

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 2006** , 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

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

- o **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.
- o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- o **Performance Goal 5** : All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

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

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2004-2005 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 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
 Part I, 2004-2005 Part II, 2004-2005

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Illinois State Board of Education

Address:
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777-0001

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Connie Wise
Telephone: 217-782-3950
Fax: 217-524-7784
e-mail: cwise@isbe.net

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Randy J. Dunn

Signature

9/25/2006 4:05 PM EST
Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART II

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)**2.1.1 Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools**

2.1.1.1 Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. 966

2.1.1.2 Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. 563

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following:

2.1.2.1 Total Number of Title I schools in the State 2255

2.1.2.2 Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State 1216

2.1.2.3 Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State 1039

2.1.3 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups during the 2004-2005 school year. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

2.1.3.1.1 Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs 2004-2005 School Year

| | Number of Students Served |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Students with Disabilities | 49074 |
| Limited English Proficient | 55242 |
| Homeless | |
| Migrant | |

Illinois does not collect Title I, Part A, student participation data on homeless or migrant students.

2.1.3.1.2 Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group 2004-2005 School Year

| | Number of Students Served |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 744 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 8041 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 192557 |
| Hispanic | 163594 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 144269 |

Multiracial -- 4117

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

2.1.3.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs during the 2004-2005 school year.

| Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level 2004-2005 School Year | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| | Public TAS | Public SWP | Private | Local Neglected | Total | Percent of Total |
| Age 0-2 | 1 | 2961 | 16 | | 2978 | 0.6 |
| Age 3-5 | 694 | 9548 | 266 | | 10508 | 2.0 |
| K | 7866 | 39497 | 754 | | 48117 | 9.4 |
| 1 | 14464 | 41988 | 1225 | | 57677 | 11.2 |
| 2 | 12480 | 40763 | 1316 | | 54559 | 10.6 |
| 3 | 10724 | 42563 | 1266 | | 54553 | 10.6 |
| 4 | 8904 | 41144 | 1195 | | 51243 | 10.0 |
| 5 | 8110 | 40682 | 1212 | | 50004 | 9.7 |
| 6 | 4500 | 35855 | 1010 | | 41365 | 8.1 |
| 7 | 3373 | 31886 | 836 | | 36095 | 7.0 |
| 8 | 3031 | 32084 | 752 | | 35867 | 7.0 |
| 9 | 8290 | 18308 | 349 | | 26947 | 5.3 |
| 10 | 4065 | 14002 | 191 | | 18258 | 3.6 |
| 11 | 2139 | 10790 | 87 | | 13016 | 2.5 |
| 12 | 1089 | 9078 | 41 | | 10208 | 2.0 |
| Ungraded | 12 | 1858 | 57 | | 1927 | 0.4 |
| TOTALS | 89742 | 413007 | 10573 | | 513322 | 100.0 |

Illinois does not collect Local Neglected data on student participation in Title I, Part A. Public SWP -- Most SWP schools are located in large cities and are losing enrollment.

2.1.3.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services - 2004-2005 School Year

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2004-2005 school year.

| Instructional Services | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Number of Students Served |
| Mathematics | 24926 |
| Reading/Language Arts | 77347 |
| Science | 5431 |
| Social Studies | 5501 |
| Vocational/Career | |
| Other (specify) | 3060 |
| Support Services | |
| Health, Dental, and Eye Care | 1342 |
| Supporting Guidance/Advocacy | 4192 |
| Other (specify) | 633 |

Illinois does not collect Vocational/Career data on student participation in Title I, Part A, Targeted Assistance Programs.

2.1.4 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs - 2004-2005 School Year

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2004-2005 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

| | Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff |
|---|--|
| Administrators (non-clerical) | 229 |
| Teachers | 4099 |
| Teacher Aides | 1156 |
| Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical) | 741 |
| Other (specify) | 248 |

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)**2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following information:

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

1. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State 58

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

("Participating" means participating in all required core services and following any period of preparation.)

1. Total number of families participating 2793

2. Total number of adults participating

("Adults" includes teen parents.) 2957

3. Total number of adults participating who are limited English proficient 1332

4. Total number of children participating 4528

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment

(A newly enrolled family means a family who is enrolled for the first time in Even Start at any time during the year.)

1. Number of newly enrolled families 1952

2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants 2049

3. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal poverty level 76.4

4. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED 78.8

5. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade 47.2

2.2.1.4 Percent of families that have remained in the program

(Include families that are newly enrolled and those that are continuing.)

| | |
|------------------------|-------------|
| 1. From 0 to 3 months | <u>15.4</u> |
| 2. From 4 to 6 months | <u>23.7</u> |
| 3. From 7 to 12 months | <u>34.4</u> |
| 4. More than 12 months | <u>26.4</u> |

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State. States should report data if local projects are using the indicated measures and the state collects the data.

| Indicator | Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator | Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies | Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal | Explanation of Progress |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading | TABE: 75+ hours Total Group | TABE: 330.0 | TABE: 190.0 | TABE: The target was set at 65% for the total group of adults who attended 75+ hours of adult education; 57.6% met the target, which is a slight increase from FY04. ISBE is delivering extensive professional development on intensity of servives in FY06. |
| | CASAS: Not applicable | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition | TABE: Not applicable (see comments) | TABE: | TABE: | TABE: Not applicable |
| | CASAS: Not applicable (see comments) | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 61.0 | 48.0 | 78.8% of school-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 217.0 | 146.0 | 67.3% of nonschool-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 6. The average number of letters children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask |
| | Not available; will be available for FY06. | Not available; will be available for FY06. | | Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 7. Percentage of school- | FLAIR Reading | 800.0 | 446.0 | The Illinois AYP target is 47.5%. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| aged children who are reading on grade level | Readiness and Reading Level for Grades K-3-- Total Group | | | 55.75% of Grades K-3 students are rated as Level 3, Meets State Standards, thereby exceeding the AYP target. |
| | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. |
| 8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. |

| Indicator | Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator | Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies | Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal | Explanation of Progress |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading | TABE: 75+ hours Total Group | TABE: 330.0 | TABE: 190.0 | TABE: The target was set at 65% for the total group of adults who attended 75+ hours of adult education; 57.6% met the target, which is a slight increase from FY04. ISBE is delivering extensive professional development on intensity of services in FY06. |
| | CASAS: Not applicable | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition | TABE: Not applicable (see comments) | TABE: | TABE: | TABE: Not applicable |
| | CASAS: Not applicable (see comments) | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 61.0 | 48.0 | 78.8% of school-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 217.0 | 146.0 | 67.3% of nonschool-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 6. The average number of letters children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask |
| | Not available; will be available for FY06. | Not available; will be available for FY06. | | Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 7. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level | FLAIR Reading Readiness and Reading Level for Grades K-3-- Total Group | 800.0 | 446.0 | The Illinois AYP target is 47.5%. 55.75% of Grades K-3 students are rated as Level 3, Meets State Standards, thereby exceeding the AYP target. |
| | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. |
| 8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. |

support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| Indicator | Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator | Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies | Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal | Explanation of Progress |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading | TABE: 75+ hours Total Group | TABE: 330.0 | TABE: 190.0 | TABE: The target was set at 65% for the total group of adults who attended 75+ hours of adult education; 57.6% met the target, which is a slight increase from FY04. ISBE is delivering extensive professional development on intensity of servives in FY06. |
| | CASAS: Not applicable | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition | TABE: Not applicable (see comments) | TABE: | TABE: | TABE: Not applicable |
| | CASAS: Not applicable (see comments) | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 61.0 | 48.0 | 78.8% of school-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 217.0 | 146.0 | 67.3% of nonschool-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 6. The average number of letters children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask |
| | Not available; will be available for FY06. | Not available; will be available for FY06. | | Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 7. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level | FLAIR Reading Readiness and Reading Level for Grades K-3-- Total Group | 800.0 | 446.0 | The Illinois AYP target is 47.5%. 55.75% of Grades K-3 students are rated as Level 3, Meets State Standards, thereby exceeding the AYP target. |
| | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. |
| 8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. |

support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| Indicator | Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator | Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies | Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal | Explanation of Progress |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading | TABE: 75+ hours Total Group | TABE: 330.0 | TABE: 190.0 | TABE: The target was set at 65% for the total group of adults who attended 75+ hours of adult education; 57.6% met the target, which is a slight increase from FY04. ISBE is delivering extensive professional development on intensity of servives in FY06. |
| | CASAS: Not applicable | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition | TABE: Not applicable (see comments) | TABE: | TABE: | TABE: Not applicable |
| | CASAS: Not applicable (see comments) | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 61.0 | 48.0 | 78.8% of school-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 217.0 | 146.0 | 67.3% of nonschool-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 6. The average number of letters children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask |
| | Not available; will be available for FY06. | Not available; will be available for FY06. | | Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 7. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level | FLAIR Reading Readiness and Reading Level for Grades K-3-- Total Group | 800.0 | 446.0 | The Illinois AYP target is 47.5%. 55.75% of Grades K-3 students are rated as Level 3, Meets State Standards, thereby exceeding the AYP target. |
| | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. |
| 8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. |

