

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 2005-2006



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

**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 are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

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

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

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 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:

- **Performance goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<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: 07/31/2007	
<p style="text-align: center;">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</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2005-2006 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2005-2006	
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): Christopher A. Koch	
_____ Signature	<u>Friday, March 30, 2007, 4:27:06 PM</u> Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART II

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007

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 2005-2006 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year.	1388
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 2005-2006 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year.	1404
Comments: These numbers are considerably larger than the SY 2004-2005 numbers due to the fact that Illinois began testing at more grade levels in SY 2005-2006. In SY 2004-2005, Illinois conducted state assessments in grades 3, 5, 8, and 11. In SY 2005-2006, Illinois conducted state assessments in grades 3-8 and 11.	

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program	
For the 2005-2006 school year, please provide the following:	
2.1.2.1 Total Number of Title I schools in the State	2355
2.1.2.2 Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State	1194
2.1.2.3 Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State	1106
Comments:	

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 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 School Year	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	39641
Limited English Proficient	63636
Homeless	8750
Migrant	327
Comments: These numbers have been doublechecked.	

2.1.3.1.2 Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group 2005-2006 School Year	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian/Alaskan Native	644
Asian/Pacific Islander	9645
Black, non-Hispanic	227186
Hispanic	175626
White, non-Hispanic	139774
Comments: Multiracial=11,893	

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 2005-2006 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level 2005-2006 School Year						
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0 to 2	54	3531	0	0	3585	0.60
Age 3 to 5	225	10823	10	10	11068	1.90
K	7632	43177	989	33	51831	8.70
1	13835	46202	1480	59	61576	10.30
2	11777	45757	1449	44	59027	9.90
3	9793	47121	1554	47	58515	9.80
4	7911	45155	1422	30	54518	9.20
5	6781	45156	1319	23	53279	8.90
6	4070	41938	1134	28	47170	7.90
7	2872	37721	985	21	41599	7.00
8	2374	37732	1260	22	41388	7.00
9	8286	23364	563	5	32218	5.40
10	36442	17221	221	14	53898	9.00
11	207	11855	159	6	12227	2.10
12	1496	10929	25	11	12461	2.10
Ungraded	20	1519	20	0	1559	0.30
TOTALS	113775	469201	12590	353	595919	100.00

Comments:

2.1.3.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services - 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 school year.

Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	22031
Reading/Language Arts	69758
Science	6004
Social Studies	5421
Vocational/Career	
Other (specify)	2811
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	3424
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	6275
Other (specify)	1059

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

Instructional Services "Other"--ELL services

Support Services "Other"--Transportation services

2.1.4 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs - 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 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)	76
Instructional Support Paraprofessionals	509
Non-Instructional Support Paraprofessionals	
Teachers	1533
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	94
Other (specify)	82

Comments: Illinois does not collect data on non-instructional support paraprofessionals.

"Other"--Parent services

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 2005-2006 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	53
---	----

Comments:

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	2461
2. Total number of adults participating ("Adults" includes teen parents.)	2609
3. Total number of adults participating who are limited English proficient	1216
4. Total number of children participating	3988

Comments:

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	1530
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	1602
3. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal poverty level	78.00
4. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED	79.50
5. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade	49.90

Comments:

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	10.70
2. From 4 to 6 months	22.90
3. From 7 to 12 months	32.80
4. More than 12 months	33.60

Comments:

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.

Instructions:

Indicators 1 and 2: The definition of significant learning gains for adult education is determined by each state. Use the definition determined by your state's adult education program in conjunction with the Department of Education's Office of Adult and Vocational Education (OVAE).

Indicators 3 and 4: School-age adults are defined as any parent attending elementary or secondary school. This term also includes those parents within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting such as directly through the Even Start program. For the "Cohort", please include only those adult participants who had a goal of earning a high school diploma or GED. Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by state, so you should include only those adult participants for whom a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

Indicator 5: A standard score increase of 4 or more points between pre- and post-test is considered to be a significant learning gain. For the "Cohort", please describe the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre-test and post-test with at least six months of services in between. In the "Explanation" box please note the number of students exempted from participation due to severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Indicator 6: In the "Result" box for this indicator, please describe the average score for the children in your state who participated in this assessment. Do not describe the number of participants who met the achievement goal. The "Cohort" is the total number of students who participated in the assessment.

Indicator 7: The source of data for this indicator is usually determined by the state, and in some cases by school district. Please indicate the source of the data you provide.

Indicator 8: While most states are using the PEP, other assessments of parenting education are acceptable. Please provide non-PEP data in the "Explanation of Progress" column.

