

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input 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		
		Friday, March 13, 2009, 4:15:09 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois has joined the American Diploma Project and has begun reviewing the high school standards, with assistance from ACHIEVE. The process is tentatively scheduled to be completed in 2010-11.
--

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois used a new alternate assessment in 2007-08 for grades 3-8 and 11 in reading and mathematics. Standard setting occurred in May 2008. The content alignment has been strengthened for the 2008-09 assessment.

For 2008-09, Illinois will allow a Spanish transadapted oral accommodation for mathematics in its high school assessment, the Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE). Illinois also will allow the accommodations of written Spanish transadapted items and Spanish responses for open-ended items in its grades 3-8 assessment, the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT).

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State *NCLB* assessments.

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for *NCLB* mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *NCLB*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	1,077,366	1,074,637	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,744	1,740	99.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	42,633	42,580	99.9
Black, non-Hispanic	209,562	208,309	99.4
Hispanic	211,605	211,038	99.7
White, non-Hispanic	582,944	582,157	99.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	153,059	152,234	99.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	71,572	71,419	99.8
Economically disadvantaged students	458,840	457,299	99.7
Migratory students	349	348	99.7
Male	550,626	548,997	99.7
Female	526,740	525,640	99.8

Comments: (Multiracial data are included at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the actual numbers are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students. Therefore, with the inclusion of these unidentified students, the actual numbers are:

All students: 1,080,907 enrolled -- 1,078,139 participating -- same %
 Amer Ind/AK Native: 1,747 enrolled-- 1,743 participating -- same %
 Asian/Pacific Islander: 42,677 enrolled --42,622 participating -- same %
 Black, non-Hispanic: 209,833 enrolled -- 208,574 participating -- same %
 Hispanic: 211,734 enrolled --211,165 participating -- same %
 White, non-Hispanic: 584,549 enrolled -- 583,756 participating -- same %
 Children w/Disabilities (*IDEA*): 153,517 enrolled -- 152,685 participating -- same %
 LEP students: 71,592 enrolled -- 71,437 participating -- same %
 Economically disadvantaged students: 459,695 enrolled -- 458,146 participating -- same %
 Migratory students: (same numbers as reported in EDEN)
 Male: 552,424 enrolled -- 550,778 participating -- same %
 Female: 528,336 enrolled -- 527,215 participating -- same %
 Multiracial: 28,935 enrolled -- 28,870 participating -- 99.8% participating

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
--------------------	--	---

Regular Assessment without Accommodations	37,499	24.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	102,395	66.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,068	8.5
Total	152,962	
Comments: Illinois does not offer alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.		
The total number of children with disabilities tested in 1.2.2 is higher than the total in 1.2.1 because 1.2.1 includes only students enrolled in regular public schools.		

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

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	1,077,366	1,074,637	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,744	1,740	99.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	42,633	42,580	99.9
Black, non-Hispanic	209,562	208,309	99.4
Hispanic	211,605	211,038	99.7
White, non-Hispanic	582,944	582,157	99.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	153,059	152,234	99.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	71,572	71,419	99.8
Economically disadvantaged students	458,840	457,299	99.7
Migratory students	349	348	99.7
Male	550,626	548,997	99.7
Female	526,740	525,640	99.8

Comments: (Multiracial data are included at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the actual numbers are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students. Therefore, with the inclusion of these unidentified students, the actual numbers are:

All students: 1,080,907 enrolled -- 1,078,139 participating -- same %
 Amer Ind/AK Native: 1,747 enrolled-- 1,743 participating -- same %
 Asian/Pacific Islander: 42,677 enrolled --42,622 participating -- same %
 Black, non-Hispanic: 209,833 enrolled -- 208,574 participating -- same %
 Hispanic: 211,734 enrolled --211,165 participating -- same %
 White, non-Hispanic: 584,549 enrolled -- 583,756 participating -- same %
 Children w/Disabilities (*IDEA*): 153,517 enrolled -- 152,685 participating -- same %
 LEP students: 71,592 enrolled -- 71,437 participating -- same %
 Economically disadvantaged students: 459,695 enrolled -- 458,146 participating -- same %
 Migratory students: (same numbers as reported in EDEN)
 Male: 552,424 enrolled -- 550,778 participating -- same %
 Female: 528,336 enrolled -- 527,215 participating -- same %
 Multiracial: 28,935 enrolled -- 28,870 participating -- 99.8% participating

The number of LEP students participating is higher in 1.2.3 than the number listed in 1.3.2 because 1.2.3 includes ALL students who took the test, some of whom may not have received a valid score.

