

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 2007-08**

ILLINOIS



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 19, 2008**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 27, 2009**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 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: 10/31/2010
<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, 2007-08 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
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: 217-782-0354		
Fax: 217-782-5333		
e-mail: cwise@isbe.net		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Christopher A. Koch		
Signature _____		<u>Friday, May 8, 2009, 2:00:48 PM</u> Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 27, 2009
5PM EST**

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's *NCLB* assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's *NCLB* mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	53,820	39,662	73.7
4	50,232	36,858	73.4
5	49,764	34,332	69.0
6	45,590	31,820	69.8
7	42,512	28,174	66.3
8	43,422	28,928	66.6
High School	18,756	3,748	20.0
Total	304,096	203,522	66.9

Comments: These numbers include students who took the assessment and received a score but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students. (EDEN does not allow for inclusion of these students.)

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	53,481	30,577	57.2
4	49,916	29,326	58.8
5	49,497	28,592	57.8
6	45,356	30,017	66.2
7	42,315	27,913	66.0
8	43,239	30,731	71.1
High School	18,744	4,106	21.9
Total	302,548	181,262	59.9

Comments: These numbers include students who took the assessment and received a score but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students. (EDEN does not allow for inclusion of these students.)

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's *NCLB* mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b) (3) of *ESEA*. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	52,944	47,186	89.1
4	51,430	45,115	87.7
5	48,915	41,398	84.6
6	35,121	30,042	85.5
7	30,787	25,510	82.9
8	30,569	25,395	83.1
High School	33,405	18,649	55.8
Total	283,171	233,295	82.4

Comments: These numbers include students who took the assessment and received a score but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students. (EDEN does not allow for inclusion of these students.)

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	52,886	40,134	75.9
4	51,407	39,247	76.3
5	48,893	37,836	77.4
6	35,054	28,405	81.0
7	30,772	24,167	78.5
8	30,518	25,218	82.6
High School	33,392	18,457	55.3
Total	282,922	213,464	75.4

Comments: These numbers include students who took the assessment and received a score but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students. (EDEN does not allow for inclusion of these students.)

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

2.1.2.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SWP or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	77,790
Limited English proficient students	73,100
Students who are homeless	10,529
Migratory students	547
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category sets B, C, D and E.

2.1.2.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either public Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,612
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,946
Black, non-Hispanic	212,230
Hispanic	194,109
White, non-Hispanic	140,558
Total	558,455
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category set A.

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

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2		1,098			1,098
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	509	11,485	40	3	12,037
K	7,881	43,744	923	19	52,567
1	12,739	47,830	1,215	32	61,816
2	11,804	46,662	1,327	34	59,827
3	9,335	47,682	1,153	26	58,196
4	7,750	44,150	1,080	17	52,997
5	6,221	43,531	1,044	18	50,814
6	4,257	38,775	959	12	44,003
7	3,115	35,665	817	13	39,610
8	3,035	36,552	873	13	40,473
9	8,526	30,056	471	9	39,062
10	4,556	24,451	228	4	29,239
11	2,706	16,800	182	10	19,698
12	1,910	15,905	17	2	17,834
Ungraded		247	94	8	349
TOTALS	84,344	484,633	10,423	220	579,620
Comments:					

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X134, that is data group 670, category set A.

2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections request data about the participation of students in TAS.

2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Mathematics	22,934
Reading/language arts	75,855
Science	7,221
Social studies	6,268
Vocational/career	
Other instructional services	1,955
Comments: Illinois does not collect Vocational/Career data on student participation in Title I, Part A, Targeted Assistance Programs.	

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036 that is data group 549, category set A.

2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	2,298
Supporting guidance/advocacy	6,280
Other support services	739
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036, that is data group 549, category set B.

2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of *ESEA*.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	1,640.20	
Paraprofessionals ¹	497.80	
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	212.30	
Clerical support staff	31.40	
Administrators (non-clerical)	67.50	
Comments: The Illinois data collection instrument was not revised in time to collect the SY 2007-08 percentage of qualified paraprofessionals due to a changeover in program administration.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on staff information

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
 - (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
 - (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
 - (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
 - (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
 - (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
 - (6) Acting as a translator; or
 - (7) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?"* Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>.

¹ Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

² Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(e).

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of *ESEA*. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	6,890.00	99.6
Comments: The Illinois data collection instrument collects this information for both schoolwide and targeted assistance programs, with no separation of data. The data collection instrument was not revised in time to collect only schoolwide program data for SY 2007-08 due to a changeover in program administration. Therefore, the total number of FTE paraprofessionals (6,890) and the percentage qualified (99.6%) includes both schoolwide AND targeted assistance programs. The total number of these schoolwide AND targeted assistance FTE paraprofessionals meeting qualifications is 6,861.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

³ Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

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 reporting program year July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008, please provide the following information:

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	33
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

In the table below, provide the number of participants for each of the groups listed below. The following terms apply:

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2007. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules.

