

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 2011-12**

ILLINOIS



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

**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) 2011-12 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 EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 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
<p style="text-align: center;">Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:		
Address:		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name:		
Telephone:		
Fax:		
e-mail:		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):		
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> <div style="width: 40%;"> _____ Signature </div> <div style="width: 40%;"> _____ Date </div> </div>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**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.

	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.		
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.		
State has revised or changed	Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) 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 achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

There are no revisions or changes in mathematics or reading/language arts. The Illinois State Board of Education will review the final version of the Next Generation science standards to determine if the state will adopt those standards. The possible adoption of the science standards will be considered for SY 2013-14.

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.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.		
	State has 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 GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.		
Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.			
Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	1012-13	2012-13	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	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 is incorporating Common Core State Standards into the assessment for grades 3-8. For SY 2012-13, approximately 20 percent of the test will connect to the Common Core State Standards.			

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

State has revised or changed	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.		
	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 GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.		
Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.			
Academic Assessments	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	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	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 is incorporating Common Core State Standards into the assessment for grades 3-8. For SY 2012-13, approximately 20 percent of the test will connect to the Common Core State Standards.

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 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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)	<u>Yes</u>
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)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>No</u>
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>Yes</u>
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>No</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>No</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
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.

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	1,073,834	1,065,175	99.19
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,180	3,143	98.84
Asian	45,640	45,446	99.57
Black or African American	193,089	190,212	98.51
Hispanic or Latino	252,019	249,947	99.18
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	983	972	98.88
White	548,269	545,253	99.45
Two or more races	29,977	29,755	99.26
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	146,192	143,736	98.32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	76,503	75,868	99.17
Economically disadvantaged students	532,251	526,638	98.95
Migratory students	271	268	98.89
Male	549,519	544,548	99.10
Female	524,053	520,521	99.33
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do 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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	34,692	24.14
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	95,702	66.58
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,342	9.28
Total	143,736	
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	1,072,340	1,063,942	99.22
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,176	3,139	98.84
Asian	45,178	44,943	99.48
Black or African American	193,007	190,230	98.56
Hispanic or Latino	251,420	249,323	99.17
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	977	968	99.08
White	547,934	545,136	99.49
Two or more races	29,971	29,753	99.27
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	146,190	143,814	98.37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	74,970	74,110	98.85
Economically disadvantaged students	531,172	525,676	98.97
Migratory students	261	255	97.70
Male	548,745	543,883	99.11
Female	523,333	519,953	99.35

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are 809 LEP students included in this table per the file specifications for C178, which populates Table 1.2.3: "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.

These 809 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.

Every student group in Table 1.2.3, except for Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander and Two or More Races, have some of these 809 students included in the Number of Students Participating; therefore, the Number of Students Participating listed in Table 1.2.3 for these student groups will be higher than the number of students who completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the same student groups in the section 1.3 Reading/Language Arts tables.

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 and 1.3.2.1 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 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 in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	34,686	24.12
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	95,783	66.60
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,345	9.28
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	143,814	
<p>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.</p> <p>There are 809 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.</p> <p>The 809 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.</p> <p>Of these 809 LEP students, 37 are also included in the number of Children With Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) participating in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment.</p>		

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	456,846	450,612	98.64
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,360	1,332	97.94
Asian	19,211	19,088	99.36
Black or African American	81,819	79,630	97.32
Hispanic or Latino	103,609	102,008	98.45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	393	386	98.22
White	237,975	235,907	99.13
Two or more races	12,261	12,110	98.77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	62,012	60,289	97.22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,865	25,450	98.40
Economically disadvantaged students	218,066	213,890	98.08
Migratory students	107	106	99.07
Male	233,077	229,463	98.45
Female	223,691	221,108	98.85
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do 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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13,671	22.68
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	40,817	67.70
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,801	9.62
Total	60,289	
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.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	152,948	133,657	87.39
American Indian or Alaska Native	412	353	85.68
Asian	6,864	6,548	95.40
Black or African American	26,989	20,164	74.71
Hispanic or Latino	38,854	31,892	82.08
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	153	142	92.81
White	74,811	70,210	93.85
Two or more races	4,790	4,297	89.71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,330	13,831	68.03
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22,804	17,238	75.59
Economically disadvantaged students	80,896	65,125	80.50
Migratory students	42	30	71.43
Male	78,741	68,545	87.05
Female	74,200	65,109	87.75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System. All data are correct.			

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	152,653	115,641	75.75
American Indian or Alaska Native	410	292	71.22
Asian	6,736	6,076	90.20
Black or African American	26,985	16,772	62.15
Hispanic or Latino	38,730	24,599	63.51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	153	134	87.58
White	74,772	63,852	85.40
Two or more races	4,791	3,878	80.94
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,327	8,637	42.49
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22,393	10,971	48.99
Economically disadvantaged students	80,701	51,799	64.19
Migratory students	41	20	48.78
Male	78,603	56,956	72.46
Female	74,043	58,682	79.25
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System. All data are correct.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
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	151,414	132,987	87.83
American Indian or Alaska Native	423	371	87.71
Asian	6,616	6,340	95.83
Black or African American	26,417	20,068	75.97
Hispanic or Latino	37,668	31,623	83.95
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	129	121	93.80
White	75,458	70,244	93.09
Two or more races	4,664	4,195	89.94
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,984	13,544	64.54
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,374	10,002	69.58
Economically disadvantaged students	78,693	64,103	81.46
Migratory students	37	23	62.16
Male	77,675	67,347	86.70
Female	73,735	65,637	89.02

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System. All data are correct.