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Indicator	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Cohort <i>Number of participants to whom the indicator applies</i>	Result <i>Number of participants who met the achievement goal</i>	Explanation of Progress
				<p>The target was set at 65% for the total group of adults who attended 75+ hours of adult education. 53.04% met target. Targets were met for the Beginning Literacy and Beginning levels. Summary of results by level:</p> <p>Beg. Lit.--Cohort=11, Result=10, 91%</p> <p>Beg.--Cohort=27, Result=19, 70%</p> <p>Low Intermed.--Cohort=92, Result=44, 48%</p> <p>High Intermed.--Cohort=93, Result=54, 58%</p> <p>Low Adv. ASE--Cohort=39, Result=20, 51%</p> <p>High Adv. ASE--Cohort=51, Result=19, 37%</p> <p>ISBE will review cut scores at the higher levels in FY07 to see if they are set too high.</p> <p>Current state criteria for expected point gains are:</p> <p>Beg. Lit.--20</p> <p>Beg.--30</p> <p>Low Intermed.--30</p> <p>High Intermed.--20</p> <p>Low Adv. ASE--10</p> <p>High Adv. ASE--10</p>
1. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	TABE: 75+ hours Total Group CASAS: Not applicable	TABE: 313 CASAS:	TABE: 166 CASAS:	Not applicable
2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language	TABE: Not applicable (see comments section) CASAS: Not applicable (see	TABE: CASAS:	TABE: CASAS:	Not applicable

acquisition	coments section)			Not applicable
				65.5% of school-age adults for whom earning a high school diploma was a goal, did earn a diploma.
				GED--Cohort=38, Result=21
	(See Explanation of Progress column for GED information.)	29	19	55% of school-age adults for whom earning a GED was a goal, did earn a GED.
3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	*Please indicate diploma or GED Diploma	*Please indicate diploma or GED Diploma	*Please indicate diploma or GED Diploma	Not applicable
				63% of nonschool-age adults for whom earning a high school diploma was a goal, did earn a diploma.
				GED--Cohort=224, Result=102
	(See Explanation of Progress column for GED information.)	49	31	45.5% of nonschool-age adults for whom earning a GED was a goal, did earn a GED.
4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	*Please indicate diploma or GED Diploma	*Please indicate diploma or GED Diploma	*Please indicate diploma or GED Diploma	Not applicable
				The total number of all children the year before kindergarten who were enrolled in Even Start for at least six months during FY06 was 357; 147 of these were non-LEP and 210 were LEP. Projects did not report the reason for not administering the PPVT-III to eligible children in FY06; this has been corrected for FY07. To facilitate test administration and scoring, ISBE offered training to all projects in how to administer the PPVT-III.
				Estimated testing status:
				Tested--LEP=21, non-LEP=49
				Did Not Understand--LEP=140, non-LEP=0
				Severe Disability--LEP=30, non-LEP=30
				Unknown--LEP=19, non-LEP=68
				Total--LEP=210, non-LEP=147
				A total of 70 children took pre-and post-tests, with at least 6 months of services in between; 48 (69%) achieved significant learning gains. The total includes all non-LEP children

5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: 70	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: 48	and LEP children who understood the directions in English. The sample of 70 includes 49 non-LEP children. Of these 49 non-LEP children, 35 (71%) achieved significant learning gains. Of the 70 children, the mean pretest was 78.16 and the mean posttest was 88.04, with a mean gain of 9.89. The mean gain was 10.20 for the 49 non-LEP children.
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: PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: 113.00	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask: 16.00 *Please indicate average score, not number of participants.	A total of 113 children with at least 6 months of services in between pre- and post-testing had PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter scores. The weighted average number of letters children can identify is 15.96. The total includes all non-LEP children and LEP children who understood the directions in English. The sample of 113 includes 76 non-LEP children; the weighted average number of letters identified by these children is 16.82. Of the 113 children, the mean pretest was 10.65 and the mean posttest was 15.96, with a mean gain of 5.31. For the non-LEP children, the mean gain was 5.05.
7. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level	Illinois State Board of Education FLAIR Form 10, Continuous Progress in Language and Literacy Development and Literacy Please indicate source. Illinois State Board of Education FLAIR Form 10, Continuous Progress in Language and Literacy Development and Literacy	755 Please indicate source. Illinois State Board of Education FLAIR Form 10, Continuous Progress in Language and Literacy Development and Literacy	469 Please indicate source. Illinois State Board of Education FLAIR Form 10, Continuous Progress in Language and Literacy Development and Literacy	<p>The FY06 performance target for students assessed with FLAIR was 50% meet Performance Level 3, Proficient. The target was exceeded as 62.12% Grade K-3 students were rated at the proficient level.</p> <p>Breakdowns by grade are:</p> <p>Kindergarten--Cohort=308, Result=197, 63.96%</p> <p>Grade 1--Cohort=211, Result=130, 61.61%</p> <p>Grade 2--Cohort=148, Result=90, 60.81%</p> <p>Grade 3--Cohort=88, Result=52, 59.09%</p> <p>NA</p>