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	37,499	24.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	102,395	66.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,068	8.5
Total	152,962	

Comments: Illinois does not offer alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.

The total number of children with disabilities tested in 1.2.4 is higher than the total in 1.2.3 because 1.2.3 includes only students enrolled in regular public schools.

The number of children with disabilities tested is higher in 1.2.4 than the number listed in 1.3.2 because 1.2.4 includes ALL students who took the test, some of whom may not have received a valid score.

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

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	453,762	451,437	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	775	771	99.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	18,167	18,127	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	84,571	83,469	98.7
Hispanic	85,001	84,491	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	253,441	252,834	99.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	63,385	62,700	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	24,940	24,813	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	180,499	179,194	99.3
Migratory students	141	140	99.3
Male	230,336	228,946	99.4
Female	223,386	222,451	99.6

Comments: Multiracial--
students enrolled: 11,107
students participating: 11,059
% students participating: 99.6

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

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

The data provided should include science participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	12,246	19.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	44,993	71.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,461	8.7
Total	62,700	

Comments: Illinois does not offer alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.

The number of children with disabilities tested is higher in 1.2.6 than the number listed in 1.3.3 because 1.2.6 includes ALL students who took the test, some of whom may not have received a valid score.

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

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State *NCLB* assessments.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	154,803	131,399	84.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	219	91.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,198	5,922	95.5
Black, non-Hispanic	30,567	20,849	68.2
Hispanic	33,167	25,826	77.9
White, non-Hispanic	79,114	73,796	93.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,564	14,529	67.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,058	13,861	72.7
Economically disadvantaged students	72,825	54,637	75.0
Migratory students	53	48	90.6
Male	79,687	67,323	84.5
Female	75,103	64,069	85.3

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 5,387

students scoring at/above efficient: 4,704

% students scoring at/above efficient: 87.3

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	154,360	110,461	71.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	181	75.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,091	5,289	86.8
Black, non-Hispanic	30,562	16,875	55.2
Hispanic	32,841	18,099	55.1
White, non-Hispanic	79,108	65,908	83.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,586	9,479	43.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,537	7,882	42.5
Economically disadvantaged students	72,434	41,149	56.8
Migratory students	52	31	59.6
Male	79,470	53,678	67.5
Female	74,877	56,780	75.8

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 5,386

students scoring at/above efficient: 4,053

% students scoring at/above efficient: 75.3

The SY 2007-08 assessment for LEP students changed from SY 2006-2007.

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Illinois does not administer a science assessment at the grade 3 level.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	152,446	128,663	84.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	234	197	84.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,188	5,869	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	29,009	20,011	69.0
Hispanic	32,326	24,796	76.7
White, non-Hispanic	79,579	73,417	92.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,316	14,295	64.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,919	9,014	64.8
Economically disadvantaged students	68,996	51,435	74.5
Migratory students	57	45	78.9
Male	77,956	65,252	83.7
Female	74,481	63,403	85.1

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 4,940

students scoring at/above proficient: 4,265

% students scoring at/above proficient: 86.3

The SY 2007-08 assessment for LEP students changed from SY 2006-2007.

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	152,026	111,085	73.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	236	174	73.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,058	5,292	87.4
Black, non-Hispanic	29,008	16,296	56.2
Hispanic	32,053	19,025	59.4
White, non-Hispanic	79,560	66,491	83.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,338	9,507	42.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,414	5,159	38.5
Economically disadvantaged students	68,648	40,358	58.8
Migratory students	55	33	60.0
Male	77,731	54,047	69.5
Female	74,285	57,033	76.8

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 4,941

students scoring at/above proficient: 3,736

% students scoring at/above proficient: 75.6

The SY 2007-08 assessment for LEP students changed from SY 2006-2007.