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	151,038	114,425	75.76
American Indian or Alaska Native	423	310	73.29
Asian	6,470	5,837	90.22
Black or African American	26,391	15,547	58.91
Hispanic or Latino	37,496	24,842	66.25
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	126	107	84.92
White	75,423	64,036	84.90
Two or more races	4,670	3,727	79.81
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,993	8,432	40.17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,924	5,372	38.58
Economically disadvantaged students	78,436	50,304	64.13
Migratory students	32	15	46.88
Male	77,468	55,533	71.69
Female	73,566	58,890	80.05

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.

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	151,139	120,272	79.58
American Indian or Alaska Native	423	316	74.70
Asian	6,603	6,007	90.97
Black or African American	26,303	15,832	60.19
Hispanic or Latino	37,593	26,929	71.63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	128	110	85.94
White	75,390	67,195	89.13
Two or more races	4,662	3,864	82.88
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,943	12,274	58.61
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,340	7,129	49.71
Economically disadvantaged students	78,496	54,197	69.04
Migratory students	37	18	48.65
Male	77,522	61,638	79.51
Female	73,613	58,632	79.65

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.

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	153,256	127,771	83.37
American Indian or Alaska Native	407	322	79.12
Asian	6,649	6,245	93.92
Black or African American	27,011	18,387	68.07
Hispanic or Latino	37,529	29,265	77.98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	113	101	89.38
White	76,957	69,519	90.33
Two or more races	4,537	3,909	86.16
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,029	11,542	54.89
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,280	6,263	55.52
Economically disadvantaged students	78,668	58,921	74.90
Migratory students	45	32	71.11
Male	78,387	64,381	82.13
Female	74,864	63,387	84.67
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.			
All data are correct.			

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	153,001	118,656	77.55
American Indian or Alaska Native	406	299	73.65
Asian	6,526	5,908	90.53
Black or African American	27,035	16,578	61.32
Hispanic or Latino	37,411	25,108	67.11
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	114	99	86.84
White	76,920	66,884	86.95
Two or more races	4,535	3,762	82.95
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,057	8,466	40.21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,904	3,328	30.52
Economically disadvantaged students	78,501	51,922	66.14
Migratory students	39	24	61.54
Male	78,246	57,896	73.99
Female	74,750	60,758	81.28
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
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 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	154,948	131,451	84.84
American Indian or Alaska Native	508	407	80.12
Asian	6,626	6,275	94.70
Black or African American	28,365	20,152	71.05
Hispanic or Latino	36,609	29,173	79.69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	141	129	91.49
White	78,232	71,468	91.35
Two or more races	4,404	3,805	86.40
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,181	11,529	54.43
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,937	4,677	52.33
Economically disadvantaged students	78,865	60,576	76.81
Migratory students	45	22	48.89
Male	79,551	66,456	83.54
Female	75,366	64,971	86.21

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.

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	154,676	126,049	81.49
American Indian or Alaska Native	507	387	76.33
Asian	6,510	6,056	93.03
Black or African American	28,371	19,084	67.27
Hispanic or Latino	36,487	27,296	74.81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	139	125	89.93
White	78,196	69,327	88.66
Two or more races	4,402	3,737	84.89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,224	9,421	44.39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,578	3,119	36.36
Economically disadvantaged students	78,668	56,567	71.91
Migratory students	40	20	50.00
Male	79,416	62,137	78.24
Female	75,228	63,891	84.93

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.

All data are correct.

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
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 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	152,459	128,785	84.47
American Indian or Alaska Native	479	393	82.05
Asian	6,121	5,850	95.57
Black or African American	27,689	19,718	71.21
Hispanic or Latino	35,130	28,262	80.45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	115	109	94.78
White	78,733	70,885	90.03
Two or more races	4,106	3,532	86.02
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,866	10,549	50.56
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,927	4,351	54.89
Economically disadvantaged students	75,501	57,740	76.48
Migratory students	43	30	69.77
Male	78,487	64,735	82.48
Female	73,962	64,044	86.59
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.			
All data are correct.			

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	152,108	118,625	77.99
American Indian or Alaska Native	478	365	76.36
Asian	6,024	5,496	91.24
Black or African American	27,678	17,316	62.56
Hispanic or Latino	34,963	24,597	70.35
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	114	94	82.46
White	78,662	67,378	85.66
Two or more races	4,103	3,337	81.33
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,870	8,160	39.10
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,517	2,298	30.57
Economically disadvantaged students	75,252	50,591	67.23
Migratory students	36	21	58.33
Male	78,292	58,157	74.28
Female	73,806	60,461	81.92
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.			
All data are correct.			