support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| Indicator | Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator | Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies | Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal | Explanation of Progress |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading | TABE: 75+ hours Total Group | TABE: 330.0 | TABE: 190.0 | TABE: The target was set at 65% for the total group of adults who attended 75+ hours of adult education; 57.6% met the target, which is a slight increase from FY04. ISBE is delivering extensive professional development on intensity of servives in FY06. |
| | CASAS: Not applicable | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition | TABE: Not applicable (see comments) | TABE: | TABE: | TABE: Not applicable |
| | CASAS: Not applicable (see comments) | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 61.0 | 48.0 | 78.8% of school-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 217.0 | 146.0 | 67.3% of nonschool-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 6. The average number of letters children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask |
| | Not available; will be available for FY06. | Not available; will be available for FY06. | | Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 7. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level | FLAIR Reading Readiness and Reading Level for Grades K-3-- Total Group | 800.0 | 446.0 | The Illinois AYP target is 47.5%. 55.75% of Grades K-3 students are rated as Level 3, Meets State Standards, thereby exceeding the AYP target. |
| | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. |
| 8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. |

support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| Indicator | Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator | Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies | Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal | Explanation of Progress |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading | TABE: 75+ hours Total Group | TABE: 330.0 | TABE: 190.0 | TABE: The target was set at 65% for the total group of adults who attended 75+ hours of adult education; 57.6% met the target, which is a slight increase from FY04. ISBE is delivering extensive professional development on intensity of servives in FY06. |
| | CASAS: Not applicable | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition | TABE: Not applicable (see comments) | TABE: | TABE: | TABE: Not applicable |
| | CASAS: Not applicable (see comments) | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 61.0 | 48.0 | 78.8% of school-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 217.0 | 146.0 | 67.3% of nonschool-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 6. The average number of letters children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask |
| | Not available; will be available for FY06. | Not available; will be available for FY06. | | Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 7. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level | FLAIR Reading Readiness and Reading Level for Grades K-3-- Total Group | 800.0 | 446.0 | The Illinois AYP target is 47.5%. 55.75% of Grades K-3 students are rated as Level 3, Meets State Standards, thereby exceeding the AYP target. |
| | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. |
| 8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. |

support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| Indicator | Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator | Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies | Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal | Explanation of Progress |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading | TABE: 75+ hours Total Group | TABE: 330.0 | TABE: 190.0 | TABE: The target was set at 65% for the total group of adults who attended 75+ hours of adult education; 57.6% met the target, which is a slight increase from FY04. ISBE is delivering extensive professional development on intensity of servives in FY06. |
| | CASAS: Not applicable | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition | TABE: Not applicable (see comments) | TABE: | TABE: | TABE: Not applicable |
| | CASAS: Not applicable (see comments) | CASAS: | CASAS: | CASAS: Not applicable |
| 3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 61.0 | 48.0 | 78.8% of school-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED | Diploma/GED Certificate--The Illinois data system combines diploma and GED data. | 217.0 | 146.0 | 67.3% of nonschool-age adults earned a high school diploma or GED. |
| | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED | *Please Indicate diploma or GED |
| 5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: | Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 6. The average number of letters children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask | PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask |
| | Not available; will be available for FY06. | Not available; will be available for FY06. | | Not available; will be available for FY06. |
| 7. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level | FLAIR Reading Readiness and Reading Level for Grades K-3-- Total Group | 800.0 | 446.0 | The Illinois AYP target is 47.5%. 55.75% of Grades K-3 students are rated as Level 3, Meets State Standards, thereby exceeding the AYP target. |
| | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. | Please indicate source. |
| 8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) | Parent Education Profile (PEP) Not available. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Cols 3 & 4 = #s, not %s. Row 2, Col 2â€“BEST/CELSA (75+ hours): Total Grpâ€“indicator 541; met goal 355; total group target 65%; 65.6% met target, significant increase from FY04 (60.7%). Beginning Litâ€“indicator 16; goal 11; 68.7% met Beginningâ€“indicator 244; goal 186; 76.2% met Low Intermed.â€“indicator 112; goal 79; 70.5% met High Intermed.â€“indicator 101; goal 45; 44.5% met Low Advncd ESLâ€“indicator 53; goal 22; 41.5% met High Advncd ESLâ€“indicator 15; goal 12; 80% met

2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

Please complete the following tables for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program.

General Data Reporting Information

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the **Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2004-2005**.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

Table 2.3.1.1 Population Data

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.1 (on the next page) requires you to report the statewide unduplicated number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 - 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

2.3.1.1 Population Data

| | Ages 0-2 | Ages 3-5 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Un- grad- ed | Out- of- school | Total |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 1. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP | 89 | 318 | 148 | 161 | 179 | 145 | 156 | 159 | 135 | 130 | 129 | 137 | 104 | 80 | 44 | 1 | 547 | 2662 |
| 2. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services" | | 0 | 47 | 36 | 51 | 34 | 28 | 41 | 30 | 28 | 30 | 25 | 16 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 381 |
| 3. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Migrant Children who are LEP | | 20 | 64 | 41 | 27 | 23 | 5 | 25 | 24 | 25 | 2 | 13 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 283 |
| 4. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 5. MOBILITY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period) | 58 | 114 | 35 | 38 | 61 | 33 | 59 | 54 | 66 | 56 | 64 | 72 | 52 | 39 | 14 | 1 | 156 | 972 |
| 2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 - 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period) | 24 | 91 | 41 | 48 | 41 | 47 | 35 | 39 | 29 | 34 | 25 | 22 | 20 | 13 | 130 | | 139 | 661 |
| 3. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 - 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period) | 7 | 82 | 48 | 52 | 47 | 34 | 44 | 42 | 28 | 24 | 28 | 25 | 15 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 215 | 716 |
| 4. Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months; counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period) | 44 | 169 | 84 | 87 | 86 | 76 | 82 | 74 | 68 | 59 | 51 | 57 | 43 | 38 | 180 | | 296 | 1332 |

2.3.1.2 Academic Status

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.2 asks for the statewide *unduplicated number of eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row

| | Ages 0-2 | Ages 3-5 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Un- grad- ed | Out- of- school | Total |
|---|-------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|----|---|----|----|----|--------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 1. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school completion <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. <i>Dropped out of school</i> | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 2. Obtained GED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| 2. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- (Note: The results of state assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts are collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, information on the number of eligible migrant students who participated in the state assessment will be collected below.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment - 1. Reading/Language Arts) | | | | | | 21 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | | 76 |
| Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts 2. (State Assessment) | | | | | | 23 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | | 88 |
| Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment - 3. Mathematics) | | | | | | 21 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | | 76 |
| Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State 4. Assessment) | | | | | | 23 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | | 88 |

2.1-2.4: IL doesn't conduct these assessments in grades 4, 6-7, 9-10, 12, or ungraded. 2.2 & 2.4 indicate all migrant students tested, whether or not served in the 04-05 migrant program. In IL, the #of students tested can exceed the # of students enrolled in migrant programs IF they are recorded as migrant students at the time of testing in nonmigrant program school districts. 2.1 & 2.3 indicate migrant students served in the 04-05 migrant program and enrolled during the testing period.