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	152,001	115,580	76.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	186	77.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,177	5,425	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	28,861	15,317	53.1
Hispanic	32,230	19,891	61.7
White, non-Hispanic	79,396	70,748	89.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,232	13,214	59.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,855	6,079	43.9
Economically disadvantaged students	68,744	41,740	60.7
Migratory students	56	34	60.7
Male	77,716	58,984	75.9
Female	74,276	56,589	76.2
Comments: Multiracial-- # students who completed assessment: 4,931 # students scoring at/above proficient: 3,937 % students scoring at/above proficient: 79.9			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	153,110	124,284	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	236	190	80.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,219	5,845	94.0
Black, non-Hispanic	29,215	18,405	63.0
Hispanic	31,521	23,310	74.0
White, non-Hispanic	81,241	72,757	89.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,186	12,257	55.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,815	6,962	58.9
Economically disadvantaged students	68,349	47,829	70.0
Migratory students	59	40	67.8
Male	78,387	62,808	80.1
Female	74,708	61,468	82.3

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 4,504

students scoring at/above proficient: 3,676

% students scoring at/above proficient: 81.6

The SY 2007-08 assessment for LEP students changed from SY 2006-2007.

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	152,759	112,097	73.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	235	171	72.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,106	5,323	87.2
Black, non-Hispanic	29,193	16,271	55.7
Hispanic	31,296	18,197	58.1
White, non-Hispanic	81,246	68,628	84.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,191	8,874	40.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,395	3,722	32.7
Economically disadvantaged students	68,045	39,516	58.1
Migratory students	58	29	50.0
Male	78,205	54,665	69.9
Female	74,538	57,422	77.0

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 4,508

students scoring at/above proficient: 3,420

% students scoring at/above proficient: 75.9

The SY 2007-08 assessment for LEP students changed from SY 2006-2007.

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Illinois does not administer a science assessment at the grade 5 level.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	156,051	128,732	82.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	245	198	80.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,080	5,740	94.4
Black, non-Hispanic	30,991	19,722	63.6
Hispanic	31,474	24,217	76.9
White, non-Hispanic	82,851	75,166	90.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,180	11,864	53.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,383	5,435	57.9
Economically disadvantaged students	68,884	49,311	71.6
Migratory students	52	35	67.3
Male	80,062	64,632	80.7
Female	75,978	64,092	84.4

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 4,229

students scoring at/above proficient: 3,585

% students scoring at/above proficient: 84.8

The SY 2007-08 assessment for LEP students changed from SY 2006-2007.

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	155,697	122,809	78.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	244	194	79.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,960	5,446	91.4
Black, non-Hispanic	31,002	19,639	63.3
Hispanic	31,224	21,163	67.8
White, non-Hispanic	82,853	72,784	87.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,211	9,927	44.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,934	3,323	37.2
Economically disadvantaged students	68,598	45,500	66.3
Migratory students	52	24	46.2
Male	79,861	60,321	75.5
Female	75,825	62,482	82.4

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 4,232

students scoring at/above proficient: 3,493

% students scoring at/above proficient: 82.5

The SY 2007-08 assessment for LEP students changed from SY 2006-2007.

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Illinois does not administer a science assessment at the grade 6 level.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	158,910	127,577	80.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	254	206	81.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,026	5,653	93.8
Black, non-Hispanic	31,251	18,671	59.7
Hispanic	31,400	23,639	75.3
White, non-Hispanic	85,905	76,141	88.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,495	10,582	47.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,624	4,142	54.3
Economically disadvantaged students	68,034	46,578	68.5
Migratory students	48	28	58.3
Male	81,451	64,288	78.9
Female	77,441	63,278	81.7

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 3,921

students scoring at/above proficient: 3,202

% students scoring at/above proficient: 81.7

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	158,566	122,931	77.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	250	197	78.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,910	5,388	91.2
Black, non-Hispanic	31,301	19,901	63.6
Hispanic	31,158	21,035	67.5
White, non-Hispanic	85,871	73,230	85.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,502	8,976	39.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,187	2,521	35.1
Economically disadvantaged students	67,792	44,213	65.2
Migratory students	48	20	41.7
Male	81,260	59,787	73.6
Female	77,288	63,132	81.7

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 3,921

students scoring at/above proficient: 3,115

% students scoring at/above proficient: 79.5

The SY 2007-08 assessment for LEP students changed from SY 2006-2007.