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	152,019	121,311	79.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	476	372	78.15
Asian	6,107	5,616	91.96
Black or African American	27,543	17,202	62.46
Hispanic or Latino	35,057	25,181	71.83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	115	99	86.09
White	78,546	69,437	88.40
Two or more races	4,091	3,369	82.35
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,731	10,241	49.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,889	2,865	36.32
Economically disadvantaged students	75,222	52,048	69.19
Migratory students	43	23	53.49
Male	78,271	61,179	78.16
Female	73,738	60,125	81.54
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System. All data are correct.			

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	152,666	129,487	84.82
American Indian or Alaska Native	481	375	77.96
Asian	6,191	5,871	94.83
Black or African American	27,942	20,057	71.78
Hispanic or Latino	34,785	28,334	81.45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	178	164	92.13
White	79,093	71,351	90.21
Two or more races	3,895	3,303	84.80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,712	10,289	49.68
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,321	4,039	55.17
Economically disadvantaged students	73,818	56,858	77.02
Migratory students	30	17	56.67
Male	78,026	64,465	82.62
Female	74,618	65,011	87.13

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.

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	152,411	131,148	86.05
American Indian or Alaska Native	478	386	80.75
Asian	6,083	5,749	94.51
Black or African American	27,951	21,252	76.03
Hispanic or Latino	34,630	28,538	82.41
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	178	161	90.45
White	79,101	71,663	90.60
Two or more races	3,889	3,356	86.29
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,733	10,420	50.26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,933	3,418	49.30
Economically disadvantaged students	73,593	58,110	78.96
Migratory students	27	13	48.15
Male	77,874	64,217	82.46
Female	74,516	66,919	89.80

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
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 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	147,484	76,603	51.94
American Indian or Alaska Native	433	210	48.50
Asian	6,379	4,941	77.46
Black or African American	25,799	5,682	22.02
Hispanic or Latino	29,372	10,770	36.67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	143	80	55.94
White	81,969	53,076	64.75
Two or more races	3,359	1,825	54.33
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	18,634	3,752	20.14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,225	439	13.61
Economically disadvantaged students	60,197	18,731	31.12
Migratory students	26	1	3.85
Male	73,681	39,627	53.78
Female	73,776	36,959	50.10

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.

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	147,246	75,118	51.02
American Indian or Alaska Native	432	201	46.53
Asian	6,341	4,206	66.33
Black or African American	25,753	6,508	25.27
Hispanic or Latino	29,284	9,951	33.98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	143	71	49.65
White	81,908	52,288	63.84
Two or more races	3,355	1,875	55.89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	18,573	4,198	22.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,052	165	5.41
Economically disadvantaged students	60,054	18,974	31.59
Migratory students	21	1	4.76
Male	73,564	35,404	48.13
Female	73,655	39,698	53.90

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.

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	147,454	76,704	52.02
American Indian or Alaska Native	433	186	42.96
Asian	6,378	4,651	72.92
Black or African American	25,784	5,335	20.69
Hispanic or Latino	29,358	9,932	33.83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	143	74	51.75
White	81,971	54,621	66.63
Two or more races	3,357	1,889	56.27
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	18,615	4,069	21.86
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,221	270	8.38
Economically disadvantaged students	60,172	17,868	29.69
Migratory students	26	1	3.85
Male	73,670	40,609	55.12
Female	73,757	36,081	48.92

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All students--There are some students who took the test who were not enrolled in the State Student Information System.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	3,786	1,241	32.78
Districts	865	152	17.57
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	2,439	663	27.18
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,324	157	11.86
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,115	506	45.38
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
829	133	16.04
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	162
Extension of the school year or school day	17
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	13
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	22
Replacement of the principal	21
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	37
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	38
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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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)	8
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	4
Other major restructuring of the school governance	307
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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	136
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	3
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	13
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	25
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	1
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	2
Restructured the district	24
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	09/30/12
---	----------

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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

For SY 2011-12 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Illinois State Board of Education engaged in a multipronged approach to ensure that each School Improvement Grant funded under Section 1003(g) received up-to-date information and ongoing technical assistance that was aligned with the evaluation processes. Illinois State Board of Education SIG 1003(g) principal consultants provided direct services to the 10 funded projects.

The awarded projects received a comprehensive FY 2012 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.

Monitoring of the projects included the use of the FY 2012 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 2011-12 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 both ISBE and the current Statewide System of Support (SSOS) to provide high-quality, coordinated, and consistent support through the SSOS, to ensure that districts and schools receive expert, timely, and relevant assistance, and to increase district-level capacity to prepare students for college and career. 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 school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	807,905
Applied to transfer	5,129
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,153
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*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 7,411,390

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	255

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.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	471,108
Applied for supplemental educational services	75,971
Received supplemental educational services	54,798
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*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 87,195,274
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.