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) Illinois State Board of Education Flair Form 16, Interactive Parents-Children Behavior	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	<p>PEP Cohort & Result = Not applicable</p> <p>All projects are required to use the ISBE FLAIR Form 16, Interactive Parents-Children Behavior, instrument to assess the degree to which families demonstrate at least one of the interactive behaviors identified or learned during interactive literacy parent-child activities or parenting education activities. Of the 2,302 families assessed, 2,255 (98%) independently demonstrated at least one interactive behavior. The average number of behaviors demonstrated per family is 5.1.</p>
--	---	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

Comments: Cohort and Result data are #s, NOT %s.

#1--CASAS is not applicable.

#2--IL uses BEST/CELSA, not CASAS. B/C Cohort=597, B/C Result=396

Target was set at 65% for the total group of adults who attended 75+ hours of adult education. 66.33% met target. Targets were met for the Beginning Literacy and Beginning levels. Results summary by level:

Beg Lit--Cohort=21, Result=19, 90%

Beg--Cohort=297, Result=237, 80%

Low Intermed--Cohort=88, Result=55, 63%

High Intermed--Cohort=111, Result=58, 52%

Low Adv ESL--Cohort=69, Result=22, 32%

High Adv ESL--Cohort=11, Result=5, 45%

ISBE will revise cut scores slightly in FY07 based on the new NRS levels.

Current state criteria for expected point gains:

Beg Lit: BEST=14, CELSA=--

Beg: BEST=11, CELSA=7.5

Low Intermed: BEST=6, CELSA=6

High Intermed: BEST=6, CELSA=5.4

Low Adv ASE: BEST=6, CELSA=4

High Adv ASE: BEST=--, CELSA=2

TABE is not applicable to this question in IL.

#6--15.96 in Cohort is number of letters, per USDE directions.

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 2005-2006.
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 2005-2006 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	Ungraded	Out of School	Total	
1. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN																			
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	84	253	151	124	138	141	111	101	147	112	124	109	89	76	49	1	295	2105	
2. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																			
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"		0	36	28	30	35	31	13	41	25	25	31	18	17	8	0	31	369	
3. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																			
1. Migrant Children who are LEP		8	46	30	45	44	29	29	39	22	15	11	9	8	2	0	1	338	
4. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION																			
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	10	
5. MOBILITY																			
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	66	95	43	37	38	38	29	24	46	52	66	46	56	47	16	0	56	755	
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	18	59	29	31	23	41	23	26	38	21	14	25	17	11	10	1	25	412	
3. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	1	62	35	30	31	36	30	19	33	19	26	17	8	13	7	0	36	403	
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)	34	111	67	63	57	68	38	38	61	38	38	33	19	30	17	0	64	776	

Comments: The number of migrant children eligible for MEP decreased approximately 27 percent from the 2004-2005 school year to the 2005-2006 school year.

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 2005-2006 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row

	Ages	Ages																Out of
	0-2	3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	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. Dropped out of school										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)						77	65	64	39	52	43			30				370
Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts						77	65	64	39	52	43			30				370
2. (State Assessment)						77	65	64	39	52	43			30				370
Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment –																		
3. Mathematics)						77	65	64	39	52	43			30				370
Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State						77	65	64	39	52	43			30				370
4. Assessment)						77	65	64	39	52	43			30				370

Comments: 1.1 and 1.2 These data are true zeros.

2.1-2.4 Illinois does not conduct state assessments in grades 9, 10, and 12, and does not conduct ungraded state assessments.

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 2005-2006 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 1305 (e) (2) – (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1305 (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		Ages	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	Out of School	Total
	0-2	3-5																	

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)	21	82	52	34	49	37	38	34	34	27	28	31	15	24	13	0	4	523
2. Priority for Service		0	29	14	25	20	24	15	22	17	14	20	11	13	4	0	2	230
3. Continuation of Service		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Any Instructional Service	17	77	46	32	39	32	32	24	27	24	25	25	14	21	9	0	0	444
5. Reading Instruction	0	34	43	24	34	21	28	24	26	24	24	24	14	20	9	0	0	349
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	34	43	24	34	21	28	24	26	24	24	24	14	20	9	0	0	349
7. High School Credit Accrual												8	6	8	2	0	1	25
8. Any Support Service	7	40	45	26	41	26	34	33	32	26	27	30	14	23	12	0	3	419
9. Counseling Service	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	4	2	5	3	0	1	28
10. Any Referred Service	0	0	2	0	3	3	1	1	1	6	1	4	2	4	0	0	0	28

Comments: The number of participants decreased approximately 204 percent from the 2004-2005 school year to the 2005-2006 school year.