2.3.1.3.1 MEP Participation - Regular School Year

Table 2.3.1.3.1 (on the next page) asks for the statewide, unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

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

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

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

Continuation of Services. In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the regular school year.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

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

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

2.3.1.3.1 MEP Participation - Regular School Year

| | | Ages 0-2 | Ages 3-5 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Un- grad- ed | Out- of- school | Total |
|--|---|-------------|-------------|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|--------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| PARTICIPATION - REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Served in MEP (with an MEP-funded Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in a SWP where MEP funds are combined) | 32 | 172 | 80 | 102 | 86 | 95 | 81 | 82 | 60 | 69 | 66 | 72 | 56 | 47 | 20 | 0 | 468 | 1588 |
| 2. | Priority for Service | | 0 | 20 | 27 | 18 | 15 | 9 | 19 | 15 | 17 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 189 |
| 3. | Continuation of Service | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 4. | Any Instructional Service | 6 | 64 | 40 | 47 | 31 | 32 | 32 | 29 | 26 | 31 | 28 | 26 | 24 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 448 |
| 5. | Reading Instruction | 0 | 41 | 39 | 44 | 27 | 31 | 31 | 29 | 26 | 31 | 28 | 24 | 20 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 393 |
| 6. | Mathematics Instruction | 0 | 41 | 39 | 44 | 27 | 31 | 31 | 29 | 26 | 31 | 28 | 24 | 20 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 393 |
| 7. | High School Credit Accrual | | | | | | | | | | | | | 20 | 16 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 57 |
| 8. | Any Support Service | 32 | 160 | 79 | 101 | 83 | 95 | 81 | 82 | 60 | 69 | 66 | 72 | 56 | 47 | 20 | 0 | 468 | 1571 |
| 9. | Counseling Service | 17 | 96 | 41 | 59 | 57 | 64 | 50 | 54 | 34 | 43 | 42 | 51 | 35 | 28 | 12 | 0 | 182 | 865 |
| 10. | Any Referred Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

2.3.1.3.2 MEP Participation -Summer/Intersession Term

Instructions Table 2.3.1.3.2 (on the next page) asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

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

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

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

Continuation of Services. In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the summer term.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

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

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

2.3.1.3.2 MEP Participation-Summer/Intersession Term

| | | Ages | Ages | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Un-grad- | Out- | Total |
|--|---|------|------|----|-----|-----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----------|------|-------|
| | | 0-2 | 3-5 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | ed | of- | | |
| PARTICIPATION-SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only) | 4 | 157 | 86 | 117 | 104 | 85 | 106 | 98 | 79 | 72 | 79 | 58 | 44 | 25 | 7 | 0 | 0 | | 1121 |
| 2. | Priority for Service | 0 | 16 | 28 | 20 | 22 | 19 | 25 | 18 | 16 | 14 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 194 |
| 3. | Continuation of Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| 4. | Any Instructional Service | 4 | 157 | 86 | 117 | 104 | 85 | 106 | 98 | 79 | 72 | 79 | 56 | 44 | 25 | 7 | 0 | 0 | | 1119 |
| 5. | Reading Instruction | 0 | 137 | 79 | 116 | 102 | 83 | 104 | 78 | 75 | 56 | 67 | 51 | 32 | 24 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | 1009 |
| 6. | Mathematics Instruction | 0 | 137 | 83 | 112 | 96 | 81 | 94 | 88 | 74 | 71 | 68 | 38 | 34 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 0 | | 1000 |
| 7. | High School Credit Accrual | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 54 |
| 8. | Any Support Service | 4 | 149 | 82 | 116 | 102 | 83 | 104 | 95 | 77 | 13 | 77 | 58 | 44 | 25 | 7 | 0 | 0 | | 1036 |
| 9. | Counseling Service | 4 | 20 | 8 | 19 | 22 | 15 | 23 | 20 | 16 | 13 | 17 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 197 |
| 10. | Any Referred Service | 0 | 147 | 75 | 117 | 104 | 85 | 106 | 75 | 62 | 47 | 35 | 15 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | 896 |

2.3.1.4 SCHOOL DATA

Table 2.3.1.4 asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in those schools.

In the first column of Table 2.3.1.4, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children during the regular school year. Schools include public schools, alternative schools, and private schools (that serve school-age children, i.e., grades K-12). In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide

| 2.3.1.4. STUDENT ENROLLMENT | NUMBER OF SCHOOLS | NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children | a. 17 | b. 2662 |
| 2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP | a. 0 | b. 0 |

2.3.1.5 MEP Project Data

2.3.1.5.1 Type Of MEP Project

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds (by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant) and provides services directly to the migrant child. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs in which MEP were combined in any row of this table.

| 2.3.1.5.1. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT | NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS | NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (All MEP Services Provided During the School Day Only) | a. 3 | b. 599 |
| 2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All MEP Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week) | a. 0 | b. 0 |
| 3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only | a. 6 | b. 845 |
| 4. MEP Projects: Year Round (All MEP Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms) | a. 4 | b. 1039 |

2.3.1.5.2 KEY MEP PERSONNEL

For each school term, enter both the actual number and *full-time-equivalent* number of staff that are paid by the MEP. Report both the actual number and FTE number by job classification. For actual numbers, enter the total number of individuals who were employed in the appropriate job classification, regardless of the percentage of time the person was employed. For the FTE number, define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. (For example, one regular term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days, one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year .) **Use only the percentage of an FTE paid by the MEP in calculating the total FTE numbers to be reported below for each job classification.**

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs where MEP funds are combined with those of other programs.

| | NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR (a) | FTE IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR 1 FTE = <u>180</u> Days (b) | NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION (c) | FTE IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION 1 FTE = <u>30</u> Days (d) |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| 2.3.1.5.2. KEY MEP PERSONNEL | | | | |
| 1. State Director | 1 | | 1 | |
| 2. Teachers | 8 | | 72 | |
| 3. Counselors | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. All Paraprofessionals | 15 | | 64 | |
| 5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals | 11 | | 53 | |
| 6. Recruiters | 5 | | 15 | |
| 7. Records Transfer Staff | 4 | | 11 | |

The numbers of MEP-funded staff are actual people counts; the FTE units represent only the percentages of time personnel are paid with MEP funds. The FTE columns would not allow for entry of correct figures, so the correct data are included here-- FTE Regular School Year: 1)=0.3, 2)=7.3, 3)=0, 4)=11.8, 5)=9.6, 6)=4.4, 7)=3.2 FTE Summer Term/Intersession: 1)=0.3, 2)=60.8, 3)=0, 4)=43.8, 5)=42.9, 6)=12.3, 7)=8.6

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

2.4.1 General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 1

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.

General Instructions for Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 Tables:

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year.

Instructions: State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all State Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including neglected programs, detention facilities, juvenile correction facilities, and adult correction centers.

In the second column, indicate the duplicated number of neglected or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students *more than once* if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program more than once during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the unduplicated number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. An unduplicated count is one that counts students *only once*, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

Note: Throughout Table I, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 3. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds for only one area, count it only once.

2.4.1.1 State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities

| Facility/Program type | Number of facilities/ programs | Number of N or D students (Duplicated) | Average length of stay (days) | Number of N or D students (Unduplicated) |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Neglected Programs | | | | |
| 2. Delinquent (Total) | 16 | 6610 | NA | 4797 |
| 2.1. Juvenile Detention | | | | |
| 2.2. Juvenile Corrections | 8 | 5798 | 245 | 3996 |
| 2.3. Adult Corrections | 8 | 812 | 219 | 801 |
| 3. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: <u> 0 </u> | | | | |

Illinois does not have any (1) Neglected Programs or (2.1) Juvenile Detention Programs funded under Subpart 1.

2.4.1.2 Student Demographics

Report demographic data on neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 1. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

| | Number in neglected programs | Number in juvenile detention | Number in juvenile correction | Number in adult correction |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| All Students | | | 3996 | 801 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | |
| American Indian or Native Alaskan | | | 3 | 0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | 9 | 0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | | 2230 | 567 |
| Hispanic | | | 397 | 103 |
| White, non-Hispanic | | | 1357 | 131 |
| Gender | | | | |
| Male | | | 3504 | 701 |
| Female | | | 492 | 100 |
| Age | | | | |
| 5-10 years old | | | 0 | 0 |
| 11-15 years old | | | 439 | 0 |
| 16-18 years old | | | 3012 | 237 |
| 19 years and older | | | 545 | 564 |

Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs or Juvenile Detention Programs funded under Subpart 1.

Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, juvenile corrections and detention facilities, and adult correction facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

2.4.1.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes

| 1. Facility Academic Offerings | Number of Facilities/Programs | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | Number of Neglected Programs (a) | Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities (b) | Number of Adult Corrections Facilities (c) |
| 1. Awarded high school course credit(s) | | 7 | 7 |
| 2. Awarded high school diploma(s) | | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Awarded GED(s) | | | |
| 2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes | Number of Students | | |
| | Number in Neglected Programs | Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention | Number in Adult Corrections |
| 1. Academic | | | |
| <i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i> | | | |
| 1. Earned high school course credits | | 2819 | 0 |
| 2. Were enrolled in a GED program | | 548 | 305 |
| <i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i> | | | |
| 3. Enrolled in their local district school | | 42 | 0 |
| 4. Earned a GED | | 132 | 108 |
| 5. Obtained high school diploma | | 51 | 0 |
| 6. Were accepted into post-secondary education | | 78 | 17 |
| 7. Enrolled in post-secondary education | | 78 | 24 |
| 2. Vocational | | | |
| <i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i> | | | |
| 1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs | | 706 | 73 |
| <i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i> | | | |
| 2. Enrolled in external job training education | | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Obtained employment | | 19 | 0 |

Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs funded under Subpart 1; in Illinois, only Regional Offices of Education can award a GED.