	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 NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	163,635	162,442	99.27	599	0.37
All elementary classes	123,310	122,711	99.51	599	0.49
All secondary classes	40,325	39,731	98.53	594	1.47

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	28.60
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	17.40
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	14.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	39.10
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Type 29 certificates and substitute teachers.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	56.30
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	19.10
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	13.20
Other (please explain in comment box below)	11.40
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Type 29 certificates and a charter school teacher; charter school teachers are not subject to NCLB and do not need to be fully certified.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at 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	24,457	24,014	98.19
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	38,233	38,211	99.94
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	11,378	10,906	95.85
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	13,277	13,273	99.97

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	76.10	26.20
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	58.30	24.60
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:

- 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.
- Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In addition to the five languages reported here, 124 more languages are reported in Illinois. Each of the five languages reported here consists of more than 2,000 LEP students.

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	187,602
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 who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	161,018
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	150,664
Polish	5,302
Arabic	5,027
Chinese	2,537
Urdu	2,452

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Pilipino, Gujarati, Korean, Vietnamese, and Russian each reported more than 1,000 LEP students.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	177,393
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,629
Total	182,022
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. EDEN file N137 asked for ALL LEP students in grades K-12 who were enrolled during the state annual English language proficiency testing window, whereas EDEN file N141 asked for ALL K-12 students enrolled in the LEA regardless of whether they were enrolled during the testing window or not. Therefore, the total in N141 will not be equal to the total in N137.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	33,275
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	18.76
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.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	152,869
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,462
Total	156,331
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of tested students is always less than (if not equal to) the number of students served (some served students left the district prior to the testing window). Per EDEN instructions, File C138 requested ALL LEP students who were served in Title III programs and enrolled in the LEA during the state annual English language proficiency testing window, whereas, EDEN File C116 requested ALL K-12 students who were served in Title III programs and enrolled in the LEA, regardless of whether they were enrolled during the testing window or not. Therefore, the total in C116 will not be equal to the total in C138.</p> <p>Of the total reported in C116 (161,018), 156,331 were enrolled during the testing window. Of the total reported in C138 (156,331), 152,869 participated in testing and 3,462 did not participate for the following reasons:</p> <p>*Test not valid with student's disability (750) *Obtained proficiency prior to 2012 or proficient based on screening tests--erroneously marked LEP (1,264) *Left public school for home schooling (23) *Left public school for private school (29) *Graduated (55) *Dropped out of school (66) *Aged out, no longer eligible to receive services (102) *Moved outside of U.S. (97) *Withdrawn by parents (19) *Lost test booklets (25) *Failed to test (898) *Absent (87) *Test results breached (23) Other--expelled, incarcerated, died, medical, etc. (24)</p>	
<p>In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).</p>	
	#
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.	34,543

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	93,257	78.81		57.40
Attained proficiency	24,624	16.11		9.00
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
14,800	12,484	27,284
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
27,069	24,461	90.37	2,608
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
27,095	22,417	82.73	4,678
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
11,222	8,954	79.79	2,268
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.)

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	190
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	81
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	188
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	187
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	51
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	107
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	71
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	56
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	24

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 202 LEAs received Title III funds, 22 of which were in consortia. There were 10 consortia and 180 nonconsortia LEAs in SY 2011-12, equaling 190 subgrantees.

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. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

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
18,322	962	9

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	4,130
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,089

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.

City of Chicago School District 299 reported 108 fully certified teachers in 2012, compared with 2,082 reported in 2011.

* 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.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	187	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	113	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	160	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	125	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	101	
Other (Explain in comment box)	145	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	168	16,721
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	182	5,127
PD provided to principals	153	1,016
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	136	649
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	33	498
PD provided to community based organization personnel	23	223
Total	695	24,234

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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/11/11	09/01/11	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 order to shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. In the third year of the electronic Grant Management System, the Illinois State Board of Education prepopulated the student enrollment data required for the application directly from the Illinois Student Information System. In addition, the time it takes for districts to manually complete the application was shortened and the number of application reviewers was increased to expedite the application review and 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	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 youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	0	0
LEAs with subgrants	745	745
Total	745	745
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)		2,149
K		3,175
1		3,292
2		3,198
3		3,212
4		3,070
5		2,996
6		2,826
7		2,705
8		2,712
9		3,326
10		3,536
11		3,329
12		3,499
Ungraded		
Total		43,025
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. EDEN will not populate the first column with zeros. Illinois does not have ungraded students; therefore, there are no ungraded data to report. EDEN will not populate the Ungraded line with a zero.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care		5,162
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)		36,314
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)		245
Hotels/Motels		1,299
Total		43,020
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. EDEN will not populate the first column with zeros. The EDEN file does not include five students who were identified as homeless during the school year but not reported as homeless at the end of the year when the data were collected for this table. Therefore, the correct total is 43,025, as in Table 1.9.1.1.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	277
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,156
K	3,175
1	3,292
2	3,198
3	3,212
4	3,070
5	2,996
6	2,826
7	2,705
8	2,712
9	3,326
10	3,536
11	3,329
12	3,499
Ungraded	
Total	43,309
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not have ungraded students; therefore, there are no ungraded data to report. EDEN will not populate the Ungraded line with a zero.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	5,073
Migratory children/youth	189
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,230
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,278
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 youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	2,886	1,680
4	2,731	1,507
5	2,673	1,534
6	2,570	1,599
7	2,413	1,394
8	2,455	1,762
High School	2,679	582
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	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	2,891	2,147
4	2,739	2,063
5	2,688	1,791
6	2,575	1,760
7	2,435	1,688
8	2,467	1,722
High School	2,694	446
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	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4	2,721	1,671
5		
6		
7	2,418	1,475
8		
High School	2,692	442
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Illinois does not administer a science assessment at grades 3, 5, 6, or 8.		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	217
K	91
1	111
2	81
3	95
4	76
5	87
6	99
7	90
8	104
9	122
10	107
11	93
12	50
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	286
Total	1,709
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of students reported in Category 1 reflects a decrease of less than 10 percent from the number reported last year.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	97
K	60
1	49
2	40
3	49
4	48
5	50
6	41
7	42
8	45
9	50
10	50
11	41
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	131
Total	797
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of students reported in Category 2 increased by less than 10 percent from the number reported last year.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois used the New Generation System (NGS) to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for the SY 2011-12 reporting period. NGS was also used to produce the child counts for the SY 2010-11 reporting period.
--