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	951
2. Adults participating	980
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	411
4. Participating children	1,302
a. Birth through 2 years	527
b. Age 3 through 5	571
c. Age 6 through 8	166
c. Above age 8	38
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of newly enrolled families for each of the groups listed below. The term "newly enrolled family" means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project or who had previously been in Even Start and re-enrolls during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	652
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	672
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	542
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	523
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9 th grade at the time of enrollment	323
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2008). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. **Report each family only once in lines 1-4.** Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	95
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days or less	192
3. Number of families enrolled more than 180 days but 365 days or less	389
4. Number of families enrolled more than 365 days	275
5. Total families enrolled	951
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators.

In the space below, provide any explanatory information necessary for understanding the data provided in this section on performance indicators.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois has made tremendous progress toward meeting the federal performance indicators. Program staff routinely use data available from the state web-based system to review progress of participants and to make programming decisions.

The number exempted for PALS (N=63) is slightly higher than the number exempted for PPVT (N=58). This can be attributed to one project that served a large number of LEP children age 3-5. The project's school district had a philosophy of early childhood education instruction in the child's native language. Thus, although the school district was willing to test children on the PPVT if they understood the instructions, the school district was not willing to test children on the PALS, with the rationale that because all alphabet instruction was conducted in Spanish, any gains in English alphabets could not be directly attributed to the project.

Illinois uses the Illinois State Board of Education FLAIR Form 11 to assess reading readiness and reading level; this instrument is closely aligned with Illinois State Goal 1: Read with understanding and fluency. In FY08, 59 percent of children in grades K-3 met the achievement goal.

All projects are required to use the Illinois State Board of Education 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. In FY08, 98.3 percent of families independently demonstrated at least one interactive behavior, and the average number of behaviors demonstrated per family was 5.6 The FLAIR Form 16 was developed by a team of Illinois evaluators, child educators, family educators, and Even Start staff, and is closely aligned with the goals of projects in Illinois.

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. To be counted under "pre- and post-test", an individual must have completed **both** the pre- and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE).

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

Note: Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			<p>The target was set at 65% for the total group of adults who attended 75+ hours of adult education; 65% met the target.</p> <p>Summary of results by level-- Beg. Literacy: Cohort = 2 / Result = 2 / 100% Beginning: Cohort = 4 / Result = 3 / 75% Low Intermed.: Cohort = 23 / Result = 14 / 61% High Intermed.: Cohort = 39 / Result = 25 / 64% Low Adv. ASE: Cohort = 25 / Result = 16 / 64% High Adv. ASE: Cohort = 6 / Result = 4 / 67%</p> <p>Current state criteria for gains-- Beg. Literacy: Expected point gain = 20 Beginning: Expected point gain = 30 Low Intermed.: Expected point gain = 30 High Intermed.: Expected point gain = 20 Low Adv. ASE: Expected point gain = 10 High Adv. ASE: Expected point gain = 10</p>
	99	64	
CASAS			
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.2 Adult English Learners Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of Adult English Learners who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
BEST			<p>The target was set at 65% for the total group of adult English learners who attended 75+ hours of adult education; 69% met the target.</p> <p>Current state criteria for gains-- Beg. ESL Literacy: Expected point gain = 14 Low Beg. ESL: Expected point gain = 11 High Beg. ESL: Expected point gain = 11 Low Inter. ESL: Expected point gain = 6 High Inter. & Advanced ESL: Expected point gain = 6</p>
	144	99	
CASAS			
TABE			
Other			<p>Illinois permits programs to use the BEST Literacy, the Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA), or the BEST Plus for assessing learning gains in reading. Data included in the "BEST" category below if from BEST Literacy. However, the target of 65% is for the combined reporting of all three assessments, not just the BEST. The number pre- and post-tested and the number who met the goal of 65% are listed below for the three assessments and for the combined results.</p>

BEST: # Pre- & Post-tested = 144 / # Met Goal = 99
BEST Plus: # Pre- & Post-tested = 46 / # Met Goal = 32
CELSA: # Pre- & Post-tested = 58 / # Met Goal = 36
Total: # Pre- & Post-tested = 248 / # Met Goal = 167

The target was set at 65% for the total group of adults who attended 75+ hours of adult education; 67% met the target.

Summary of results by level--

Beg. ESL Literacy: Cohort = 23 / Result = 19 / 83%

Low Beg. ESL: Cohort = 43 / Result = 31 / 72%

High Beg. ESL: Cohort = 57 / Result = 34 / 60%

Low Inter. ESL: Cohort = 48 / Result = 33 / 69%

High Inter. & Advanced ESL: Cohort = 44 / Result = 29 / 66%

Advanced ESL: Cohort = 33 / Result = 21 / 64%

Current state criteria for gains (Expected Point Gains)--

Beg. ESL Literacy: BEST = 14 / BEST Plus = 9 / CELSA = --

Low Beg. ESL: BEST = 11 / BEST Plus = 7 / CELSA = --

High Beg. ESL: BEST = 11 / BEST Plus = 21 / CELSA = 8

Low Inter. ESL: BEST = 6 / BEST Plus = 29 / CELSA = 6

High Inter. & Advanced ESL: BEST = 6 / BEST Plus = 17 / CELSA = 6

Advanced ESL: BEST = 6 / BEST Plus = 17 / CELSA = 3

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

In the table below, provide the number of school-age and non-school age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED during the reporting year.