3. Continuation of Service--These data are true zeros.

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/Interession Term

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	Out of School	Total
PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																		
1. Served in MEP Summer of Interession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	0	92	95	80	76	83	63	64	89	63	71	51	36	25	7	0	2	897
2. Priority for Service	0	0	24	16	20	13	8	12	26	8	10	7	6	3	1	0	1	155
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	0	92	95	80	76	83	63	64	89	63	71	51	36	25	7	0	2	897
5. Reading Instruction	0	92	95	80	76	83	62	64	85	59	67	25	22	20	5	0	1	836
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	80	92	69	76	82	62	64	87	62	69	48	35	21	7	0	1	855
7. High School Credit Accrual												30	20	14	2	0	0	66
8. Any Support Service	0	92	95	80	76	83	63	64	89	63	71	51	36	25	7	0	2	897
9. Counseling Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4	1	0	0	17
10. Any Referred Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Comments: The number of participants decreased approximately 28 percent from the 2004-2005 school year to the 2005-2006 school year.

3. Continuation of Service--These data are true zeros.

10. Any Referred Service--These data are true zeros.

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. 21	b. 1252
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 0	b. 0

Comments: The number of regular school participants decreased approximately 204 percent from the 2004-2005 school year to the 2005-2006 school year.

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. 0	b. 0
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. 8	b. 662
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (All MEP Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 3	b. 790

Comments: 1. Regular School Year, School Day Only--These data are true zeros.

2. Regular School Year, Extended Day/Week--These data are true zeros.

3. Number of MEP projects--The type of MEP Projects funded shifted to respond to changes in the migrant population in the state.

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 (columns a and c), 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 (columns b and d), enter the number of FTEs generated by the individuals who worked in the specific job classification. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.

Alternatively, calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each job classification in your state for each term. (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, or one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.

Use only the percentage of days worked by an individual that were 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 (b)	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION (c)	FTE IN SUMMER- TERM/ INTERSESSION (d)
2.3.1.5.2. KEY MEP PERSONNEL				
1. State Director	1	0.20	1	0.20
2. Teachers	6	3.20	72	65.40
3. Counselors	0	0.00	1	1.00
4. All Paraprofessionals	7	2.80	63	48.60
5. Qualified Paraprofessionals	5	2.60	51	39.90
6. Recruiters	4	2.50	13	9.20
7. Records Transfer Staff	2	1.20	9	7.50

Comments: The number of regular school participants decreased approximately 204 percent from the 2004-2005 school year to the 2005-2006 school year and the number of MEP-funded regular school year staff decreased.

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 2005-2006, defined as July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006.

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.

Program Definitions: (Definitions New)

Neglected Programs (N): An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.

NOTE: Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A in these tables.

Juvenile Detention Facilities (JD): Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.

Juvenile Corrections (JC): An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision.

NOTE: States should include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non secure facilities and group homes) in the JC category.

Adult Corrections (AC): An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons under 21 years of age, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.

Other (O): Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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. If no data are available for the requested information, leave that cell blank and add a note in the comments field.

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, juvenile detention facilities, juvenile correction facilities, adult correction centers, or other programs.

In the second column, enter the yearly average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit each student was enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included.

In the third 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.

Throughout the table, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified to ED for funding purposes. Indicate the number of multipurpose facilities in row 6.

2.4.1.1 State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities

Note: The unduplicated number of students reported in the far right column in this table should match the figures in the "All Students" row in Table 2.4.1.2.

Facility/Program type	Number of facilities/programs	Average length of stay (days)	Unduplicated Number of Neglected or Delinquent Students
1. Neglected Programs			
2. Juvenile Detention			
3. Juvenile Corrections	8	89	3148
4. Adult Corrections	9	154	948
5. Other			

6. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: 0

Comments: Illinois does not have any (1) Neglected Programs, (2) Juvenile Detention Programs, or (5) "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.

2.4.1.2 Student Demographics**Instructions: Student Demographics**

Report demographic data on students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 1. Report the number of students by program type and by race/ethnicity, gender, and age. This should be an unduplicated count of students. If no data are available for the requested information, leave that cell blank and add a note in the comments field.