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	158,289	125,126	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	253	215	85.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,014	5,511	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	31,011	18,278	58.9
Hispanic	31,272	21,119	67.5
White, non-Hispanic	85,688	76,749	89.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,375	11,432	51.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,573	2,962	39.1
Economically disadvantaged students	67,610	4,400	6.5
Migratory students	48	22	45.8
Male	81,088	64,249	79.2
Female	77,183	60,865	78.9
Comments: Multiracial-- # students who completed assessment: 3,905 # students scoring at/above proficient: 3,187 % students scoring at/above proficient: 81.6			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	159,989	128,366	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	244	201	82.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,932	5,556	93.7
Black, non-Hispanic	33,395	20,374	61.0
Hispanic	30,009	22,336	74.4
White, non-Hispanic	86,652	76,900	88.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,977	10,391	45.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,144	3,247	52.8
Economically disadvantaged students	67,311	45,965	68.3
Migratory students	43	23	53.5
Male	82,062	64,852	79.0
Female	77,913	63,509	81.5

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 3,605

students scoring at/above proficient: 2,928

% students scoring at/above proficient: 81.2

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	159,610	129,711	81.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	243	199	81.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,831	5,377	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	33,444	22,960	68.7
Hispanic	29,756	21,837	73.4
White, non-Hispanic	86,583	76,206	88.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,001	10,246	44.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,701	2,318	40.7
Economically disadvantaged students	67,042	47,207	70.4
Migratory students	42	23	54.8
Male	81,860	63,353	77.4
Female	77,736	66,352	85.4

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 3,604

students scoring at/above proficient: 3,053

% students scoring at/above proficient: 84.7

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic

groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Illinois does not administer a science assessment at the grade 8 level.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	134,778	71,738	53.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	265	129	48.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,765	4,457	77.3
Black, non-Hispanic	21,344	4,641	21.7
Hispanic	19,498	6,447	33.1
White, non-Hispanic	85,609	54,935	64.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,219	3,087	19.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,792	564	20.2
Economically disadvantaged students	39,280	11,169	28.4
Migratory students	31	10	32.3
Male	66,459	37,004	55.7
Female	68,319	34,734	50.8

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 2,089

students scoring at/above proficient: 1,094

% students scoring at/above proficient: 52.4

The SY 2007-08 assessment for LEP students changed from SY 2006-2007.

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	134,713	72,105	53.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	265	134	50.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,763	3,679	63.8
Black, non-Hispanic	21,320	5,514	25.9
Hispanic	19,491	6,106	31.3
White, non-Hispanic	85,577	55,488	64.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,184	3,895	24.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,787	235	8.4
Economically disadvantaged students	39,254	11,576	29.5
Migratory students	31	10	32.3
Male	66,415	34,244	51.6
Female	68,298	37,861	55.4

Comments: (The multiracial category appears at the end of this comment section.)

Some of the numbers included here are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.

Multiracial--

students who completed assessment: 2,089

students scoring at/above proficient: 1,138

% students scoring at/above proficient: 54.5

The SY 2007-08 assessment for LEP students changed from SY 2006-2007.

The SY 2007-08 migratory student population is too small to compare with SY 2006-07.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	134,732	69,407	51.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	265	132	49.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,765	4,052	70.3
Black, non-Hispanic	21,308	4,167	19.6
Hispanic	19,506	5,480	28.1
White, non-Hispanic	85,592	54,481	63.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,187	3,187	19.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,790	271	9.7
Economically disadvantaged students	39,250	9,761	24.9
Migratory students	31	10	32.3
Male	66,428	36,320	54.7
Female	68,304	33,087	48.4
Comments: Multiracial-- # students who completed assessment: 2,088 # students scoring at/above proficient: 1,057 % students scoring at/above proficient: 50.6			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	3,803	2,603	68.4
Districts	868	528	60.8
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	2,124	1,352	63.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	996	440	44.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,128	912	80.8
Comments: The Title I data that were provided via EDEN in March 2008 (1,352) were not final data. The final SY 2007-08 number of Title I schools that made AYP in SY 2007-08 is 1,444.			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
788	470	59.6
Comments:		

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

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	29
Extension of the school year or school day	2
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	4
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	9
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	9
Comments:	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	16
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	1
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	265
Comments:	

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

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Many Illinois schools in restructuring are high schools and districts are choosing the "other major restructuring" option to implement school-specific interventions, which include smaller learning communities; freshman academies; restructuring oversight panels, including district and external experts; and changes in the school schedule or calendar.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

² The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Illinois SEA has established a system of support for school districts that do not make adequate yearly progress (AYP).