The following terms apply:

1. "School-age adults" is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. Include only the number of adult participants who had a realistic 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 attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	19	15	
GED	18	13	
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	15	9	
GED	72	34	
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.4 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development

In the table below, provide the number of children who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre- and post-test with at least 6 months of Even Start service in between.
3. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	144	79	56	59	Tested = 79 Not Tested = 65 Reasons for Not Tested: 58 = inability to understand the directions in English 1 = severe disability 6 = missing data/unknown
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					
Comments:					

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.4.1 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age-Appropriate Oral Language Skills

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PPVT-III or TVIP in the spring of the reporting year.
3. # who met goal includes children who score a Standard Score of 85 or higher on the spring PPVT-III
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Note: Projects may use the PPVT-III or the PPVT-IV if the PPVT-III is no longer available, but results for the two versions of the assessment should be reported separately.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	144	79	48	59	Tested = 79 Not Tested = 65 Reasons for Not Tested: 58 = inability to understand the directions in English 1 = severe disability 6 = missing data/unknown
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					
Comments:					

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

2.2.2.5 The Average Number of Letters Children Can Identify as Measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2008.
3. The term "average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	144	76	64	15.4	Tested = 76 Not Tested = 68 Reasons for Not Tested: 63 = inability to understand the directions in English 1 = severe disability 4 = missing data/unknown
Comments:					

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

In the table below, provide the number of school-age children who read on or above grade level ("met goal"). The source of these data is usually determined by the State and, in some cases, by school district. Please indicate the source(s) of the data in the "Explanation" field.

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	86	53	ISBE FLAIR Form 11.K: Reading Readiness and Reading Level for Kindergarten
1	44	26	ISBE FLAIR Form 11.1: Reading Readiness and Reading Level for First Grade
2	27	14	ISBE FLAIR Form 11.2: Reading Readiness and Reading Level for Second Grade
3	9	5	ISBE FLAIR Form 11.3: Reading Readiness and Reading Level for Third Grade
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.7 Parents Who Show Improvement on Measures of Parental Support for Children's Learning in the Home, School Environment, and Through Interactive Learning Activities

In the table below, provide the number of parents who show improvement ("met goal") on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities.

While many states are using the PEP, other assessments of parenting education are acceptable. Please describe results and the source(s) of any non-PEP data in the "Other" field, with appropriate information in the Explanation field.

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I			
PEP Scale II			
PEP Scale III			
PEP Scale IV			
Other	947	931	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 947 families assessed, 931 (98.3 percent) independently demonstrated at least one interactive behavior. The average number of behaviors demonstrated per family was 5.6.
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children;
- Academic data of eligible migrant students;
- Participation data – migrant children served during either the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year;
- School data;
- Project data;
- Personnel data.

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the reporting period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the reporting period would only be reported in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

FAQs at 1.10 contain definitions of out-of-school and ungraded that are used in this section.

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by age/grade. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	139
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	272
K	139
1	110
2	124
3	106
4	100
5	116
6	101
7	109
8	143
9	121
10	112
11	103
12	35
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	185
Total	2,015
Comments:	

Source – All rows except for "age birth through 2" are populated with the data provided in Part I, Section 1.10, Question 1.10.1.

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	27
1	24
2	25
3	27
4	26
5	22
6	27
7	28
8	40
9	27
10	46
11	29
12	24
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	55
Total	427

Comments: The difference between the priority for services count in SY 2006-07 and SY 2007-08 reflects fluctuations in the migrant population from year to year. Many migrant children come to Illinois only during the summer months and may not return the following year.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on priority for services:

Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	26
1	19
2	22
3	16
4	15
5	8
6	17
7	13
8	14
9	11
10	6
11	8
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	183
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) under Part B or Part C of the *IDEA*. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2
K	2
1	1
2	4
3	2
4	3
5	4
6	3
7	4
8	11
9	11
10	10
11	10
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	5
Total	77

Comments: The difference between the total number reported for SY 2006-07 and SY 2007-08 reflects fluctuations in the migrant population from year to year; many migrant children come to Illinois only during the summer months and may not return the following year.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	94	37	8	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	127	88	40	17
K	68	34	20	17
1	47	32	21	10
2	50	38	15	21
3	43	27	23	14
4	45	26	19	9
5	64	19	15	18
6	50	29	14	8
7	60	21	12	16
8	91	19	16	17
9	87	15	9	10
10	80	15	10	7
11	72	14	7	10
12	17	10	5	3
Ungraded	0	0	0	0
Out-of-school	87	62	26	10
Total	1,082	486	260	187

Comments: The difference between the total number reported for SY 2006-07 and SY 2007-08 reflects fluctuations in the migrant population from year to year; many migrant children come to Illinois only during the summer months and may not return the following year.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	56
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	126
K	64
1	47
2	50
3	53
4	50
5	44
6	38
7	32
8	31
9	27
10	33
11	20
12	13
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	74
Total	758
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.2 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of **eligible** migrant students.