Instructions: Academic Performance Tables

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 students in neglected programs, juvenile corrections/detention, or adult corrections who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004 , to June 30, 2005

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs **(N)**, students in juvenile corrections or detention **(JC)**, and students in adult corrections **(AC)**. As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for both the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more the one of these change categories

2.4.1.4 Academic Performance in Reading

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Number of long-term students | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------|-----|--|-----|-----|--|-----|----|
| | In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days | | | In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days | | | In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days | | |
| | N | JC | AC | N | JC | AC | N | JC | AC |
| 1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category) | | 1018 | 425 | | 899 | 207 | | 832 | 31 |
| 2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry. | | 879 | 380 | | 817 | 195 | | 740 | 27 |
| 3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams | | 140 | 255 | | 810 | 162 | | 469 | 39 |
| 4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams | | 25 | 31 | | 109 | 29 | | 97 | 8 |
| 5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams | | 13 | 14 | | 72 | 79 | | 26 | 14 |
| 6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams | | 31 | 35 | | 313 | 8 | | 103 | 6 |
| 7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams | | 35 | 39 | | 247 | 32 | | 80 | 6 |
| 8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams | | 38 | 136 | | 69 | 14 | | 163 | 5 |

Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs funded under Subpart 1.

2.4.1.5 Academic Performance in Math

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Number of long-term students | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------|-----|--|-----|-----|--|-----|----|
| | In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days | | | In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days | | | In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days | | |
| | N | JC | AC | N | JC | AC | N | JC | AC |
| 1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category) | | 1018 | 423 | | 915 | 207 | | 832 | 31 |
| 2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry. | | 885 | 385 | | 827 | 195 | | 768 | 27 |
| 3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams | | 128 | 234 | | 761 | 160 | | 500 | 30 |
| 4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams | | 22 | 29 | | 65 | 22 | | 104 | 5 |
| 5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams | | 16 | 7 | | 59 | 7 | | 33 | 5 |
| 6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams | | 27 | 41 | | 326 | 80 | | 147 | 6 |
| 7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams | | 31 | 32 | | 241 | 29 | | 82 | 6 |
| 8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams | | 32 | 125 | | 70 | 22 | | 134 | 8 |

Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs funded under Subpart 1.

End Subpart 1 Reporting Form

2.4.2 General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 2

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, **defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.**

General Instructions For Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 Tables:

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year.

At-risk students are reported only in the facility/program and demographic counts. They are **not** reported in the outcome or academic performance tables.

Instructions: Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities And Students

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all Local Education Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including at-risk programs, neglected programs, detention facilities, and juvenile correction facilities.

In the second column, indicate the duplicated number of at-risk, neglected, or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students more than once if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program *more than once* during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the unduplicated number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. An unduplicated count is one that counts students *only once*, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

Note: Throughout this table, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 4. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds for only one area, count it only once.

2.4.2.1 Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students

| Facility/Program type | Number of facilities/ programs | Number of at-risk or N or D Students (Duplicated) | Average length of stay (days) | Number of at-risk or N or D students (Unduplicated) |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1. At-Risk Programs | | | NA | |
| 2. Neglected Programs | 21 | 1150 | 65 | 1081 |
| 3. Delinquent (Total) | 7 | 6305 | NA | 2518 |
| 4. Juvenile Detention | 7 | 6305 | 65 | 2518 |
| 5. Juvenile Corrections | | | | |
| 6. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: | | | | <u> 0 </u> |

Illinois does not have any (1) At-Risk Programs or (2) Juvenile Corrections Programs funded under Subpart 2.

Instructions: Student Demographics

Report demographic data on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 2. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

2.4.2.2 STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

| | Number in at-risk programs | Number in neglected programs | Number in juvenile detention | Number in juvenile correction |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| All Students | | 1081 | 2518 | |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | |
| American Indian or Native Alaskan | | 2 | 2 | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | 0 | 10 | |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | 640 | 1664 | |
| Hispanic | | 84 | 183 | |
| <i>White, non-Hispanic</i> | | 355 | 659 | |
| Gender | | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | | 697 | 2167 | |
| <i>Female</i> | | 384 | 351 | |
| Age | | | | |
| 5-10 years old | | 74 | 4 | |
| 11-15 years old | | 440 | 732 | |
| 16-18 years old | | 509 | 1775 | |
| 19 years and older | | 58 | 7 | |

Illinois does not have any At-Risk Programs or Juvenile Corrections Programs funded under Subpart 2.

Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table, items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, and juvenile corrections and detention facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

2.4.2.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes

| 1. Facility Academic Offerings | Number of Facilities | |
|---|------------------------------|--|
| | Number of Neglected Programs | Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities |
| 1. Awarded high school course credit(s) | 15 | 4 |
| 2. Awarded high school diploma(s) | 9 | 2 |
| 3. Awarded GED(s) | | |
| 2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes | Number of Students | |
| | Number in Neglected Programs | Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention |
| 1. Academic | | |
| <i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i> | | |
| 1. Earned high school course credits | 530 | 2010 |
| 2. Were enrolled in a GED program | 14 | 2 |
| <i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i> | | |
| 3. Enrolled in their local district school | 653 | 4216 |
| 4. Earned a GED | 8 | 1 |
| 5. Obtained high school diploma | 47 | 3 |
| 6. Were accepted into post-secondary education | 29 | 0 |
| 7. Enrolled in post-secondary education | 27 | 0 |
| 2. Vocational | | |
| <i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i> | | |
| 1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs | 65 | 0 |
| <i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i> | | |
| 2. Enrolled in external job training education | 32 | 0 |
| 3. Obtained employment | 100 | 10 |

1.3) Awarded GEDs--In Illinois, only Regional Offices of Education can award a GED. 2.1.3 Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention -- The number includes BOTH the number in juvenile corrections and/or detention returning to school, and therefore can/does include more students than just the number reported in juvenile corrections.

Instructions: Academic Performance Tables

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 students in neglected programs or juvenile corrections/detention who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005.

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs **(N)** and students in juvenile corrections or detention **(JC)**. As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for both the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more than one of these change categories.

2.4.2.4 Academic Performance In Reading

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Number of long-term students | | | | | |
|---|---|-----|--|----|--|----|
| | In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days | | In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days | | In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days | |
| | N | JC | N | JC | N | JC |
| 1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category) | 304 | 299 | 186 | 31 | 402 | 27 |
| 2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry. | 152 | 36 | 96 | 17 | 317 | 13 |
| 3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams | 191 | 30 | 74 | 19 | 335 | 17 |
| 4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams | 43 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 23 | 2 |
| 5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams | 31 | 6 | 15 | 3 | 45 | 1 |
| 6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams | 69 | 10 | 22 | 0 | 159 | 0 |
| 7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams | 28 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 72 | 4 |
| 8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams | 26 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 36 | 10 |

Note: Since Illinois has no Juvenile Corrections Programs funded under Subpart 2, all data entered in the "JC" columns pertain to Juvenile Detention Programs.

2.4.2.5 Academic Performance In Math

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Number of long-term students | | | | | |
|--|---|----|--|----|--|----|
| | In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days | | In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days | | In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days | |
| | N | JC | N | JC | N | JC |
| 1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category) | 229 | 55 | 128 | 31 | 308 | 27 |
| 2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry. | 86 | 36 | 86 | 22 | 280 | 18 |
| 3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams | 131 | 28 | 52 | 19 | 293 | 17 |
| 4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams | 39 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| 5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams | 28 | 4 | 11 | 3 | 45 | 4 |
| 6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams | 42 | 9 | 17 | 0 | 124 | 0 |
| 7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams | 14 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 52 | 6 |
| 8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams | 8 | 10 | 2 | 11 | 32 | 7 |

Note: Since Illinois has no Juvenile Corrections Programs funded under Subpart 2, all data entered in the "JC" columns pertain to Juvenile Detention Programs.

END Subpart 2 Reporting Form

2.5 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM (TITLE I, PART F)

2.5.1 Please provide the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in reading/language arts based on data from the 2004-2005 school year. 57.7

2.5.2 Please provide the percentage of CSR schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in mathematics based on data from the 2004-2005 school year. 49.4

2.5.3 How many schools in the State have or have been awarded a CSR grant since 1998? 460

2.5.3 includes schools in Illinois school district Chicago Public Schools #299.

2.6 ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY (TITLE II, PART D)

Funding Year: FY 2003

School Years: 2003-2004 AND 2004-2005

2.6.1 FY 2003 Program Information

| | |
|--|---|
| State (Approved) Technology Plan (YES/NO) | Yes <u>X</u> No <u> </u> (circle one) |
| Year last updated: | <u>2002</u> (year) |
| Date of State Approval: | <u>11/21/02</u> MM/DD/YY |
| Web Site Location/URL: <u>http://www.isbe.net/curriculum/elearning/pdf/tech_plan.pdf</u> | |

State Program Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its EETT performance indicators based on data sources that the State established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement, as submitted in the Consolidated State Application. Indicate which of the three or combination of the three Title II, Part D goals relates to your State goals.

Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology Goals:

1. Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools.
2. To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.
3. To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.

Provide results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

For the purpose of completing the table below, please explain how your State defines the following:

2.6.2.1.1 Curriculum Integration

Curriculum integration is when a teacher thinks about and uses technology to accomplish some teaching and learning goal. It is integrated when the thought and action occur seamlessly; when the learners do not need extensive direction or training with each new tool or technology; and when the form of the technology is not prespecified and the teacher does not describe himself or herself as a certain type of technology teacher, for example, a Web instructor or an expert at movie digitalization.

2.6.2.1.2 Technology literacy

Technology literacy is the ability to contribute effectively in a global society through the appropriate use of technology to solve problems, to communicate, to collaborate, and to connect information, ideas, and learning.

2.6.2.2 Goals, Objectives, Targets

| Goals, Objectives, Targets | Narrative | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| <p>Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p> | <p>Illinois Program Goal 1a: Students Illinois students will demonstrate high academic achievement of continual improvement in all learning areas, with particular emphasis on reaching 100 percent of students meeting read and mathematics standards by 2013-14.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p> | <p>To improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p> | <p>Illinois students will demonstrate high academic achievement or continuous improvement in all learning areas, with particular emphasis on reaching 100 percent of students meeting reading and mathematics standards by 2013-14.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p> | <p>The percentage of students who meet or exceed state standards in meeting reading and mathematics areas.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA</p> | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Grade 3</th> <th>Grade 5</th> <th>Grade 8</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>62.0</td> <td>60.4</td> <td>63.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Math</td> <td>75.7</td> <td>68.3</td> <td>53.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Grade 3 | Grade 5 | Grade 8 | Reading | 62.0 | 60.4 | 63.7 | Math | 75.7 | 68.3 | 53.1 |
| | Grade 3 | Grade 5 | Grade 8 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reading | 62.0 | 60.4 | 63.7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Math | 75.7 | 68.3 | 53.1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p> | <p>10% of the gap between baseline and 100% (3%)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Grade 3</th> <th>Grade 5</th> <th>Grade 8</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>65.0</td> <td>60.9</td> <td>67.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Math</td> <td>79.1</td> <td>71.8</td> <td>54.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Grade 3 | Grade 5 | Grade 8 | Reading | 65.0 | 60.9 | 67.1 | Math | 79.1 | 71.8 | 54.4 |
| | Grade 3 | Grade 5 | Grade 8 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reading | 65.0 | 60.9 | 67.1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Math | 79.1 | 71.8 | 54.4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i></p> | <p>20 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent (6 percent)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Grade 3</th> <th>Grade 5</th> <th>Grade 8</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>66.6</td> <td>59.8</td> <td>72.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Math</td> <td>79.2</td> <td>73.1</td> <td>54.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Grade 3 | Grade 5 | Grade 8 | Reading | 66.6 | 59.8 | 72.7 | Math | 79.2 | 73.1 | 54.3 |
| | Grade 3 | Grade 5 | Grade 8 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reading | 66.6 | 59.8 | 72.7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Math | 79.2 | 73.1 | 54.3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p> | <p>20 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Target <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p> | <p>30 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i></p> | <p>40 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) Target met (2) Target not met</p> | <p>2004-2005: Illinois students met the target in Grade 8 reading only. In other areas, there were nonsignificant changes.</p> <p>2009-10: 60 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent</p> <p>2010-11: 70 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent</p> <p>2011-2012: 80 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent</p> <p>2012-2013: 90 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent</p> <p>2013-2014: 100 percent aligned with the ESEA benchmarks for 100 percent achievement by 2013-14</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.

Results taken from <http://www.isbe.net/research/Default.htm>

IGAP Test Results

| Goals, Objectives, Targets | Narrative |
|---|--|
| Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.) | Illinois Program Goal 1b: Students Illinois students will be ready to thrive in a knowledge-based, global society by 2013-14. |
| Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application. | To improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools. |
| Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.) | One hundred percent of Illinois students will demonstrate higher-order knowledge, skills, and ways of thinking and acting essential for success in the 21st century, as documented by performance rubrics or checklists selected by school districts that assess knowledge, skills, and performance. |
| Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.) | The percentage of students who demonstrate proficiency in higher order and 21st century skills at three levels: knowledge, skills, and performance. |
| Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA | The technology literacy definition was not approved until September 2005. |
| Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i> | The technology literacy definition was not approved until September 2005. |
| Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i> | The technology literacy definition was not approved until September 2005. |
| Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i> | The technology literacy definition was not approved until September 2005. |
| Target <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i> | 30 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent |
| Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i> | 40 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent |
| Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> (1) Target met (2) Target not met | School districts are in the process of determining the 21st century knowledge, skills, and performance they will expect of their students, and at the same time determining what assessment tools they will use to determine if those expectations have been met. Self-reports from 288 Illinois school districts (1/3 sample) in 2005 indicated that 282 of 429 (65 percent) targeted priorities were focused on ISTE student standards 2–social, ethical, and human concerns; 3–productivity; 4–communication; 5–research; and 6–problem-solving skills. Those are the areas most closely associated with 21st century skills. 2008-09: 50 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent 2009-10: 60 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent 2010-11: 70 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent 2011-2012: 80 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent 2012-2013: 90 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent 2013-2014: 100 percent |
| Measurement tool(s) used to | School district self-reporting instrument. Responses taken from the self-reports were taken from a 1/3 |

assess progress of indicators.

sample of Illinois school districts. Districts that received less than \$750 Formula EETT funds were not included because of difficulties associated with attribution. Districts that are eligible for Title I schoolwide and REAP are underrepresented because certain parts of the survey were optional for them. Analyses of reports for schoolwide and REAP revealed minimal differences in responses, as compared with the general population. The two greatest limitations of this survey are its self-report design and that two large school districts, Chicago and Rockford, are not included because they exercised their option to submit the brief version of the survey.

| Goals, Objectives, Targets | Narrative |
|---|---|
| <p>Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p> | <p>Illinois Program Goal 2: Educators Illinois students will learn under the guidance of educators who routinely and effectively use technology in teaching, learning, leading, and administration by 2013-14.</p> |
| <p>Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p> | <p>One hundred percent of Illinois students will learn under the guidance of educators who routinely and effectively use technology in teaching, learning, leading, and administration. The environment is led and staffed by educators who are informed about, highly competent in, and who model effective uses of technology for learning, teaching, and assessment.</p> |
| <p>Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p> | <p>Objective 1: Work with PBS to develop an online portfolio tool that will allow Illinois teachers to meet the content area standards for technology for all teachers (Technology Standards). Objective 2: Develop a mandatory, online administrator academy course (six modules) that provides awareness of and hands-on best practices experiences that support the technology standards for administrators. Objective 3: Work with the Illinois State Board of Higher Education to provide preservice teachers with opportunities to visit technology-rich classrooms that support the <i>Illinois Learning Standards</i>, the NETS-S, and engaged learning.</p> |
| <p>Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p> | <p>Indicator 1–Teacher Training and Curriculum Development: The percentage of teachers who meet the content area standards for technology for all teachers at the knowledge and performance levels. Indicator 2–Administrator Performance: The percentage of administrators who meet the TSSA standards (or the Illinois technology standards for administrators) at the knowledge and performance levels. Indicator 3–Preservice Performance: The percentage of preservice teachers who meet the content area standards for technology for all teachers at the knowledge and performance levels.</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA</p> | <p>Indicator 1–The PBS portal was completed on February 1, 2006, and will be available on July 1, 2006, for all Illinois teachers. Indicator 2–The administrator academy course was completed on March 1, 2006, and the first class will begin on April 26 & 27, 2006. Indicator 3–The preservice performance portion will not be available until fall 2006.</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p> | <p>Indicator 1–The PBS portal was completed on February 1, 2006, and will be available on July 1, 2006, for all Illinois teachers. Indicator 2–The administrator academy course was completed on March 1, 2006, and the first class will begin on April 26 & 27, 2006. Indicator 3–The preservice performance portion will not be available until fall 2006.</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i></p> | <p>Indicator 1–The PBS portal was completed on February 1, 2006, and will be available on July 1, 2006, for all Illinois teachers. Indicator 2–The administrator academy course was completed on March 1, 2006, and the first class will begin on April 26 & 27, 2006. Indicator 3–The preservice performance portion will not be available until fall 2006.</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p> | <p>Indicator 1–The PBS portal was completed on February 1, 2006, and will be available on July 1, 2006, for all Illinois teachers. Indicator 2–The administrator academy course was completed on March 1, 2006, and the first class will begin on April 26 & 27, 2006. Indicator 3–The preservice performance portion will not be available until fall 2006.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Target <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i> | 30 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent |
| Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i> | 40 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent |
| Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> (1) <i>Target met</i> (2) <i>Target not met</i> | Indicator 1–Teacher Training and Curriculum Development: Met Indicator 2–Administrator Performance: Met Indicator 3–Preservice Performance: The preservice performance portion will not be available until fall 2006. Teacher Training and Curriculum Development Response: This is ongoing effort. School districts are developing priorities for assisting teachers to meet Illinois Technology Standards for teachers. Self-reports from 288 Illinois school districts (1/3 sample) in 2005 indicated present inservice priorities were focused on Illinois Teacher Standards 3 through 8, with “Application of Technology” and “Productivity Tools” the overwhelming priorities. Analysis of the survey revealed that assessment was the area of greatest weakness for both teachers and administrators. Few districts (25 percent) demonstrated knowledge of the why, how, use, and value of assessment. Preservice and Administrator Response: This is an ongoing effort. School districts are developing priorities for assisting administrators to meet Administrator Technology Standards. Self-reports from 288 Illinois school districts (1/3 sample) in 2005 indicated present in-service priorities were focused on Administrator Standards 2 through 4 as most important, with “Learning/Teaching, Productivity, and Management/Operations” the overwhelming priorities. Analysis of the survey revealed that assessment was the area of greatest weakness for both teachers and administrators. Few districts (25 percent) demonstrated knowledge of the why, how, use, and value of assessment. |
| Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators. | Indicator 1 –PBS/ISBE teacher portal. Indicator 2 –Administrator academy course. Indicators 1, 2, & 3 –District self-reporting instrument. |