NOTE: The unduplicated number of students on the "All Students" row in this table should match the figures reported in the far right column in Table 2.4.1.1. unduplicated count = all students row = race total = gender total = age total.

	Number in neglected programs	Number in juvenile detention	Number in juvenile correction	Number in adult correction	Number in other programs
All Students			3148	948	
RACE/ETHNICITY					
American Indian or Alaska Native			0	0	
Asian or Pacific Islander			4	1	
Black, non-Hispanic			1812	645	
Hispanic			315	113	
White, non-Hispanic			1017	189	
GENDER					
Male			2879	858	
Female			269	90	
AGE					
5-10 years old			0	0	
11-15 years old			462	0	
16-18 years old			2020	188	
19-21 years old			666	760	

Comments: Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.

2.4.1.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes

Indicate 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 who 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). Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. If no data are available for the requested information, leave that cell blank and add a note in the comments field.

For Section 1, items 1-3, report on the number of programs (not students) 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. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, Adult Corrections, or Other). These numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

For Section 2.1, 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, Adult Corrections, or Other).

For Section 2.1, 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, Adult Corrections, or Other).

For Section 2.2, 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, Adult Corrections, or Other).

For Section 2.2, 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, Adult Corrections, or Other).

2.4.1.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes

1. Facility Academic Offerings	Number of Neglected Programs	Number of Facilities/Programs		
		Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities	Number of Adult Corrections Facilities	Number of Other Programs
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)		8	0	
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)		8	0	
3. Awarded GED(s)		8	9	
2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes	Number in Neglected Programs	Number of Students		
		Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention	Number of Adult Corrections Facilities	Number of Other Programs
1. Academic				
While in the facility, the number of students who...				
1. Earned high school course credits		2553	0	
2. Were enrolled in a GED program		203	432	
While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...				
3. Enrolled in their local district school		164		
4. Earned a GED		106	108	
5. Obtained high school diploma		53		
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education		5	41	
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education			32	
2. Vocational				
While in the facility, the number of students who...				
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		58	56	
While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...				
2. Enrolled in external job training education		58		
3. Obtained employment				

Comments: Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.

Academic and Vocational Outcomes--

3. # of Adult Corrections Facilities: Not Sufficient Data to Report

5. # of Adult Corrections Facilities: Not Sufficient Data to Report

7. # in Juvenile Corrections: Not Sufficient Data to Report

Vocational--

2. # of Adult Corrections Facilities: Not Sufficient Data to Report

3. # in Juvenile Corrections and # of Adult Corrections Facilities: Not Sufficient Data to Report

2.4.1.6. Academic Performance in Reading and Math

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 students in neglected programs, juvenile corrections and/or detention, adult corrections, or other programs who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006.

Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2005 may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the tables, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. If no data are available for the requested information, leave that cell blank and add a note in the comments field.

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs (N), students in juvenile corrections and/or detention (JD/JC), students in adult corrections (AC), and students in other programs (O).

For row 1, enter the number of long-term students who were in placement during the reporting year.

For row 2, enter the number of long-term students who tested below grade level in reading or math (respectively) when they entered the facility or program.

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

For rows 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to + grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students should be reported in only one of these five change categories. The sum of rows 4-8 should be equal to the number provided in row 3.

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance in Reading and Math

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of Long-Term Students							
	Reading Performance				Math Performance			
	N	JD/JC	AC	O	N	JD/JC	AC	O
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006		2573	834			2513	840	
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.		2060	762			2054	773	
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test exams		979	505			980	509	
4. # students from row 3 who showed negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		129	71			133	62	
5. # students from row 3 who showed no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		61	27			73	16	
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		114	72			161	56	
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		337	98			336	87	
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		338	237			277	288	

Comments: Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.

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 2005-2006, defined as July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006.

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.

Program Definitions: (New Definitions)

Neglected Programs (N): An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.

NOTE: Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A in these tables.

Juvenile Detention Facilities (JD): Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.

Juvenile Corrections (JC): An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision.

NOTE: States should include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in the JC category.

At-Risk Programs (AR) or Other (O): Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school. Other is any other program, not defined above, which receives Title I, Part D funds and serves non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.4.2.1 Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students**Instructions: Local Education 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 2 funds. If no data are available for the requested information, leave that cell blank and add a note in the comments field.

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 neglected programs, juvenile detention facilities, juvenile correction facilities, and at-risk or other programs.

In the second column, enter the yearly average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit each student was enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included.

In the third 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.

Throughout the table, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified to ED for funding purposes. Indicate the number of multipurpose facilities in row 5.