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropped Out
7	0
8	0
9	1
10	1
11	2
12	2
Ungraded	0
Total	6
Comments: The total number of dropouts identified for SY 2007-08 is correct.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public or private school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2007-08 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your state.

Obtained a GED in your state	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.2.3 Participation in State NCLB Assessments

The following questions collect data about the participation of eligible migrant students in State NCLB Assessments.

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students enrolled in school during the State testing window and tested by the State *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment by grade level. The totals are calculated automatically.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	54	54
4	58	58
5	59	59
6	52	52
7	48	48
8	43	43
9	0	0
10	0	0
11	35	34
12	0	0
Ungraded	0	0
Total	349	348

Comments: Illinois does not administer state assessments at grades 9, 10, and 12; Illinois does not have ungraded migrant students.

The difference between the total number reported for SY 2006-07 and SY 2007-08 reflects fluctuations in the migrant population from year to year; the number of migrant students who remain in Illinois through the state testing window varies from year to year.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

This section is similar to 2.3.2.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on migrant students and the State's *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	54	54
4	58	58
5	59	59
6	52	52
7	48	48
8	43	43
9	0	0
10	0	0
11	35	34
12	0	0
Ungraded	0	0
Total	349	348

Comments: Illinois does not administer state assessments at grades 9, 10, and 12; Illinois does not have ungraded migrant students.

The difference between the total number reported for SY 2006-07 and SY 2007-08 reflects fluctuations in the migrant population from year to year; the number of migrant students who remain in Illinois through the state testing window varies from year to year.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant students served during the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year.

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children who continued to receive services (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section 1304(e)(1–3)).

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I SWP where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who were served by a "referred" service only.

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

The following questions collect data on migrant children who participated in the MEP during the **regular** school year. Do not include:

- Children who were only served during the summer/intersession term.

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. Do **not** count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	9
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	65
K	44
1	27
2	36
3	17
4	15
5	23
6	17
7	21
8	21
9	16
10	16
11	11
12	9
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	348
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	5
K	10
1	7
2	8
3	2
4	7
5	9
6	6
7	6
8	9
9	9
10	10
11	7
12	6
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	101
Comments: The data for Table 2.3.3.1.2 were obtained at the time of service, at which time there were five participating migrant children counted in the Age 3 through 5 category. The data for Table 2.3.1.2 were obtained at the end of the reporting period, at which time the five children reported in the Table 2.3.3.1.2 Age 3 through 5 category during the earlier collection date had progressed to the K category.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received instructional or support services during the regular school year served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do **not** include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: Illinois does not have any migrant students served under Continuation of Services.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.1.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the regular school year.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the regular school year. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	65
K	42
1	27
2	33
3	9
4	15
5	23
6	17
7	21
8	20
9	15
10	14
11	11
12	9
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	322
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the regular school year. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	22	21	
K	22	19	
1	16	15	
2	25	23	
3	7	5	
4	15	12	
5	23	23	
6	17	16	
7	21	21	
8	18	17	
9	15	14	10
10	14	14	7
11	10	10	6
12	8	8	4
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	1	1	1
Total	234	219	28

Comments: The difference between the total number reported for SY 2006-07 and SY 2007-08 reflects fluctuations in the migrant population from year to year; the number of migrant students who remain in Illinois into the regular school year varies from year to year.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "*high school credit accrual*"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the regular school year. In the column titled **Counseling Service**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received a counseling service during the regular school year. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	23	0
K	20	0
1	15	0
2	24	0
3	4	0
4	12	3
5	18	3
6	14	1
7	17	0
8	13	2
9	15	3
10	12	1
11	10	5
12	9	2
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	1	0
Total	207	20
<p>Comments: The difference between the total number reported for SY 2006-07 and SY 2007-08 reflects fluctuations in the migrant population from year to year, as well as fluctuating need for these services from year to year.</p> <p>Children received counseling services from staff school counselors (NOT paid with MEP funds) working together with MEP instructional staff and students.</p>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.
- b. *What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	1
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	1
5	2
6	1
7	0
8	0
9	1
10	0
11	2
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	9
Comments: The difference between the total number reported for SY 2006-07 and SY 2007-08 reflects fluctuations in the migrant population from year to year, as well as fluctuating need for these services from year to year.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section. There are two differences. First, the questions in this subsection collect data on the **summer/intersession term** instead of the regular school year. The second is the source for the table on migrant students served during the summer/intersession is *EDFacts* file N/X124 that includes data group 637, category set A.