| Goals, Objectives, Targets | Narrative |
|---|--|
| Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.) | Illinois Program Goal 3: Transformative Learning Systems Illinois students will be educated in environments conducive to learning in a technological, knowledge-based age by 2013-2014. |
| Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application. | To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes Grade 8, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability. |
| Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.) | One hundred percent of Illinois students will be educated in environments conducive to learning in a technological, knowledge-based age by 2013-2014. |
| Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.) | <p>Indicator 1—The percentage of classrooms, schools, and districts that engage students in high-quality, technology-based learning that is grounded in current research and sound instructional practices, and embedded in the context of the academics (consistent with Next Steps and the NCREL engaged learning model).</p> <p>Indicator 2—The percentage of schools with a wide range of technology use across the academics (as defined by NCREL/Metiri).</p> <p>Indicator 3—The number of students whose educational opportunity is improved through eLearning (e.g., Virtual High School, online courses, online field trips, etc.).</p> <p>Indicator 4—The percentage of school districts with approved technology plans that meet Illinois guidelines.</p> |
| Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA | <p>Indicators 1 & 2—no baseline data established.</p> <p>Indicator 3—Number of high schools: 69; Number of students served: 282</p> <p>Indicator 4—96 percent of all Illinois school districts had approved technology plans.</p> |
| Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i> | <p>Indicator 1 & 2—no baseline data established.</p> <p>Indicator 3—Number of high schools: 162; Number of students served: 937</p> <p>Indicator 4—93 percent of all Illinois school districts had approved technology plans.</p> |
| Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i> | <p>Indicators 1 & 2—Self-reports from 288 Illinois school districts (1/3 sample) in 2005 indicated that 336 of 480 (70 percent) of targeted priorities were focused on the content area technology standards 3 through 8. Those are the areas most closely associated with environments conducive to learning in a technological, knowledge-based age.</p> <p>Indicator 3—Number of high schools: 213; Number of students served: 1409</p> <p>Indicator 4—87 percent of all Illinois school districts had approved technology plans.</p> |
| Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i> | <p>Indicators 1 & 2—In the process of collecting data.</p> <p>Indicator 3—Estimated number of high schools: 225; Estimated number of students served: 1500</p> <p>Indicator 4—85 percent of all Illinois school districts had approved technology plans (as of April 1, 2006).</p> |
| Target <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i> | No targets set at this time; Illinois school districts are experiencing continued loss of technology funding. |
| Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i> | No targets set at this time; Illinois school districts are experiencing continued loss of technology funding. |
| Assessment of Progress | Indicators 1 & 2 —Targets not met at this time; currently in the process of collecting data. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> (1) <i>Target met</i> (2) <i>Target not met</i> | Indicators 3 & 4 –met |
| Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators. | School district self-reporting instrument ISBE Technology Planning database Illinois Virtual High School Report |

| Goals, Objectives, Targets | Narrative |
|---|---|
| <p>Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p> | <p>Illinois Program Goal 4: Robust Technology Access</p> <p>Illinois students will have access to contemporary and high-speed technologies and communications networks by 2013-2014.</p> |
| <p>Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p> | <p>To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes Grade 8, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.</p> |
| <p>Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p> | <p>One hundred percent of Illinois students' attainment of or continuous improvement in the NETS-S in the context of multiple content areas, with particular emphasis on reaching 100 percent of Grade 8 student technology literacy by 2013-2014, as indicated in the Illinois state application to the NCLB program.</p> <p>Learning Opportunities: Illinois students have equitable access to rich, diverse, and high-quality learning opportunities through technology. Students, especially those in high-need areas, have their learning needs met in part through their engagement in high-quality learning through virtual courses, access to resources, interactions with peers, and access to experts.</p> <p>Digital Equity: All children have access to contemporary, robust technology and communications networks during and outside the school day, and use such technology access effectively and efficiently regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.</p> |
| <p>Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p> | <p>Indicator 1—Robust Technology Performance: 100 percent of Illinois students will have access to contemporary and high-speed technologies and communications networks.</p> <p>Indicator 2—Internet Connection Performance: 100 percent of Illinois school districts will have Internet connection and 80 percent of the school districts will have DSL or better Internet connection.</p> <p>Indicator 3—Computer Access Performance: Illinois school districts will provide one computer that is five years old or newer for every four students.</p> <p>Indicator 4—Learning Environments Networks Performance: 80 percent of Illinois school districts will have 80 percent or more of instructional computers connected to the Internet.</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA</p> | <p>Indicator 1—90 percent</p> <p>Indicator 2—90 percent</p> <p>Indicator 3—80 percent</p> <p>Indicator 4—80 percent</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p> | <p>Indicator 1—92 percent</p> <p>Indicator 2—92 percent</p> <p>Indicator 3—85 percent</p> <p>Indicator 4—82 percent</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i></p> | <p>Indicator 1—93 percent</p> <p>Indicator 2—Self-reports from 288 Illinois school districts (1/3 sample) in 2005 indicated that 100 percent of school districts had Internet connection and that 92 percent of the school districts had fractional T1 connection or better. Only two school districts reported having dial-up connection.</p> <p>Indicator 3—Self-reports from 288 Illinois school districts (1/3 sample) in 2005 indicate that after eliminating computers used for administrative purposes, the statewide average computer to student ratio is 1 computer to every 3.55 students. Six percent of the computers were one year or newer, 48 percent were 2-3 years old, 42 percent were 3-5 years old, and 6 percent were more than five years old. Totals showed that 94 percent</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>of the computers were five or newer years old.</p> <p>Indicator 4—Self-reports from 288 Illinois school districts (1/3 sample) in 2005 indicate that 66 percent of school districts have 100 percent of their instructional computers connected to the Internet, 16 percent had between 90 percent and 99 percent connected, and 8.6 percent had between 80 percent and 89 percent connected, for a total of 90.6 percent of school districts that have at least 80 percent of computers connected to the Internet.</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p> | <p>Indicators 1-4: 20 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p> | <p>Indicators 1-4: 30 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i></p> | <p>Indicators 1-4: 40 percent of the gap between baseline and 100 percent</p> |
| <p>Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) <i>Target met</i> (2) <i>Target not met</i></p> | <p>Indicators 1-4 have been met.</p> |
| <p>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</p> | <p>School district self-reporting instrument</p> <p>ISBE Technology Planning database</p> <p>School district computer inventories</p> <p>TechPoint Grade 8 technology assessment tool</p> |