Note: The unduplicated number of students reported in the far right column in this table should match the figures reported in the "All Students" row in Table 2.4.2.2.

Facility/Program type	Number of facilities/programs	Average length of stay (days)	Unduplicated Number of Neglected or Delinquent Students
1. Neglected Programs	21	282	939
2. Juvenile Detention	5	35	3588
3. Juvenile Corrections			
4. At-risk Programs or Other	2	118	119
5. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose:			0
Comments: 3. Juvenile Corrections--Funded under Subpart 1 only.			

2.4.2.2 STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS**Instructions: Student Demographics**

Report demographic data on students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 2. Report the number of students by program type and by race/ethnicity, gender, and age. This should be an unduplicated count of students. If no data are available for the requested information, leave that cell blank and add a note in the comments field.

NOTE: The unduplicated number of students on the "All Students" row in this table should match the figures reported in the far right column in Table 2.4.2.1. unduplicated count = all students row = race total = gender total = age total.

	Number in neglected programs	Number in juvenile detention	Number in juvenile correction	Number in at risk or other programs
All Students	939	3588		119
RACE/ETHNICITY				
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7	1		0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	7		1
Black, non-Hispanic	556	2717		33
Hispanic	69	450		14
White, non-Hispanic	307	413		71
GENDER				
Male	602	3385		79
Female	337	203		40
AGE				
5-10 years old	68	12		0
11-15 years old	437	1985		96
16-18 years old	382	1574		23
19-21 years old	52	17		0

Comments: Juvenile Corrections programs are funded under Subpart 1 only.

Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes

Indicate 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 who 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). Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. At-risk /other program columns are provided for States for reporting outcome data, as available. If no data are available for the requested information, leave that cell blank and add a note in the comments field.

For Section 1, items 1-3, report on the number of programs (not students) 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. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or At-Risk/Other). These numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

For Section 2.1, 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 At-Risk/Other).

For Section 2.1, 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 At-Risk/Other).

For Section 2.2, 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 At-Risk/Other).

For Section 2.2, 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 At-Risk/Other).

2.4.2.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes			
1. Facility Academic Offerings	Number of Facilities/Programs		
	Number of Neglected Programs	Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities	Number of At Risk or Other Programs
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)	18	5	2
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)	16	4	2
3. Awarded GED(s)	3	1	1
2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes	Number of Students		
	Number in Neglected Programs	Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention	Number in At Risk or Other Programs
1. Academic			
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>			
1. Earned high school course credits	529	3134	98
2. Were enrolled in a GED program	21	0	6
<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	619	2179	103
4. Earned a GED	5	0	6
5. Obtained high school diploma	39	2	0
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education	16	14	1
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education	21	8	1
2. Vocational			
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>			
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	126	57	
<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	12	0	
3. Obtained employment	104	2	
Comments: Juvenile Corrections programs are funded under Subpart 1 only; therefore, column 3 is Juvenile Detention Facilities only.			
Vocational--			
Number in At-Risk or Other Programs: Not Sufficient Data to Report			

2.4.2.6. Academic Performance in Reading and Math**Instructions:**

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 students in neglected programs, juvenile corrections and/or detention, adult corrections, or other programs who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006.

Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2005 may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the tables, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. At-risk /other program columns are provided for States for reporting performance data, as available. If no data are available for the requested information, leave that cell blank and add a note in the comments field.

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs (N), students in juvenile corrections and/or detention (JD/JC), students in at-risk or other programs (AR/O).

For row 1, enter the number of long-term students who were in placement during the reporting year.

For row 2, enter the number of long-term students who tested below grade level in reading or math (respectively) when they entered the facility or program.

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

For rows 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to ½ grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students should be reported in only one of these five change categories. The sum of rows 4-8 should be equal to the number provided in row 3.

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance in Reading and Math

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of Long-Term Students					
	Reading Performance			Math Performance		
	N	JD/JC	AR/O	N	JD/JC	AR/O
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006	830	3056	58	691	3053	58
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.	530	1708	36	379	1704	46
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test exams	562	9	37	493	5	37
4. # students from row 3 who showed negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	98	0	2	91	0	3
5. # students from row 3 who showed no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	78	1	8	86	0	7
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	210	0	4	168	0	4
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	112	0	9	78	2	9
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	64	8	14	70	3	14

Comments: Juvenile Corrections programs are funded under Subpart 1 only; therefore, information in the JD/JC columns is Juvenile Detention only.

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 2005-2006 school year.

62.80

Comments:

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 2005-2006 school year.

66.60

Comments:

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

529

Comments:

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

Performance data for this program will be available from other sources, including State Educational Technology indicators in EDEN.