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 and Category 2 counts include only migrant children and youth with completed Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) and data entered into the New Generation System. The eligibility of each counted child and youth was documented with a current, valid COE on file at the local project, and an approved copy of the COE located at the statewide records office.

The Illinois COE contains all the data sections and elements required by the national COE, as well as additional information used by the state MEP, including student enrollment, legal parent identification, home base, and continued residency verification.

Local recruiters employed by the local MEP projects completed paper COEs after conducting face-to-face interviews with families to identify migrant children. The Illinois Migrant Council coordinated recruiting efforts at the state level and conducted recruiting and completed COEs in areas of the state that local recruiters did not reach.

The "Illinois Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual 2012" (http://www.isbe.net/bilingual/htmls/migrant_resources.htm) stipulates that only certified migrant recruiters who have successfully completed the required annual state training may complete the COE. Each COE was reviewed and approved at the local and state levels, with any questionable items returned to the local project for correction. Illinois uses a three-year COE to document continued residency during annual residency verification efforts. A new COE was completed for each migrant family that made a new, qualifying move.

The Category 2 child count includes only children who were served for one or more days in MEP-funded summer programs in Illinois. The dates scheduled for the summer program varied from one site to another but all summer programs fell within the period of June 1-August 31, 2012, and were not part of the regular school year. Local projects maintained records of individual student enrollment, attendance, and services. Based on their records, local projects indicated participation in the MEP-funded summer program for each eligible migrant student entered in NGS for the summer program. Average daily attendance figures are submitted each year as part of the application for MEP funds.

Recruiters completed COEs daily and delivered them to their project offices. Trained NGS data entry specialists entered student enrollment and participation information into the NGS information system, a centralized database in accordance with the state requirements and timelines specified in "Illinois Migrant Education Program Requirements and Timelines: New Generation System and ID&R Data Flow." Illinois requirements stipulate that information be entered into NGS within five working days of COE completion.

Residency verification was conducted by local project staff between September 1 and October 31 to update information for migrant children and youth with COEs documenting eligibility during the previous year. The verification information was entered into the NGS history line reflecting the appropriate reporting period for each eligible migrant.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count data were entered into NGS by local project staff based on the information recorded on the paper COE. The statewide records office was responsible for managing the COE verification and the NGS data entry for the State to ensure the accuracy and consistency of child eligibility determinations and the data collected. This office also managed MSIX record matching issues with other states as they arose.

Trained recruiters completed paper COEs by hand. Trained data entry specialists entered the migrant child information from the COE or Continuing Enrollment/Residency Worksheet into NGS at the local project site. For each newly identified migrant child, the local project contacted the statewide records office to request a unique student identifier. The statewide records office verified that the student had not already been entered into NGS before issuing a unique student identifier and giving the local project staff permission to enter the student's information into NGS.

Local projects sent copies of completed documentation to the statewide records office where staff compared COEs and NGS entries for all local projects to ensure that the data entered matched the information on the COE. Reports of any discrepancies were sent to local projects to be corrected. When local school MEP personnel could not input student data, the state records office provided data entry assistance. At the end of the local project grant period, a final review identified any remaining discrepancies to be resolved.

Residency verification was conducted between September 1 and October 31 to update information for migrant children and youth with COEs documenting eligibility during the previous year. For migrant children whose residency was recertified during the year, local projects followed the record update process to include the child in the new funding period. The Illinois COE contains a space for documentation of continuing eligibility and residency verification. Each child's residency was confirmed through face-to-face interviews, review of school attendance records, or, less frequently, via telephone.

NGS allows for multiple enrollment data entry. However, prior to data entry for each student, residency was verified through the COE and enrollment information was updated on the Continuing Enrollment/Residency Worksheet.