| Goals, Objectives, Targets | Narrative |
|---|--|
| <p>Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p> | <p>Illinois Program Goal 5: Policy, Leadership, and Accountability</p> <p>Policies, leadership, and budgets are aligned with and support a statewide school system that makes appropriate use of technology in teaching, learning, leading, and administration by 2013-2014.</p> |
| <p>Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p> | <p>To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development in order to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by the Illinois State Board of Education and Illinois LEAs.</p> |
| <p>Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p> | <p>Objective 1: Establish a state-level policy and action agenda aligned with the state goals and establish a statewide technology advisory committee.</p> <p>Objective 2: Promote public-private partnerships that support equity of access, particularly for students from high-poverty schools.</p> <p>Objective 3: Provide leadership and support systems for learning technology at the state and regional levels.</p> <p>Objective 4: Establish ongoing, sustainable funding for technology.</p> <p>Objective 5: Establish and fund a research agenda related to technology literacy, student learning, and academic achievement.</p> <p>Objective 6: Establish a comprehensive evaluation process that tracks and reports progress in meeting the goals and benchmarks of the plan using internal and external expertise.</p> |
| <p>Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p> | <p>Indicator 1–The degree to which technology is integrated into state standards.</p> <p>Indicator 2–The degree to which technology is integrated into state assessments.</p> <p>Indicator 3–The degree to which technology is integrated into state policies.</p> <p>Indicator 4–The level and sustainability of state funding for technology in Illinois.</p> <p>Indicator 5–The leadership of the state is proactively building the capacity of educators, schools, and districts to attain the systems conditions for Digital Age, Transformative Learning.</p> <p>Indicator 6–The quality and effectiveness of the comprehensive evaluation process for gauging the progress of education toward the effective use of technology for all students.</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA</p> | <p>Indicator 1–The five Applications of Learning are embedded into the <i>Illinois Learning Standards</i>. One of the five Applications of Learning is "using technology."</p> <p>Indicator 2–Schools can take "practice" online ISAT tests.</p> <p>Indicator 3–Policies and procedures were written to provide low-cost loans to school districts to purchase technology equipment.</p> <p>Indicator 4–Illinois provided \$25,025,000 of state funds in technology funding for schools, plus \$50,000,000 in additional funds for the School Technology Revolving Loan Program.</p> <p>Indicator 5–Illinois created a Technology Advisory Board and a State Technology Planning Committee.</p> <p>Indicator 6–Implementation of an evaluation plan was begun.</p> |
| <p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-</i></p> | <p>Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5–See 2002-03.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 04 school year | <p>Indicator 4–Illinois provided \$11,500,000 of state funds in technology funding for schools, plus \$50,000,000 in additional funds for the School Technology Revolving Loan Program.</p> <p>Indicator 6–Implementation of the evaluation plan continued.</p> |
| <p>Target Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</p> | <p>Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5–See 2002-03.</p> <p>Indicator 4–Illinois provided \$5,000,000 of state funds in technology funding for schools, plus \$10,000,000 in additional funds for the School Technology Revolving Loan Program.</p> <p>Indicator 6–A revised evaluation plan was implemented.</p> |
| <p>Target Target for 2005-06 school year</p> | <p>Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5–See 2002-03.</p> <p>Indicator 4–Illinois provided \$4,967,700 of state funds in technology funding for schools.</p> <p>Indicator 6–The revised evaluation plan continues to be implemented.</p> |
| <p>Target Target for 2006-07 school year.</p> | <p>Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5–See 2002-03.</p> <p>Indicator 4–Illinois provided \$25,025,000 of state funds in technology funding for schools, plus \$50,000,000 in additional funds for the School Technology Revolving Loan Program.</p> <p>Indicator 6–The revised evaluation plan will continue to be implemented.</p> |
| <p>Target Target for 2007-08 school</p> | <p>Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5–See 2002-03.</p> <p>Indicator 4–No funds have been budgeted at this time.</p> <p>Indicator 6–The revised evaluation plan will continue to be implemented.</p> |
| <p>Assessment of Progress Status of progress on indicator</p> <p>(1) Target met (2) Target not met</p> | <p>Indicators 1, 2, 3, & 5–Met</p> <p>Indicators 4 & 6–Not met</p> |
| <p>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</p> | <p>The Illinois Learning Standards</p> <p>The K-12 Information Technology Plan</p> <p>The 2005 Annual Report and Proposed Budget for FY07</p> <p>The Digital Age Technology Plan</p> <p>The Illinois School Code</p> |

If for any reason you have modified or added Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets since submitting the State Consolidated Application, please indicate in the chart below.

| Original Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.) | Modification or Additions |
|--|--|
| Illinois Program Goal 5: Policy, Leadership, and Accountability | Illinois Program Goal 5: Policy, Leadership, and Accountability |
| Policies, leadership, and budgets are aligned with and support a statewide school system that makes appropriate use of technology in teaching, learning, leading, and administration by 2013-2014. | Policies and leadership are aligned with and support a statewide school system that makes appropriate use of technology in teaching, learning, leading, and administration by 2013-2014. |
| Objective 5.2: Promote public-private partnerships that support equity of access, particularly for students from high-poverty schools. | Delete Objective 2 from Program Goal 5. |
| Objective 5.4: Establish ongoing, sustainable funding for technology. | Delete Objective 4 from Program Goal 5. |
| Objective 5.5: Establish and fund a research agenda related to technology literacy, student learning, and academic achievement. | Delete Objective 5 from Program Goal 5. |
| Indicator 5.4 —The level and sustainability of state funding for technology in Illinois. | Delete Indicator 4 from Program Goal 5. |
| | |

2.7 SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)

2.7.1 Performance Measures

Instructions: In the following chart, please identify:

- o Each of your State indicators as submitted in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application;
- o The instrument or data source used to measure the indicator;
- o The frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection;
- o The baseline data and year the baseline was established; and
- o Targets for the years in which your State has established targets.

2.7.1 Performance Measures

| Indicator | Instrument/ Data Source | Frequency of collection | Targets | Actual Performance |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| 1) The number of students indicating 0 days of carrying a weapon, such as a gun, knife, or club, on one or more of 30 days preceding the reporting period, divided by the total number of respondents to this question on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, multiplied by 100. | Youth Risk Behavior Survey | Frequency: <u>Every two years</u> (not collected in <u>2003</u>) Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u> | 2003-2004 <u> </u> 2004-2005 <u>8%</u> 2005-2006 <u> </u> 2006-2007 <u>6%</u> 2007-2008 <u> </u> | 2003-2004 <u> </u> 2004-2005 <u>14%</u> Baseline: <u>11%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u> |
| 2) The number of students who did not go to school in 30 days preceding the reporting period because they felt unsafe, divided by the total number of respondents to this question on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, multiplied by 100. | Youth Risk Behavior Survey | Frequency: <u>Every two years</u> (not collected in <u>2003</u>) Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u> | 2003-2004 <u> </u> 2004-2005 <u>5%</u> 2005-2006 <u> </u> 2006-2007 <u>3%</u> 2007-2008 <u> </u> | 2003-2004 <u> </u> 2004-2005 <u>6.1%</u> Baseline: <u>8.6%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u> |
| 3) The number of students who were in a physical fight on school property one or more times during the 12 months preceding the reporting period, divided by the total number of respondents to this question on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, multiplied by 100. | Youth Risk Behavior Survey | Frequency: <u>Every two years</u> (not collected in <u>2003</u>) Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u> | 2003-2004 <u> </u> 2004-2005 <u>6%</u> 2005-2006 <u> </u> 2006-2007 <u>5%</u> 2007-2008 <u> </u> | 2003-2004 <u> </u> 2004-2005 <u>10.6%</u> Baseline: <u>10.2%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u> |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <p>4) The number of students who have ever tried cigarette smoking (even one or two puffs), divided by the total number of respondents to this question on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, multiplied by 100.</p> | <p>Youth Risk Behavior Survey</p> | <p>Frequency: <u>Every two years</u> (not collected in <u>2003</u>) Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u></p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>18%</u> 2005-2006 ___ 2006-2007 <u>42%</u> 2007-2008 ___</p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>25.1%</u> Baseline: <u>22.9%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u></p> |
| <p>5) The number of students who have smoked at least one cigarette every day for 30 days preceding the reporting period, divided by the total number of respondents to this question on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, multiplied by 100.</p> | <p>Youth Risk Behavior Survey</p> | <p>Frequency: <u>Every two years</u> (not collected in <u>2003</u>) Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u></p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>12%</u> 2005-2006 ___ 2006-2007 <u>10%</u> 2007-2008 ___</p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>13.2%</u> Baseline: <u>16.1%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u></p> |
| <p>6) The number of students who had their first drink of alcohol (other than a few sips) before age 13, divided by the total number of respondents to this question on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, multiplied by 100.</p> | <p>Youth Risk Behavior Survey</p> | <p>Frequency: <u>Every two years</u> (not collected in <u>2003</u>) Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u></p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>18%</u> 2005-2006 ___ 2006-2007 <u>16%</u> 2007-2008 ___</p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>25.1%</u> Baseline: <u>22.9%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u></p> |
| <p>7) The number of students who had five or more drinks in a row (within a couple of hours) on one or more of the 30 days preceding the reporting period, divided by the total number of respondents to this question on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, multiplied by 100.</p> | <p>Youth Risk Behavior Survey</p> | <p>Frequency: <u>Every two years</u> (not collected in <u>2003</u>) Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u></p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>23%</u> 2005-2006 ___ 2006-2007 <u>20%</u> 2007-2008 ___</p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>30.2%</u> Baseline: <u>28.4%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u></p> |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| <p>8) The number of students who tried marijuana before age 13, divided by the total number of respondents to this question on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, multiplied by 100.</p> | <p>Youth Risk Behavior Survey</p> | <p>Frequency: <u>Every two years</u> (not collected in <u>2003</u>) Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u></p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>4%</u> 2005-2006 ___ 2006-2007 <u>3%</u> 2007-2008 ___</p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>19.5%</u> Baseline: <u>6.6%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u></p> |
| <p>9) The number of students who used marijuana one or more times during the 30 days preceding the reporting period, divided by the total number of respondents to this question on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, multiplied by 100.</p> | <p>Youth Risk Behavior Survey</p> | <p>Frequency: <u>Every two years</u> (not collected in <u>2003</u>) Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u></p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>15%</u> 2005-2006 ___ 2006-2007 <u>13%</u> 2007-2008 ___</p> | <p>2003-2004 ___ 2004-2005 <u>19.5%</u> Baseline: <u>20%</u> Year established: <u>2001</u></p> |