If a school district does not make AYP for two consecutive years it is required to develop a district improvement plan to assist the district to make AYP. The plan must include an objective established for each area in which the district is not making AYP. A Regional System of Support Providers (RESPRO) team is assigned to work with the school district to develop and implement the district improvement plan.

Districts in corrective action must file a district improvement plan for review by the Illinois SEA that must include implementation plans for one of the required steps identified in NCLB, Section 1116. In most cases, this results in the district ensuring implementation of a new curriculum, with access for all students in the district. Year 1 districts participate in a telephone conference with the SEA and explain how the district is going to work toward making AYP or showing marked improvement. Although this is not the only sanction to be imposed by the SEA, it is the one that is chosen most often. The RESPRO team works with the school district until AYP is made for two consecutive years. The SEA will conduct onsite monitoring visits for some Year 2 districts in conjunction with the monitoring of School Improvement Grants using 1003(g) funds.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	37
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	1
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	27	3
Schools	86	18
Comments: A total of 38 appeals were filed with the Illinois SEA that challenged the designation of 86 schools and 27 districts. Of these, 28 schools were included in the appeals based on coding errors. Eight schools went from not making AYP to making AYP and the designations of ten schools and two districts were changed from making AYP to not making AYP as a result of the coding corrections processed through the appeal. The SEA received appeals from ten districts challenging the designation of 32 schools and six districts based on the inclusion of English Language Learners in the state assessment. These appeals were denied outright as not being an appealable issue.		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	11/15/08
---	----------

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2007-08.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the **SY 2006-07 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	182,408	185,019
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	124,504	123,845
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	68.3	66.9
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	116,004	113,812
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	63.6	61.5
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	493	
Comments: The total number of students who were enrolled in grades assessed under section 1111 of ESEA does NOT necessarily equal the number of students who were actually assessed AND received a score. Additionally, the number of students who were assessed in mathematics does NOT necessarily equal the number of students who were assessed in reading, and neither of these separate assessment totals necessarily equals the total number of students who were enrolled in grades assessed under section 1111 of ESEA. The correct number of students who were ASSESSED (and received a score) and the percentages of students who were proficient, by subject, are: MATH SY 2007-08 Total # students assessed (received a score) = 179,378 Total # students proficient = 124,504 % of students proficient = 69.4% MATH SY 2006-07 Total # students assessed (received a score) = 182,385 Total # students proficient = 123,845 % students proficient = 67.9% READING SY 2007-08 Total # students assessed (received a score) = 179,250 Total # students proficient = 116,004 % students proficient = 64.7% READING SY 2006-07 Total # students assessed (received a score) = 182,453 Total # students proficient = 113,812 % students proficient = 62.4%		

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

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	205
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	18
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	285
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.

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used	Description of "Other Strategies"	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"
(See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	This response is limited to 500 characters.				(See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	This response is limited to 500 characters.
5	The specific strategies provided to each school typically used a combination of planning, training, coaching, and monitoring--all data-driven.	226	11	39	D	Of the 176 schools that did not make AYP, 94 schools increased the percentage of students proficient in reading; 41 of these schools increased the percentage proficient by more than five points. 79 schools increased the percentage of students proficient in math; 35 of these schools increased the percentage proficient by more than five points. Of the schools that did not make AYP, 41 had been served through 1003(a) funds for less than one year.
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

- 1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
- 2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- 3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
- 4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
- 5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement
D = Other

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

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois SEA staff have shared "tips" for planning at statewide and area conferences through the work of the RESPRO consultant network. Illinois SEA staff meet monthly with the key contacts for the RESPRO areas and the three statewide associations that are included in the RESPRO System of Support. In addition, the Illinois SEA showcases districts and schools at these conferences and meetings in order to share best practices.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

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.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.
Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois did not have Section 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

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

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

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The primary vehicle for providing support to Title I schools identified for improvement is the RESPRO system of support, which receives the majority of funding through 1003(a). Additional state funds are made available to support non-Title I schools. ISBE uses other available federal and state funds to provide technical assistance to Title I schools identified for improvement with the development of the improvement and restructuring plans and oversees the review of the plans, including written feedback.