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:

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

Note: The target information submitted for 2003-2004, 2004-2005, and 2005-2006 cannot be changed from the figures established as part of your 2004-2005 CSPR submission. At the completion of the Part II CSPR submission cycle, ED will analyze the figures submitted as part of the 2004-2005 CSPR against those submitted in the 2005-2006 CSPR and ask states to reconcile any differences.

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: Every two years	2003-2004	2004-2005 14%
			2004-2005 8%	2005-2006
			2005-2006	
		Year of most recent collection: 2005	2006-2007 6% 2007-2008	Baseline: 11% Year Established: 2001

Comments: Not collected in 2003

Collected every two years; therefore, not collected for school year 2005-06.

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
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: Every two years	2003-2004	2004-2005 6.1%
			2004-2005 5%	2005-2006
			2005-2006	
		Year of most recent collection: 2005	2006-2007 3% 2007-2008	Baseline: 8.6% Year Established: 2001

Comments: Not collected in 2003

Collected every two years; therefore, not collected for school year 2005-06.

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
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: Every two years	2003-2004	2004-2005 10.6%
			2004-2005 6%	2005-2006
			2005-2006	
		Year of most recent collection: 2005	2006-2007 5% 2007-2008	Baseline: 10.2% Year Established: 2001

Comments: Not collected in 2003

Collected every two years; therefore, not collected for school year 2005-06.

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
		Frequency: Every two years	2003-2004	2004-2005 25.1%
			2004-2005 18%	2005-2006
			2005-2006	

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.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Year of most recent collection: 2005	2006-2007 42%	Baseline: 22.9% Year Established: 2001
			2007-2008	

Comments: Not collected in 2003

Collected every two years; therefore, not collected for school year 2005-06.

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
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.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: Every two years	2003-2004	2004-2005 13.2%
			2004-2005 12%	2005-2006
		Year of most recent collection: 2005	2006-2007 10%	Baseline: 16.1% Year Established: 2001
			2007-2008	

Comments: Not collected in 2003

Collected every two years; therefore, not collected for school year 2005-06.

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
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.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: Every two years	2003-2004	2004-2005 25.1%
			2004-2005 18%	2005-2006
		Year of most recent collection: 2005	2006-2007 16%	Baseline: 22.9% Year Established: 2001
			2007-2008	

Comments: Not collected in 2003

Collected every two years; therefore, not collected for school year 2005-06.

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
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.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: Every two years	2003-2004	2004-2005 30.2%
			2004-2005 23%	2005-2006
		Year of most recent collection: 2005	2006-2007 20%	Baseline: 28.4% Year Established: 2001
			2007-2008	

Comments: Not collected in 2003

Collected every two years; therefore, not collected for school year 2005-06.

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
8) The number of students who tried marijuana before age 13, divided by the total number of respondents to this	Youth Risk	Frequency: Every two years	2003-2004	2004-2005 19.5%
			2004-2005 4%	2005-2006
		Year of most recent collection: 2005	2006-2007 3%	Baseline: 6.6%
			2007-2008	

question on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, multiplied by 100.	Behavior Survey	recent collection: 2005	2007-2008	Year Established: 2001
--	-----------------	-------------------------	-----------	------------------------

Comments: Not collected in 2003

Collected every two years; therefore, not collected for school year 2005-06.

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
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.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: Every two years	2003-2004	2004-2005 19.5%
			2004-2005 15%	2005-2006
			2005-2006	
		Year of most recent collection: 2005	2006-2007 13% 2007-2008	Baseline: 20% Year Established: 2001

Comments: Not collected in 2003

Collected every two years; therefore, not collected for school year 2005-06.

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
Comments:	

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 2005-2006	
	school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	19363	845
Middle	16623	845
High School	19572	845
EXPULSIONS	Number for 2005-2006	
	school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	136	845
Middle	146	845
High School	676	845

Comments: There are 21 fewer operating districts to report this year. School districts appear to have increased their expulsion rates and decreased their suspension rates.

2.7.2.3 The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession

State definition of weapons: A weapon, as defined in 18 USC 921.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2005-2006 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary School	774	845
Middle School	585	845
High School	979	845
EXPULSIONS	Number for 2005-2006 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary School	114	845
Middle School	103	845
High School	236	845

Comments: There are 21 fewer operating districts to report this year. School districts appear to have increased their expulsion rates and decreased their suspension rates.

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 2005-2006 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary School	77	845
Middle School	146	845
High School	1283	845
EXPULSIONS	Number for 2005-2006 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary School	7	845
Middle School	6	845
High School	88	845

Comments: There are 21 fewer operating districts to report this year. School districts appear to have increased their expulsion rates and decreased their suspension rates.