2.7.2 Suspension and Expulsion Data

Instructions: In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students for each of the underlined incidents.

Please also provide the State's definition of an elementary, middle, and high school, as well as the State's definition of each of the incidents underlined below.

(If your State does not collect data in the same format as requested by this form, the State may provide data from a similar question, provided the State includes a footnote explaining the differences between the data requested and the data the State is able to supply.)

| School Type | State Definition |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Elementary School | K through 5 or 6 |
| Middle School | 5 or 6 through 8 or 9 |
| High School | 9 or 10 through 12 |

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

State definition of physical fighting: Two or more students opposing each other, as with fists.

| SUSPENSIONS | Number for 2004-2005 school year | Number of LEAs reporting |
|-------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Elementary | 23157 | 866 |
| Middle | 16001 | 866 |
| High School | 18427 | 866 |

| EXPULSIONS | Number for 2004-2005 school year | Number of LEAs reporting |
|-------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Elementary | 20 | 866 |
| Middle | 95 | 866 |
| High School | 434 | 866 |

2.7.2.3 The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possessionState definition of weapons: A weapon, as defined in 18 USC 921.

| SUSPENSIONS | Number for 2004-2005 school year | Number of LEAs reporting |
|--------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Elementary | 1379 | 866 |
| Middle | 664 | 866 |
| High School | 1429 | 866 |

| EXPULSIONS | Number for 2004-2005 school year | Number of LEAs reporting |
|-------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Elementary | 106 | 866 |
| Middle | 134 | 866 |
| High School | 269 | 866 |

2.7.2.4 The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.State definition of alcohol-related: Related to illegal use of alcohol.

| SUSPENSIONS | Number for 2004-2005 school year | Number of LEAs reporting |
|--------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Elementary | 21 | 866 |
| Middle | 205 | 866 |
| High School | 1224 | 866 |

| EXPULSIONS | Number for 2004-2005 school year | Number of LEAs reporting |
|-------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Elementary | 0 | 866 |
| Middle | 10 | 866 |
| High School | 53 | 866 |

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

State definition of illicit-drug related: Drugs that are illegal to have.

| SUSPENSIONS | | Number for 2004-2005 school year | | Number of LEAs reporting |
|--------------------|------|---|--|---------------------------------|
| Elementary | 229 | | | 866 |
| Middle | 684 | | | 866 |
| High School | 3800 | | | 866 |

| EXPULSIONS | | Number for 2004-2005 school year | | Number of LEAs reporting |
|-------------------|-----|---|--|---------------------------------|
| Elementary | 44 | | | 866 |
| Middle | 137 | | | 866 |
| High School | 709 | | | 866 |

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

Instructions: Section 4116 of ESEA requires that each State provide information pertaining to the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts. Please describe your State's efforts to include parents in these activities.

The Illinois State Board of Education posts bulletins on the agency website to help parents become informed of SEA drug and violence prevention efforts. The same information is included in news releases and in the weekly bulletin from the state superintendent of education.

In addition, the Illinois State Board of Education monitors for compliance at the LEA level to ensure that parents are involved in local program decisions. Minutes of the meetings are included in the review.

The Illinois State Board of Education also operates a statewide training program that includes conferences and training for parents in how to work with drug and violence prevention in various communities.

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS(TITLE V, PART A)

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

The major use of these funds was to improve teaching and learning by conducting training in the area of Standards-Aligned Classrooms. The Illinois standards are used to write state assessments for determining AYP for all students. The training enabled Illinois to show an increase in the number of students making AYP.

The Regional Service provider (RESPRO) group works with schools and school districts statewide to help write and execute school and school district improvement plans. RESPRO groups serve as members of the school support team and bring experts from various disciplines to the table to help schools review data and determine objectives and activities for the year. These services, primarily provided to schools in corrective action or restructuring status, have enabled schools to show an increase in the number of students and schools making AYP.

2.8.2 The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including: (1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2004-2005 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

| Priority Activity/Area [1] | Number of LEAs that used 20% or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for: | Number of these LEAs that met AYP | Total Number of Students Served |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Area 1: Student Achievement in Reading and Math | 552 | 301 | 1020415 |
| Area 2: Teacher Quality | 248 | 176 | 415183 |
| Area 3: Safe and Drug Free Schools | 23 | 16 | 21416 |
| Area 4: Increase Access for all Students | 92 | 61 | 44315 |

Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).

2.8.3 Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2004-2005, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. 31

2.8.4 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2004-2005. 27

2.8.5 Indicate the percentage of Title V funds, including funds transferred from other programs into Title V that LEAs used for the four strategic priorities. 81.0

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

2.8.6 Indicate the percentage of LEAs that completed needs assessments that the State determined to be meaningful and credible. 94.0

2.8.7 Describe how decisions were made regarding the local uses of funds.

Each school district receiving a grant under Title V must have a committee made up of educators; parents of participating children, including nonpublic parents and teachers, where applicable; and school support personnel to evaluate the program from the current year and to determine the best use of funds for the coming year. The committee is charged with making any changes that are required to help children make AYP. Each school district is required to complete a nonpublic consultation report, which must be signed by the nonpublic school administrator. The primary purpose of this committee is to review the current year's program and determine if changes are required for the coming year. Changes involve additional teacher training, additional student program in technology, or a myriad of other activities permitted under the law.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B)

2.9.1 Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2004-2005 school year. 77

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

2.9.2.1 LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2004-2005 school year.

| Purpose | Number of LEAs |
|--|----------------|
| Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives | 2 |
| Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers | 11 |
| Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D | 19 |
| Parental involvement activities | 5 |
| Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A) | 6 |
| Activities authorized under Title I, Part A | 13 |
| Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students) | 1 |

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

The SEA continues to work toward the goals of improving academic achievement, decreasing student dropout rates, and increasing the percentage of classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by providing grant funds as additional resources to eligible school districts.

Based on three-year trend data, school report cards show Illinois students have improved greater than 4 percent on the state assessments (Illinois Standards Achievement Test and Prairie State Achievement Examination) in reading and mathematics. Of the 21 school districts receiving REAP funds, 18 school districts show an increase from 2003–2005, and the remaining 3 school districts show an increase from 2004-2005. Dropout rates of students attending high schools have decreased by 2 percent. School district reports, through consolidated grant applications, identify that highly qualified teacher percentages in Illinois are increasing with the help of these funds through professional development, training, and continuing education. The SEA continues to provide resources to assist all schools in having a highly qualified teacher in every classroom.

Rural and Low-Income Program funds provided to eligible rural school districts have an impact on the academic improvement of schools in Illinois. State test data continue to be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the programs and projects using these funds.

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2004-2005 school year?
No

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds

2.10.2.1 Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2004-2005 school year. 300

2.10.2.2 In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

| Program | Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program | Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program |
|---|---|---|
| Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121) | 19 | 72611 |
| Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A)) | 1 | 3267 |
| Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1)) | 13 | 55915 |
| State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a)) | 188 | 2600791 |
| Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs | 79 | 1497694 |

| Program | Total Number of LEAs transferring funds FROM eligible program | Total amount of funds transferred FROM eligible program |
|---|--|--|
| Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121) | 112 | 3643848 |
| Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A)) | 4 | 70841 |
| Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1)) | 77 | 459006 |
| State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a)) | 28 | 56583 |

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

2.11 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS(TITLE IV, PART B)

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