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	3
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	93
K	82
1	66
2	70
3	74
4	62
5	64
6	59
7	46
8	61
9	42
10	47
11	31
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	9
Total	816
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	3
K	9
1	6
2	11
3	10
4	6
5	9
6	14
7	9
8	12
9	7
10	15
11	5
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	119
Comments: The data for Table 2.3.3.2.2 were obtained at the time of service, at which time there were three participating migrant children counted in the Age 3 through 5 category. The data for Table 2.3.1.2 were obtained at the end of the reporting period, at which time the three children reported in the Table 2.3.3.2.2 Age 3 through 5 category during the earlier collection date had progressed to the K category.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do **not** include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: Illinois does not have any migrant students served under Continuation of Services.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the summer/intersession term.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are NOT considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	91
K	82
1	66
2	70
3	74
4	62
5	64
6	59
7	46
8	61
9	42
10	47
11	31
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	9
Total	811
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	88	57	
K	82	82	
1	66	66	
2	70	70	
3	74	73	
4	62	62	
5	64	64	
6	59	59	
7	46	32	
8	61	60	
9	42	39	26
10	47	40	32
11	31	28	15
12	7	6	5
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	6	6	2
Total	805	744	80
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "*high school credit accrual*"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled **Counseling Service**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received a counseling service during the summer/intersession term. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	3	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	90	0
K	81	0
1	65	0
2	69	0
3	72	0
4	59	0
5	62	0
6	57	0
7	31	0
8	61	3
9	42	3
10	46	8
11	31	0
12	7	0
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	9	0
Total	785	14
Comments: Counselors worked with migrant students of high school age only. Children received counseling services from staff school counselors (NOT paid with MEP funds) working together with MEP instructional staff and students. The difference between the total number reported for SY 2006-07 and SY 2007-08 reflects fluctuations in the migrant population from year to year; many migrant children come to Illinois only during the summer months and may not return the following year.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on Support Services:

- What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.
- What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	3
1	0
2	1
3	0
4	1
5	0
6	0
7	1
8	1
9	0
10	1
11	1
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	15
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the program year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	12
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	130
K	100
1	82
2	89
3	76
4	70
5	75
6	66
7	56
8	76
9	53
10	55
11	41
12	16
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	10
Total	1,007
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.4 School Data

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migrant children in schools during the regular school year.

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled **eligible** migrant children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	146
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	861
Comments: The difference between the total number reported for SY 2006-07 and SY 2007-08 reflects fluctuations in the migrant population from year to year; many migrant children come to Illinois only during the summer months and may not return the following year.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	0
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	0
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide 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 projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children **participating** in the projects. Since children may participate in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	0	0
Regular school year – school day/extended day	1	31
Summer/intersession only	9	615
Year round	4	361
Comments: Three MEP projects included in "year-round" operate only during summer and fall until migrant families leave Illinois. These projects are included under "year-round" because there is no "summer/fall" category. One new fall project was funded in SY 2007-08 to address emerging needs.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on type of MEP project:

- What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds either as a subgrantee or from a subgrantee and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites.
- What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.
- What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).
- What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.
- What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the reporting period (e.g., September 1 through August 31). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

State Director FTE	0.30
Comments: This FTE is for the SEA employee who coordinates the MEP in Illinois.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on the MEP State director

- a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director?* Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for the State director in your State for the reporting period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the reporting period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.
- b. *Who is the State director?* The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	9	5.80	65	60.90
Counselors	0	0.00	0	0.00
All paraprofessionals	11	5.70	43	41.90
Recruiters	4	1.90	16	11.30
Records transfer staff	5	2.20	8	7.10
Comments: Local program staffing patterns can vary from year to year. The regular school year headcount and FTE increased due to the added fall project in SY 2007-08. Migrant projects are staffed based on an assessment of student needs; during SY 2007-08, no need was identified for additional, MEP-funded counselors to supplement the services already being provided by existing school counselors. Counseling services provided to MEP participants during the 2007-08 regular school year and summer/intersession term were provided by existing school counseling staff (NOT paid with MEP funds) working together with MEP instructional staff and students.				

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

FAQs on MEP staff:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
 1. 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.
 2. 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.
- b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.
- c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.
- e. *Who is a recruiter?* A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.
- f. *Who is a record transfer staffer?* An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE of the qualified paraprofessionals funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	10	5.60	29	28.40
Comments: Local program staffing patterns can vary from year to year. The regular school year headcount and FTE increased due to the new fall project funded for SY 2007-08. The summer/intersession term headcount and FTE reflect the number of paraprofessionals needed to assist teachers with large or multigrade classrooms; the number of highly qualified paraprofessionals needed reflects this need, and therefore can fluctuate each summer.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
 1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE 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 for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of *ESEA*).

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)

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** 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.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** 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. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** 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.
 - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
 - **Neglected Programs:** 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.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.4.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	8	171
Adult corrections	5	151
Other		
Total	13	161

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments: Illinois does not have any (1) Neglected Programs, (2) Juvenile Detention Programs, or (5) "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.	