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 2005-2006 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary School	188	845
Middle School	690	845
High School	3539	845
EXPULSIONS	Number for 2005-2006 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary School	38	845
Middle School	119	845
High School	651	845

Comments: There are 21 fewer operating districts to report this year. School districts appear to have increased their expulsion rates and decreased their suspension rates.

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)

All information should be for the 2005-2006 school year.

2.8.8 Section 5122 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended, requires States to provide an annual statewide summary of how Title V, Part A funds are contributing to improving student academic performance and the quality of education for students. The statute further requires that those summaries be based on evaluations provided to the State by local educational agencies (LEAs) receiving program funds.

Please attach your statewide summary. You can upload file by entering the file name and location in the box below or use the browse button to search for the file as you would when attaching a file to an e-mail. The maximum file size for this upload is 4 meg.

2.8.9 Indicate the NUMBER of LEAs that completed Title V, Part A needs assessments that the State determined to be credible.

884

Comments:

2.8.10 Indicate the AMOUNT of Title V, Part A funds in dollars (including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A under the Transferability authority in Section 6123(b)) that LEAs used for the four strategic priorities listed below. (Include all LEAs, not just LEAs that spent at least 85 percent for the four strategic priorities.)

\$ 13859885

The **4 strategic priorities** are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and math, (2) improve the quality of teachers, (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free, (4) promote access for all students to a quality education.

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the ESEA that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 19-20, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23-24.

Comments:

2.8.11 In the table below, please provide the following information for LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds.

First row:

- The number of LEAs that used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds (including funds transferred into their Title V allocations from other programs) for the four strategic priorities above, and
- The number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP)

Second row:

- The number of LEAs that did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds (including funds transferred into their Title V allocations from other programs for the four strategic priorities), and
- The number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP

LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	NUMBER of these LEAs	NUMBER of these LEAs that met AYP
Number of LEAs that <u>used at least 85%</u> of Title V, Part A funds (including funds transferred into Title V, Part A) for the 4 priorities listed above	688	531
Number of LEAs that <u>did not use at least 85%</u> of Title V, Part A funds (including funds transferred into Title V, Part A) for the 4 priorities listed above	196	137
	884	668
TOTAL	(total = all LEAS receiving Title V, Part A funds) 884	(total = all LEAS receiving Title V, Part A funds <u>that met</u> AYP) 668

Note: Allocations should include any funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132 (b).

Comments:

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 2005-2006 school year.

77

Comments:**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 2005-2006 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	1
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	6
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	10
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	4
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	3

Comments:

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.

In the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, the Illinois State Board of Education indicated that the measure of success of this program would be in improving student academic achievement, decreasing student dropout rates, and increasing the percentage of highly qualified teachers.

Twelve rural school districts received this grant in 2005-2006. Substantial progress has been made by these school districts in reaching the program goals. Of these 12 school districts, 10 have now improved student academic achievement to where the school district is making adequate yearly progress. All comparisons were made between the 2004 and 2006 Illinois Standards Achievement Test or Prairie State Achievement Examination data.

The two school districts that did not achieve adequate yearly progress are Cairo Unit School District 1 and Mount Vernon School District 80. In Cairo Unit School District 1, there has been substantial growth in reading and mathematics. In reading, the school district has increased from 33.3 percent of the students meeting or exceeding the Illinois Learning Standards to 46.3 percent meeting or exceeding. In mathematics, the school district has increased from 31.4 percent of the students meeting or exceeding the Illinois Learning Standards to 55.2 percent meeting or exceeding.

Mount Vernon School District 80 has shown similar growth. In 2004, the reading assessment data indicated that 56.8 percent of the students met or exceeded the Illinois Learning Standards, compared with 62.7 percent in 2006. In mathematics, 64.2 percent of the students met or exceeded the Illinois Learning Standards in 2004, compared with 74.3 percent in 2006.

Of these two school districts, only Cairo has a high school population, with a graduation rate that increased from 92.8 percent in 2004 to 100 percent in 2006. In Mount Vernon, the attendance rate for the school district has remained constant at around 94 percent.

In relation to highly qualified teachers, 83 percent of the school districts now have all of their teachers highly qualified, with one school district at 99 percent and one at 94 percent.

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 2005-2006 school year?

No

Comments:

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 2005-2006 school year.

234

Comments:

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)	29	52179
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	4	8357
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	9	26584
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	125	2973980
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	67	533355
Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>FROM</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>FROM</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	113	3286550
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	5	3389
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	90	257622
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	26	46894

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

Comments:

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.