For each new or updated COE, NGS created a history line that was coded to identify eligible children to be included in the Category 1 count. A history line was created for each child enrolled in summer school to be included in the Category 2 count. NGS assigned a unique student identifier to each child so that an unduplicated count could be produced.

The statewide records office distributed reports of data entered into NGS to local projects for review. Local projects also generated their own NGS reports to ensure accuracy and eliminate any duplication.

Illinois established a deadline for entering into the system and cleaning all data for the reporting year. After all data were entered, NGS produced a snapshot of the data for the reporting year. The State conducted a review of the data to eliminate errors before submitting the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts to the Office of Migrant Education in the Consolidated State Performance Report.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Information for the Category 1 and Category 2 counts was collected and maintained following the procedures described in 1.10.3.2.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

- Children who were between age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NGS programming used the eligibility information entered for each child to generate an unduplicated child count report, which includes only migrant children ages 3-21 who were eligible, based on federal requirements, for at least one day during the counting period of 9/1/2011 to 8/31/2012.

1. Children who met the program eligibility criteria (i.e., were between 3-21 years of age, were within three years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity).

The NGS query was programmed to include only children who were at least three and fewer than 22 years of age who had not graduated from high school and who had been eligible for at least one day during the period 9/1/2011-8/31/2012 based on the date of the last qualifying move. Recruiters verified birth dates, the date of the last qualifying move, and the qualifying activity through initial interviews with families; this information was entered into NGS. Recruiters used an NGS report to track two-year-olds about to turn three and scheduled visits with families to verify residency and to enroll three-year-olds into programs. NGS counts only those three-year-olds who were actually in residence in the state on or after their third birthday.

2. Children who were resident in the state for at least one day during the eligible period.

Record updates were conducted to verify continuing residency for all children identified in a previous year. Illinois uses school/program attendance records or information obtained during a home visit to confirm residency. Less frequently, a telephone conversation with the family may be used to confirm continued residency after the initial COE has been completed. The residency verification date was entered into NGS. The NGS query was programmed to count only children verified to be resident in Illinois for at least one day during their eligibility period. NGS creates history lines with specific enrollment type flags for each new or updated COE for the count.

3. Children who received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term.

For the Category 2 count, the NGS query was programmed to include only eligible children, as described above, who received MEP-funded services under a summer enrollment flag of "S." A summer enrollment is entered only after the student enrolls and participates in an MEP-funded summer program, as documented in local project records. Summer migrant programs operate during the months of June, July, and, less frequently, August. Enrollment and withdrawal dates must be entered for every student included in the summer count.

4. Children counted once per age/grade level for each child count category.

NGS is programmed to count a student only once statewide in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. Each student has a unique student identifier in NGS. In Illinois, the statewide records office assigns a unique student identifier to newly identified migrant children to ensure that a check for duplicates is performed before a new student record is created. The system checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name. Potential duplicates are then checked against additional fields, such as first name, birth date, and parents' names. To generate the unduplicated count, data are consolidated, duplicates are removed, and students are sorted by current age for children not yet in kindergarten and by grade for K-12 students, based on the information entered into the student record in NGS.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 and Category 2 counts were generated using NGS.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

IL contracts with the Illinois Migrant Council (IMC) to coordinate statewide identification and recruitment and data collection activities. ISBE migrant program staff oversee the contract and monitor the work through ongoing contact and monthly reporting.

The IL MEP Quality Control Plan is designed to strengthen the accuracy of state Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) processes through a variety of checks and balances, including validations of child eligibility involving re-interviews of families previously identified. The Plan, revised annually, sets the minimum quality control requirements of all MEP ID&R efforts in IL. The Plan and the whole IL MEP ID&R component is managed by Migrant Education Services at the IMC.

The IL Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual contains the state plan for implementing the quality control process to ensure that all eligible migrant children are properly and clearly identified. The IL COE contains the required sections and data elements of the national COE, plus additional fields for SEA-collected information. All IL recruiters received training in completing the COE, and only children with eligibility documented on the IL COE are included in the child count. IL annually reviews the quality control efforts and modifies them to address identified issues.

Recruiter Training, Technical Assistance, & Review:

The state ID&R coordinator and the statewide recruiter conduct annual recruiter training. All recruiters participated in the mandatory IL MEP annual 2.5-day ID&R training to become authorized COE completers. Training emphasized eligibility determinations, documentation, quality control techniques, recruiting strategies, and programmatic and policy updates. All recruiters received the updated Manual, which is also available online. Further training was offered at the statewide MEP workshop in June 2012. The professional networking site implemented in 2012 was discontinued due to disuse. Recruiters will be encouraged to participate in the SOSOSY networking site, currently being developed, when fully operational.

The state MEP also provided training and distributed the IL NGS Manual for Data Entry Specialists to those who enter child eligibility and summer enrollment data.

The state ID&R coordinator provided ongoing technical assistance and support throughout the year by telephone, e-mail, and in person. He visited local projects, reviewed recruiting practices and documentation, and, if apropos, organized joint recruiting opportunities for local recruiters. The state records office identified local projects needing additional technical assistance based on the quality of COEs submitted for approval.