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student 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. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	
Juvenile Detention	
Juvenile Corrections	8
Adult Corrections	5
Other	
Total	13
Comments: Illinois does not have any (1) Neglected Programs, (2) Juvenile Detention Programs, or (5) "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 that are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			3,606	460	
Long Term Students Served			1,764	327	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			2	2	
Asian or Pacific Islander			10	0	
Black, non-Hispanic			2,322	304	
Hispanic			376	58	
White, non-Hispanic			896	96	
Total			3,606	460	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			3,416	428	
Female			190	32	
Total			3,606	460	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	0	
6			0	0	
7			0	0	
8			0	0	
9			0	0	
10			0	0	
11			0	0	
12			0	0	
13			22	0	
14			126	0	
15			851	0	
16			1,101	0	
17			707	7	
18			354	75	
19			262	139	
20			161	210	
21			22	29	
Total			3,606	460	

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? 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.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (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. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)		8	0	
Awarded high school diploma(s)		7	0	
Awarded GED(s)		8	5	
Comments: Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits		3,137	0	
Enrolled in a GED program		457	184	
Comments: Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school		206	0	
Earned a GED		178	57	
Obtained high school diploma		34	0	
Were accepted into post-secondary education		154	3	
Enrolled in post-secondary education		154	3	
Comments: Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		462	17	
Comments: Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education		0	0	
Obtained employment		0	0	
Comments: Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2007, 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 table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		1,281	298	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		615	241	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		146	35	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		93	1	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		37	27	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		52	31	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		287	147	
Comments: Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.				

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		1,344	308	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		627	240	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		174	26	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		68	3	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		68	37	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		48	30	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		269	144	
Comments: Illinois does not have any Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 1.				

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs		
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention	6	72
Juvenile corrections		
Other		
Total	6	72

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments: Illinois does not have any At-Risk Programs, Neglected Programs, Juvenile Corrections Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 2.	

FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student 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. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	6
Juvenile corrections	
Other	
Total	6
Comments: Illinois does not have any At-Risk Programs, Neglected Programs, Juvenile Corrections Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 2.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			1,142		
Total Long Term Students Served			201		

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			1		
Asian or Pacific Islander			1		
Black, non-Hispanic			529		
Hispanic			103		
White, non-Hispanic			508		
Total			1,142		

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male			950		
Female			192		
Total			1,142		

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5			0		
6			0		
7			0		
8			0		
9			0		
10			4		
11			13		
12			29		
13			100		
14			235		
15			314		
16			370		
17			68		
18			8		
19			1		
20			0		
21			0		
Total			1,142		

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Illinois does not have any At-Risk Programs, Neglected Programs, Juvenile Corrections Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 2.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? 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.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (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. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)			4	
Awarded high school diploma(s)			2	
Awarded GED(s)			1	
Comments: Illinois does not have any At-Risk Programs, Neglected Programs, Juvenile Corrections Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 2.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits			505	
Enrolled in a GED program			7	
Comments: Illinois does not have any At-Risk Programs, Neglected Programs, Juvenile Corrections Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 2.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school			339	
Earned a GED			4	
Obtained high school diploma			4	
Were accepted into post-secondary education			2	
Enrolled in post-secondary education			2	
Comments: Illinois does not have any At-Risk Programs, Neglected Programs, Juvenile Corrections Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 2.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs			30	
Comments: Illinois does not have any At-Risk Programs, Neglected Programs, Juvenile Corrections Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 2.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education			0	
Obtained employment			0	
Comments: Illinois does not have any At-Risk Programs, Neglected Programs, Juvenile Corrections Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 2.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2007, 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 table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			137	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			51	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			5	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			9	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			1	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			9	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			27	
Comments: Illinois does not have any At-Risk Programs, Neglected Programs, Juvenile Corrections Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 2.				

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			148	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			59	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			5	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			19	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			4	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			9	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			22	
Comments: Illinois does not have any At-Risk Programs, Neglected Programs, Juvenile Corrections Programs, or "Other" Programs funded under Subpart 2.				

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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

This section collects data on student behaviors under the *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act*.

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
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	Every two years	2007	2005-06: not collected	2005-06: not collected	11%	2001
				2006-07: 6.0%	2006-07: 3.7%		
				2007-08: not collected	2007-08: not collected		
				2008-09: 3.0%			
				2009-10:			
Comments: The performance indicator is "the number of students..., DIVIDED by the total number of respondents..., MULTIPLIED by 100," which results in a percentage. Therefore, the performance indicators ARE defined as percentages and the actual performance results are reported as percentages.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
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	Every two years	2007	2005-06: not collected	2005-06: not collected	8.6%	2001
				2006-07: 3.0%	2006-07: 4.6%		
				2007-08: not collected	2007-08: not collected		
				2008-09: 2.0%			
				2009-10:			
Comments: The performance indicator is "the number of students..., DIVIDED by the total number of respondents..., MULTIPLIED by 100," which results in a percentage. Therefore, the performance indicators ARE defined as percentages and the actual performance results are reported as percentages.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005-06: not collected	2005-06: not collected		
				2006-	2006-		

