for two consecutive years it is required to develop a district improvement plan to assist the district in making AYP. The plan must include an objective established for each area in which the district is not making AYP. The Center for School Improvement (The Center) is assigned to work with the school district to develop and implement the district improvement plan by using the Rising Star indicator-based system for continuous improvement.

Districts in corrective action must have a current, locally approved district improvement plan submitted for review by the Illinois State Board of Education, which must include implementation plans for one of the required steps identified in NCLB, Section 1116. In most cases, this results in the district ensuring implementation of a new curriculum, with access for all students in the district. Year 1 and Year 2 districts submitted progress reports to the Illinois State Board of Education to explain how the district is going to work toward making AYP or showing marked improvement. Although this is not the only sanction to be imposed by the Illinois State Board of Education, it is the one that is chosen most often. The Center teams work with their assigned school districts until AYP is made for two consecutive years.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 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	186
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	34
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	12
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	30
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	2
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	2
Restructured the district	16
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)	1

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

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	0	0
Schools	0	0

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

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	NA

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.

1.4.8.5.1 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 C SPR Crosswalk. The C SPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the C SPR, 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 C SPR 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) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2012-13.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The awarded projects received a comprehensive FY 2013 School Improvement Plan 1003(g) Resource Manual and individualized technical assistance that focused on the implementation of their projects during face-to-face meetings in August and September. These sessions were conducted by the Illinois State Board of Education consultants, and follow-up, site-based sessions were scheduled. The projects also engaged in statewide teleconferences and individualized technical assistance was provided by the SIG 1003(g) principal consultants.

Project monitoring included use of the FY 2013 Illinois State Board of Education SIG 1003(g) Monitoring Instrument, which aligns with the goals of Section 1003(g). The Illinois State Board of Education consultants performed site visits to monitor the grant.

Presentations on the School Improvement Plan 1003(g) project expectations were included in the fall and spring Title I Directors Conferences in Springfield and at the Committee of Practitioners sessions.

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.

The primary vehicle for providing support to Title I schools identified for improvement is the Statewide System of Support, which receives the majority of funding through 1003(a). The Illinois State Board of Education uses other available federal funds, such as Title II, to provide technical assistance to Title I schools that have been identified for improvement. Technical assistance includes assisting with development of the improvement and restructuring plans and overseeing review of the plans, including written feedback for the continuous improvement process.

To increase the agency's capacity to meet the needs of all schools and districts, Illinois established the Center for School Improvement (The Center). The Center builds upon the foundational, guiding principles of ISBE and the current Statewide System of Support to provide high-quality, coordinated, and consistent support; to ensure that districts and schools receive expert, timely, and relevant assistance; and to increase district-level capacity to prepare students for college and careers. The Center will bring high-quality, research-based services and resources to help districts improve education outcomes for students. The Center will employ content area specialists, coaches, and turnaround experts with specific expertise in working with English language learners, students with disabilities, low-income students, and racial and ethnic minority students.

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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	933,485
Applied to transfer	5,539
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,059
Comments: 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.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 5,143,227

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	407

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. The "dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice" should be \$0. The EDEN file will not populate the zero.

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.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	558,553
Applied for supplemental educational services	80,550
Received supplemental educational services	60,140
Comments: 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.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 82,145,223
Comments: 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	167,346	163,675	97.81	306	0.18
All elementary classes	128,358	126,680	98.69	241	0.19
All secondary classes	38,988	36,995	94.89	65	0.17

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

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

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

Illinois has reported the data that were collected. Some school districts had difficulty tracking the qualifications of teachers. Therefore, the total number of core academic classes (167,346) does not equal the number of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified PLUS the number of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. 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.

For grades K-5, a classroom is counted as a full-day, self-contained classroom and equals one class. Grades 6-8 classrooms may be counted as a full-day, self-contained classroom that equals one class, OR may be counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.

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.

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes	
Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	7.00
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	4.70
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	48.80
Other (please explain in comment box below)	39.50
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Elementary ELL teachers enrolled in an approved program while teaching. Teachers who hold a Type 29 certificate.

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes	
Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	14.80
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	59.30
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	14.80
Other (please explain in comment box below)	11.10
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: ELL teachers enrolled in an approved program while teaching. Teachers who hold a Type 29 certificate. Special education teachers who have a temporary certificate.
--

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
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	22,573	22,426	99.35
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	43,800	43,790	99.98
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	8,727	8,680	99.46
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	13,408	13,405	99.98

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	27.60	77.40
Poverty metric used	Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches. High-poverty schools are the lowest 25 percent. Low-poverty schools are the highest 25 percent.	
Secondary schools	27.20	59.40
Poverty metric used	Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches. High-poverty schools are the lowest 25 percent. Low-poverty schools are the highest 25 percent.	