Proper Eligibility Determinations & Documentation Quality Controls:

The Quality Control Plan operates at the state and local levels. Each locally funded MEP is required to create a plan to ensure that only eligible children are recruited and served. The plans are approved by the SEA and implemented at the local level. Together, state and local quality control plans act as early warning systems to detect problems in the ID&R process.

To gather information for determining eligibility, recruiters conducted personal interviews with a parent, guardian, other responsible adult, or the migrant youth traveling without family. Recruiters verified all eligibility information, local project reviewers approved the COE, and COE data were entered into NGS. Recruiters maintained documentation to back up their recruiting activity and decisions, including recruiters' logs. A COE review checklist was used to review the COE for completeness and accuracy. The trained local project COE reviewer checked each COE for accuracy and initialed the document. NGS data entry specialists received training in conducting initial reviews of all COEs as they prepare to enter COE data into NGS. Funded projects follow district procedures to collect and maintain student attendance data. In accordance with the written instructions, local projects used MEP summer project attendance records to identify eligible migrant children who had participated in the summer MEP and entered the enrollment information into NGS. NGS data entry specialists receive annual training at the June statewide workshop on how to review summer site records, input data, and run reports for child counts. They also receive an updated NGS manual annually. Technical assistance and training are available throughout the year, as needed.

Following state NGS implementation guidelines, local projects sent completed COE to the statewide records office for review. IL contracts with the IMC to coordinate the office on behalf of the SEA. IMC staff reviewed all COEs for clarity of eligibility documentation and consistency with NGS data. An independent SEA contractor conducted a final review for accuracy. The statewide records office contacted the local program to resolve questions. The designated SEA reviewer approved all COEs of children to be included in the child count. Questionable COEs were returned to the local project recruiter for clarification or eligibility documentation. If eligibility status could not be resolved, SEA staff reviewed the COE to

make an eligibility determination.

The state plan includes procedures for addressing eligibility questions at every level. These procedures are described in the ID&R Manual (http://www.isbe.net/bilingual/pdfs/migrant_manual.pdf). If the recruiter and local COE reviewer cannot resolve an eligibility question, it is sent to the state ID&R coordinator at the IMC. If the IMC cannot resolve the eligibility status, the COE is referred to ISBE. A COE is also referred to ISBE if a local project director wishes to appeal an eligibility rejection made by the state ID&R coordinator.

State & Local Random COE Checks:

Under the Quality Control Plan, the state ID&R coordinator organized re-interviews of migrant families chosen through random selection of 50 migrant children. Re-interviewers are familiar with the migrant community but not directly associated with the local project that determined eligibility. Re-interviewers received training to follow an established protocol to ensure they ask stipulated questions on required eligibility criteria in face-to-face meetings with families or by phone. A committee of reviewers determines if the information confirms eligibility. An ineligible child is removed from NGS data and not included in the child count. At least once every three years, re-interviews are conducted by independent re-interviewers and overseen by an independent entity. IL conducted an independent re-interview process in SY 2010-11.

Locally, funded projects verified a random selection of COEs completed by validating each MEP eligibility criterion. A trained, bilingual recruiter independent of the original determination conducted re-interviews. Eligibility verifications were evenly divided among a project's recruiters. Local projects reported results of the quality control reviews to the state ID&R coordinator.

The SEA, along with the IMC, regularly assesses the effectiveness of recruitment efforts. Findings from the annual state and local quality control processes and feedback from recruiters and other local project staff are used to revise procedures to ensure timely and accurate identification of eligible migrant children and youth. The local quality control process will be revised in FY13 to incorporate recommendations from a quality control review regarding the re-interview procedures and documentation.

Monitoring:

The ID&R coordinator examined COEs and eligibility documentation and procedures during onsite visits to local projects. Eligibility documentation review, student attendance documentation, and procedures in summer programs, were also included in SEA monitoring of local projects.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State Quality Control Plan operates at the state and local levels. Each locally funded MEP is required to develop its own plan to ensure that only eligible children are recruited and served. These plans are approved by the SEA and are implemented at the local level. Together, state and local Quality Control Plans act as early warning systems to identify problems in the ID&R process. In addition, an independent re-interview process was conducted in SY 2010-11.

In SY 2011-12, at the state level, the eligibility of 50 children with current year eligibility determinations was verified by validating each criterion that makes children eligible for the MEP. The universe from which the statewide sample was drawn was all children and youth who were recruited from September 1, 2011, to August 31, 2012. A rolling design was used, with re-interviews principally taking place in July and August, when migrant children and youth are in Illinois. Eligibility verifications, or re-interviews, were made by a trained recruiter or re-interviewer independent of the original eligibility determination. Samples were generated by randomly selecting children/youth and using systematic sample replacement when selected migrants could not be located. Eligibility verifications were divided proportionally among the state's regions and recruiters.