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	Every two years	2007	07: 5.0%	07: 11.3% 2007-08: not collected	10.2%	2001
				2007-08: not collected			
				2008-09: 5.0%			
				2009-10:			
Comments: The performance indicator is "the number of students..., DIVIDED by the total number of respondents..., MULTIPLIED by 100," which results in a percentage. Therefore, the performance indicators ARE defined as percentages and the actual performance results are reported as percentages.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
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	Every two years	2007	2005-06: not collected	2005-06: not collected	22.9%	2001
				2006-07: 42.0%	2006-07: 51.8%		
				2007-08: not collected	2007-08: not collected		
				2008-09: 42.0%			
				2009-10:			
Comments: The performance indicator is "the number of students..., DIVIDED by the total number of respondents..., MULTIPLIED by 100," which results in a percentage. Therefore, the performance indicators ARE defined as percentages and the actual performance results are reported as percentages.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
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	Every two years	2007	2005-06: not collected	2005-06: not collected	16.1%	2001
				2006-07: 10.0%	2006-07: 13.7%		
				2007-08: not collected	2007-08: not collected		
				2008-09: 10.0%			
				2009-10:			
Comments: The performance indicator is "the number of students..., DIVIDED by the total number of respondents..., MULTIPLIED by 100," which results in a percentage. Therefore, the performance indicators ARE defined as percentages and the actual performance results are reported as percentages.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005-			

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	Every two years	2007	06: not collected	2005-06: not collected	22.9%	2001
				2006-07: 16.0%	2006-07: 23.4%		
				2007-08: not collected	2007-08: not collected		
				2008-09: 16.0%			
				2009-10:			
Comments: The performance indicator is "the number of students..., DIVIDED by the total number of respondents..., MULTIPLIED by 100," which results in a percentage. Therefore, the performance indicators ARE defined as percentages and the actual performance results are reported as percentages.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
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	Every two years	2007	2005-06: not collected	2005-06: not collected	28.4%	2001
				2006-07: 20.0%	2006-07: 28.0%		
				2007-08: not collected	2007-08: not collected		
				2008-09: 20.0%			
				2009-10:			
Comments: The performance indicator is "the number of students..., DIVIDED by the total number of respondents..., MULTIPLIED by 100," which results in a percentage. Therefore, the performance indicators ARE defined as percentages and the actual performance results are reported as percentages.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
8) The number of students who tried marijuana before age 13, divided by the total number of respondents to this question on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, multiplied by 100.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Every two years	2007	2005-06: not collected	2005-06: not collected	6.6%	2001
				2006-07: 3.0%	2006-07: 8.6%		
				2007-08: not collected	2007-08: not collected		
				2008-09: 3.0%			
				2009-10:			
Comments: The performance indicator is "the number of students..., DIVIDED by the total number of respondents..., MULTIPLIED by 100," which results in a percentage. Therefore, the performance indicators ARE defined as percentages and the actual performance results are reported as percentages.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

		Frequency	Year of most				Year
--	--	-----------	-----------------	--	--	--	------

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	of Collection	recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Baseline Established
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	Every two years	2007	2005-06: not collected	2005-06: not collected	20.0%	2001
				2006-07: 13.0%	2006-07: 20.3%		
				2007-08: not collected	2007-08: not collected		
				2008-09: 13.0%			
				2009-10:			
Comments: The performance indicator is "the number of students..., DIVIDED by the total number of respondents..., MULTIPLIED by 100," which results in a percentage. Therefore, the performance indicators ARE defined as percentages and the actual performance results are reported as percentages.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

The following questions collect data on the out-of-school suspension and expulsion of students by grade level (e.g., K through 5, 6 through 8, 9 through 12) and type of incident (e.g., violence, weapons possession, alcohol-related, illicit drug-related).

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

In the spaces below, provide the State definitions for each type of incident.

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	Related to illegal use of alcohol.
Illicit drug related	Drugs that are illegal to have.
Violent incident without physical injury	While on school grounds or under the supervision of school authorities, any conduct that involves the use, attempted use, or threatened use of force against the person or property of another, or any other offense that is a felony and that by its nature, involves a substantial risk that physical force against the person or property of another may be used in the course of committing the offense, with or without a weapon, that does not result in injury requiring professional medical attention. Violent incidents include, but are not limited to: aggravated battery/battery, fighting, aggravated assault/assault, homicide, kidnapping, robbery, burglary, school threat, predatory criminal sexual assault of a child, aggravated criminal sexual assault, criminal sexual assault, criminal sexual abuse, aggravated sexual battery, reckless endangerment, bullying/harassment, and threats/intimidation/menacing.
Violent incident with physical injury	While on school grounds or under the supervision of school authorities, any conduct that involves the use, attempted use, or threatened use of force against the person or property of another, or any other offense that is a felony and that by its nature, involves a substantial risk that physical force against the person or property of another may be used in the course of committing the offense, with or without a weapon, that results in injury requiring professional medical attention, e.g., stab or bullet wound, concussion, fractured or broken bone, or cut requiring stitches. Violent incidents include, but are not limited to: aggravated battery/battery, fighting, aggravated assault/assault, homicide, kidnapping, robbery, burglary, school threat, predatory criminal sexual assault of a child, aggravated criminal sexual assault, criminal sexual assault, criminal sexual abuse, aggravated sexual battery, reckless endangerment, bullying/harassment, and threats/intimidation/menacing.
Weapons possession	A weapon, as defined in 18 USC 921.
Comments: The definitions for Violent Incident With/Without Physical Injury are undergoing consideration by the agency legal staff.	

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident without physical injury.