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.
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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Dual language	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Polish, Arabic, Chinese, Urdu
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish, Polish, Arabic Chinese, Urdu
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	190,172
Comments: 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.	175,714
Comments: 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	152,240
Arabic	5,322
Polish	5,304
Chinese	2,581
Urdu	2,494

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).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	180,266
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,900
Total	182,166
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number tested on State annual ELP assessment should be 180,266 and the number not tested on State annual ELP assessment should be 1,900. The total should be 182,166.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	39,314
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	21.83
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Title III LEP Testing		#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		172,423
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		1,612
Total		174,035
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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).

Title III First Time Tested		#
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.		43,191

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%).

Title III Results	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	84,296	65.23		60.50
Attained proficiency	35,433	20.55		10.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois has target percentages only, not target numbers.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: 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)
NA
NA
NA
NA
NA
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This table is not applicable because Illinois does not administer native language mathematics assessments.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
NA
NA
NA
NA
NA
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This table is not applicable because Illinois does not administer native language reading/language arts assessments.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
NA
NA
NA
NA
NA
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This table is not applicable because Illinois does not administer native language science assessments.

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
16,750	15,148	31,898
Comments: 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
31,729	18,488	58.27	13,241
Comments: 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
31,759	16,374	51.56	15,385
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
12,859	9,945	77.34	2,914
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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	206
=====	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	70
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	182
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	197
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	32
=====	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	131
=====	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2011-12 and 2012-13)	91
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2012-13 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	28
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13)	44

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. A total of 206 LEAs received Title III funds, 17 of which were in consortia. There were 8 consortia and 189 consortia LEAs in SY 2012-13.

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	<u>No</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: 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
16,243	279	12

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.	7,543
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	3,286

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	125
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	93
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	74
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	57
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	23
Other (Explain in comment box)	120

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	180	20,023
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	199	5,124
PD provided to principals	161	1,058
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	166	783
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	123	2,101
PD provided to community based organization personnel	30	739
Total	////////////////////////////////////	29,828

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Other" includes school/program improvement plans, technology for ELL programs, and training in meeting teacher certification requirements.

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
07/06/12	09/01/12	90
Comments: 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.

The Illinois State Board of Education continues to streamline the application review and approval process. In the fourth year of the electronic Grant Management System the SEA prepopulated the student enrollment data required for the application directly from Illinois Student Information System, which shortened the time for LEAs to manually complete the application. The SEA also reduced the levels of application review from three to two in order to expedite the approval process.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 EDUCATION 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 will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	100	100
LEAs with subgrants	780	780
Total	880	880

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Subgrants are made to regional service centers, not directly to LEAs. The regional service centers provide McKinney-Vento program services to LEAs that have homeless students enrolled AND that submit an approvable subgrant application. Illinois had 880 LEAs with enrollments of homeless students, approved subgrant applications, and provided students with McKinney-Vento program services through subgrants. There were 100 LEAs with no homeless students enrolled or no submitted subgrant applications, and therefore, no students provided with McKinney-Vento program services through subgrants.

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)	0	2,396
K	0	3,937
1	2	3,945
2	2	3,832
3	1	3,796
4	3	3,616
5	0	3,524
6	0	3,399
7	0	3,179
8	0	3,194
9	2	3,855
10	4	3,983
11	1	3,842
12	3	4,004
Ungraded		
Total	18	50,502

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not have ungraded students.

The correct total number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants is 47,241. The EDEN-populated total of 52,971 includes duplicate counts.

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		5,210
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)		42,199
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)		267
Hotels/Motels		1,611
Total		49,287

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data on the number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school LEAs without subgrants are not collected.

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		4,848
Migratory children/youth		97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4	9,170
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	0	2,662

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	260
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,338
K	3,759
1	3,761
2	3,649
3	3,652
4	3,465
5	3,385
6	3,279
7	3,053
8	3,092
9	3,694
10	3,819
11	3,619
12	3,884
Ungraded	
Total	48,709

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not have ungraded students.

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	4,783
Migratory children/youth	96
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,341
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,716

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	2		3,040	1,053
4	2	2	2,937	1,091
5	3		2,869	983
6			2,818	972
7			2,577	883
8	1		2,655	978
High School	1		2,894	699

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

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	2		3,060	891
4	2		2,961	1,059
5	3	1	2,881	1,000
6			2,833	938
7			2,605	914
8	1		2,668	897
High School	1		2,905	522

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

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	2	2	2,937	1,882
5				
6				
7			2,581	1,548
8				
High School	1		2,902	464

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not administer science assessments at the grade 3, grade 5, grade 6, and grade 8 levels.