To achieve the required 50 re-interviews, the sample size initially selected was 67. Once the re-interviews began, it became apparent that an increase to 75 would be needed in the sample size due to the highly mobile nature of the migrant population. Reasons for this increase related to the difficulty of contacting families due to telephone numbers no longer working and families moving from housing where the original interview was conducted for purposes of completing the COE. Changing residences is a common occurrence as families try to find available and affordable housing during their temporary residency in Illinois.

Aligned with the State Quality Control Plan, Local Quality Control Plans required that small- and medium-sized programs conduct re-interviews on 3 COEs and large projects on 10 COEs completed during the current program year by validating each criterion that makes children eligible for the MEP. Local projects used random sampling to select the COEs to be validated. Trained, bilingual recruiters independent of the original eligibility determination conducted the eligibility verifications,

or re-interviews. Eligibility verifications were divided as evenly as possible among a project's recruiters.

To ensure the most complete results, re-interviews were scheduled when nearly all migrant families had been recruited for the season and therefore more easily accessible. Systematic data collection was ensured by using standardized documentation for all re-interviews throughout the state and provision of training and comprehensive support to those involved in the re-interview process at any point along the way. A standard instrument and protocol were used for all state and local re-interviews to ensure consistency of results. The re-interview instrument and protocol contained all items used in making the original eligibility determination. Families were interviewed in person, in most cases, and telephone interviews were used only when the family could not be reached directly. The overall response rate statewide was 80 percent.

The ID&R coordinator monitored the state and local re-interview processes. Re-interview results were submitted for review and a Review Committee made final eligibility determinations. Although all children included in the re-interviews this year were found to be eligible, the Plan states that any children determined to be ineligible must be removed from NGS data and not included in the child count.

Summary of Random Sample for State and Local Re-interviews--

Total Re-interviews Attempted = 127

Total Re-interviews Completed = 102

Total Children Represented in Interviews = 208

Total Percentage of Eligible Children Represented by Interviews = 100%

Overall Response Rate = 80%

State Results:

Initial Sample Size = 67 children (Final Sample Size = 75 children)

Number of Target Children Re-interviewed = 50

Percentage of Target Children in Sample & Eligibility Confirmed = 100%

Number of Siblings of Target Children in Sample = 40

Percentage of Siblings of Target Children in Sample & Eligibility Confirmed = 100%

Total Number of Children in Sample = 90

Percentage of Total Children in Sample & Eligibility Confirmed = 100%

Local Results:

Number of COEs Targeted = 52

Number of COEs Examined = 52

Number of Eligible COEs = 52

Number of Children Represented by Re-interviews = 118

Number of Eligible Children Represented by Re-interviews = 118 (100%)

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Illinois Migrant Council runs the statewide migrant records office, which is housed in Princeville, Illinois. NGS data entry specialists receive training at the annual Statewide Migrant Education Workshop and through individual technical assistance throughout the year. Updated copies of the "Illinois NGS Manual for Data Entry Specialists" are also distributed at the annual workshop. The Illinois Migrant Council statewide migrant records office staff distributes a data entry manual to all local projects and responds to questions by telephone and e-mail throughout the year.

The statewide migrant records office manages the NGS data system. Every COE is reviewed by statewide migrant records office staff for clarity of eligibility documentation and consistency with NGS data. The office controls the entry of newly identified migrant children into NGS. Before issuing a unique student identifier to allow the local project staff to enter a child's information, the statewide migrant records office confirms that the child is not already included in the system. Office staff reviews the NGS data entered by local projects to ensure that the NGS record matches the information collected on the COE and then sends reports of discrepancies to all migrant-funded sites. Sites use this information to verify migrant student data against COEs on file and to assess identification and recruitment procedures. The Illinois Migrant Council uses these reports to provide technical assistance and to design follow-up training. The SEA uses these reports to monitor child counts and the provision of services to eligible children by local MEP-funded projects.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MEP State Director and staff review and assess the reasonableness of final child counts each year before submitting the annual performance report. To verify the accuracy of the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Counts, the statewide migrant records office and the SEA, in consultation with NGS, conduct ongoing substantiation of data by running preliminary federal report data, including the aggregate counts and the list of the individual migrant children included in the counts. These reports are reviewed for inconsistencies or inaccuracies and compared with the previous year's counts. To address any discrepancies, staff may consult source documents, including the COEs, and contact local projects to provide any additional information needed to correct the NGS data.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The results of the SY 2011-12 quality control re-interviews showed that 100 percent of the MEP eligibility determinations sampled were valid. The Illinois MEP will continue to update and enhance the State Quality Control Plan. The Illinois MEP continues to re-evaluate and adjust ID&R procedures to address recruiting questions and issues as they arise. The state will continue to incorporate the development of qualified, well-trained, and well-supported recruiting staff, as well as the systematic and timely review of eligibility decisions and recruiting processes at the state and local levels. The state MEP finds that ongoing communication with local recruiters is essential to respond quickly to any emerging areas of concern by modifying local procedures to avoid errors in eligibility determination. To maintain effective and current practices, the state MEP will also seek opportunities to network and interact with ID&R staff from other states and with the OME staff who oversee the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SY 2011-12 independent re-interview verified that 100 percent of the children sampled were eligible for the MEP.