2.7.2.2.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: As the agency had not yet received management approval for its proposed definition of Violent Incident Without Physical Injury, it continued to collect Physical Fighting data for SY 2007-08: Suspensions-- K-5 = 16,776 6-8 = 16,886 9-12 = 21,027 868 LEAs reporting		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.2.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: As the agency had not yet received management approval for its proposed definition of Violent Incident Without Physical Injury, it continued to collect Physical Fighting data for SY 2007-08: Expulsions-- K-5 = 116 6-8 = 120 9-12 = 571 868 LEAs reporting		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.3 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident with physical injury.

2.7.2.3.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: As the agency had not yet received management approval for its proposed definition of Violent Incident with Physical Injury, it continued to collect Physical Fighting data for SY 2007-08: Suspensions-- K-5 = 16,776 6-8 = 16,886 9-12 = 21,027 868 LEAs reporting		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.3.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: As the agency had not yet received management approval for its proposed definition of Violent Incident Without Physical Injury, it continued to collect Physical Fighting data for SY 2007-08: Expulsions-- K-5 = 116 6-8 = 120 9-12 = 571 868 LEAs reporting		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.4 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Weapons Possession

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	1,111	868
6 through 8	685	868
9 through 12	1,105	868
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	43	868
6 through 8	104	868
9 through 12	171	868
Comments: The data are correct as reported by the LEAs.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.5 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

2.7.2.5.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	117	868
6 through 8	232	868
9 through 12	1,675	868
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.5.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	1	868
6 through 8	15	868
9 through 12	75	868
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.6 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	170	868
6 through 8	679	868
9 through 12	3,957	868
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.6.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	21	868
6 through 8	82	868
9 through 12	483	868
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

In the table below, provide the types of efforts your State uses to inform parents of, and include parents in, drug and violence prevention efforts. Place a check mark next to the five most common efforts underway in your State. If there are other efforts underway in your State not captured on the list, add those in the other specify section.

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
<u>Yes</u>	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
<u>No</u>	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
<u>No</u>	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
<u>Yes</u>	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
<u>No</u>	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
<u>No</u>	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
<u>No</u>	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
<u>Yes</u>	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
<u>No</u>	Other Specify 1
<u>No</u>	Other Specify 2

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

This section collects information pursuant to Title V, Part A of *ESEA*.

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

Section 5122 of *ESEA*, requires States to provide an annual Statewide summary of how Title V, Part A funds contribute to the improvement of student academic performance and the quality of education for students. In addition, these summaries must be based on evaluations provided to the State by 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.

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that completed a Title V, Part A needs assessment that the State determined to be credible and the total number of LEAs that received Title V, Part A funds. The percentage column is automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	309	100.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	309	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

In the table below, provide the amount of Title V, Part A funds expended by the LEAs. The percentage column will be automatically calculated.

The **4 strategic priorities** are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and mathematics, (2) improve the quality of teachers, (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free, and (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.

	\$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	1,108,880	70.6
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	1,570,595	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8.4 LEA Uses of Funds for the Four Strategic Priorities and AYP

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

1. That used **at least 85 percent** of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities above and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP).
2. That did not use **at least 85 percent** of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.
3. For which you **do not know** whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.

The total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds will be automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	173	102
Did <u>not</u> use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	136	79
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	309	181
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.9.1 LEA Use of Alternative Funding Authority Under the Small Rural Achievement (SRSA) Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that notified the State of their intent to use the alternative uses funding authority under Section 6211.

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	21
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	7
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	12
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	5
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	4
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Twenty-one rural school districts received this grant in 2007-2008. All school districts except one showed improvement in student achievement, decrease in high school dropout rate, or increase in percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers in the three-year data. The Illinois Standards Achievement Test, Prairie State Achievement Examination, Illinois Report Card dropout figures, and percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers as reported to the Illinois State Board of Education were reviewed for this report. The school district that did not have the highest achievement test scores in the three-year period in 2008 did have all classes taught by highly qualified teachers and a dropout rate of 2.4. This school district did not receive Rural Low-income School funds in the two previous years. In all but one school district, all classes were taught by highly qualified teachers. One school district reported an increase in student achievement in four of the five reported areas, a decreased dropout rate, and all classes taught by highly qualified teachers.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 SY 2007-08?	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	222
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the tables below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from and to each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	114	17
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	10	2
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	79	14
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	19	121
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		68

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	1,925,531.00	18,994.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	11,548.00	11,431.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	167,068.00	81,038.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	12,931.00	1,538,514.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		467,101.00
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

2.8 Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)

2.8.1 Each year when school districts complete the NCLB Consolidated Application they are required to provide a summary of their needs assessment. Based on this needs assessment, the school district must then allocate funds to match what is included in the needs assessment. In reviewing this year's needs assessments, 309 applications (100 percent) completed the assessment. Of the 309 applicants 55.9 percent used their funds for the four priorities. Of this number 58.9 percent made adequate yearly progress. Approximately 44.0 percent chose not to use their funds for the four priorities; of those, 58.0 percent made adequate yearly progress.

Thus, those school districts that chose not to use the funds based on the four strategic priorities had a slightly greater percentage (3 percent) of school districts making adequate yearly progress.