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

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	452,842
Applied to transfer	3,218
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,941

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$
Comments: Due to a changeover in program administration, the Illinois data collection instrument was not revised in time to collect this information for SY 2007-08, which resulted in this amount being included in the larger transportation cost budget item. The data collection instrument is being revised to collect this information for SY 2008-09.	

Source – Initially populated from ED^{FACTS}. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED^{FACTS} Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	93
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

- How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?*
An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	293,367
Applied for supplemental educational services	55,617
Received supplemental educational services	48,681
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 60,003,977
Comments:	

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of *ESEA*.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of *ESEA*) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	160,709	159,630	99.3	1,079	0.7
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	22,319	21,925	98.2	394	1.8
Low-poverty schools	37,131	37,061	99.8	70	0.2
All elementary schools	122,429	121,625	99.3	804	0.7
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	8,711	8,508	97.7	203	2.3
Low-poverty schools	13,878	13,853	99.8	25	0.2
All secondary schools	38,280	38,005	99.3	275	0.7
Comments:					

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For a grades K-5, a classroom is counted as a full-day, self-contained classroom and equals one class.
For grades 6-8, a classroom is counted multiple times, by core subjects.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	31.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	12.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.9
Other (please explain in comment box below)	36.9
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other:

Elementary ELL teachers enrolled in an approved program while teaching.

ELL certified teachers, but Illinois type certified.

Substitute teachers.

Teachers who hold a Type 29 certificate.

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	21.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	28.2
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	31.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	19.1
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other:

ELL teachers enrolled in an approved program while teaching.

Teachers who hold a Type 29 certificate.

Special education teachers who have a temporary certificate.

Charter school teachers.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	66.5	16.9
Poverty metric used	Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches. High-poverty schools are the lowest 25 percent. Low-poverty schools are the highest 25 percent.	
Secondary schools	46.0	15.7
Poverty metric used	Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches. High-poverty schools are the lowest25 percent. Low-poverty schools are the highest 25 percent.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois also offers a Newcomer Program.

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of *ESEA* in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	175,454
Comments: Includes ALL K-12 LEP students enrolled in SY2007-2008 regardless if assessed on the annual ELP assessments or not.	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	167,130
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	141,936
Polish	5,812
Arabic	3,249
Chinese	2,405
Urdu	2,206

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	156,979
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	9,997
Total	166,976
Comments: The total number of students reported in this section includes only those students who were enrolled during the annual ELP testing window, consistent with what was requested in EDEN file N137. There were 8,478 K-12 ELL students enrolled during SY 2007-08 who were not enrolled during the ELP testing window. The total number of ELL K-12 students enrolled in Illinois in SY 2007-08 was 175,454--166,976 enrolled during the testing window and 8,478 not enrolled during the testing window. Reasons for not being tested on the state annual ELP assessment: Parental Refusal = 2,966 Exempted Special Ed/504 = 28 Unknown = 7,003	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	48,143
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	28.8
Comments: In Illinois, "proficient" (relative to annual ELP assessments) is operationally defined as obtaining a Composite Proficiency Level of 4.0 or higher on ACCESS for ELLs. The maximum overall ELP level that a student taking the kindergarten form of ACCESS for ELLs can receive is 3.7. Given the Illinois operational definition of "proficient" and the cut-score established by WIDA, in general, no kindergarten student can obtain the "proficient" level. Moreover, WIDA calculates only a composite score for students who have scores in all four domains--listening, speaking, reading, and writing.	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	149,905
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	9,692
Total	159,597
Comments: The total number of students reported in this section includes only those students who were enrolled during the annual ELP testing window, consistent with what was requested in EDEN file N138. There were 7,533 K-12 ELL students enrolled during SY 2007-08 who were not enrolled during the ELP testing window. The total number of ELL K-12 students enrolled in Illinois in SY 2007-08 was 167,130--159,597 enrolled during the testing window and 7,533 not enrolled during the testing window. Reasons for not being tested on the state annual ELP assessment: Parental Refusal = 2,855 Exempted Special Ed/504 = 21 Unknown = 6,816	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

- Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	100,493	95.4
ELP attainment	45,509	27.2
Comments: The percentage for "making progress" is calculated based on the total number of students with two data points (105,312).		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: not applicable

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: not applicable

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: not applicable

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
13,818	11,567	25,385
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
25,334	21,468	84.7	3,866
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
25,344	18,910	74.6	6,434
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
11,025	7,965	72.2	3,060
Comments:			

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	196
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	101
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	171
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	177
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	47
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	9
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	7
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	3
Comments: In SY 2007-08, 101 of the 196 Title III subgrantees met the AMAO for 2008, 80 did not meet, and 15 did not have a sufficient number of ELL students to calculate. The minimum size (n) required at the district level for AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 is 30. The minimum size for calculating AMAO 3 is 45.	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

- 1. Immigrant Students Enrolled =** Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
- 2. Students in 3114(d)(1) Program =** Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
- 3. 3114(d)(1) Subgrants =** Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
43,274	10,308	52

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	6,541
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	5,281

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **# Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in PD activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	196	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	88	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	114	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	87	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	44	
Other (Explain in comment box)	170	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	163	15,121
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	180	4,841
PD provided to principals	138	1,654
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	146	787
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	24	211
PD provided to community based organization personnel	35	434
Total	686	23,048

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

170 subgrantees provided training in the use of technology in implementing ELL program activities.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/08	10/01/08	92
Comments:		

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

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois has eliminated redundancy by consolidating four separate grant applications into a single consolidated grant application. Several years ago, school districts had to complete as many as four different applications for additional funds to serve their ELL student populations. Today, districts apply for the different grants on a single, menu-driven, electronic application.

To shorten the process of distributing Title III funds, one option is to have the grant application available at least one to two months prior to the end of the school year. Currently, the completed grant application is due on June 30, at the end of the school year. Because the applications are being reviewed by ISBE staff during the summer months, when district personnel are on summer vacation, the approval process is delayed until district staff is able to respond to questions regarding the grant application. To ensure that Title III funds budgeted for the regular school year are supplementing and not supplanting local/state funds, ISBE staff must contact districts to obtain clarification on the proposed budgeted activities. The alternative is to limit activities budgeted during the regular school year to professional development and parental outreach. All activities budgeted for before, after, and summer school are considered supplemental and therefore are less time-consuming to review and approve. This alternative is only an option if it is supported by ED.

Another alternative is to make ISBE staff available at regional sites to meet with school district personnel onsite for application review and approval before the end of the school year. ISBE questions and concerns could be communicated in person to district personnel for the issues to be addressed immediately.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	85.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	72.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.5
Black, non-Hispanic	73.8
Hispanic	73.4
White, non-Hispanic	92.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	71.9
Limited English proficient	69.1
Economically disadvantaged	74.9
Migratory students	51.5
Male	83.1
Female	88.7
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.4
Black, non-Hispanic	7.7
Hispanic	6.9
White, non-Hispanic	2.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5.3
Limited English proficient	4.7
Economically disadvantaged	4.3
Migratory students	0.4
Male	4.5
Female	3.5
Comments: The dropout rate for migratory students is correct as reported.	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	862	862
LEAs with subgrants	0	0
Total	862	862
Comments: With approval from USDE, the Illinois McKinney-Vento program funds seven Area Lead grants to provide services to all Illinois homeless children and youth. The Area Lead grantees provide funding to 45 Regional Offices of Education and two LEAs in order to provide more direct homeless education services. All Illinois LEAs have a registered and trained LEA homeless liaison.		

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	666	718
K	1,131	816
1	1,185	949
2	1,138	963
3	1,095	1,073
4	1,090	924
5	971	882
6	905	933
7	835	895
8	893	1,037
9	819	1,340
10	708	1,102
11	683	802
12	835	850
Ungraded	0	0
Total	12,954	13,284
Comments: The totals of homeless children/youth enrolled without subgrants and those with subgrants may have some inconsistency (290) based on data collection input error (information was reported in the wrong column).		

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	1,855	2,665
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	9,784	9,989
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	196	107
Hotels/Motels	931	151
Total	12,766	12,912
Comments: The totals for primary nighttime residence reported in Table 1.9.1.2 indicate 560 fewer students than reported in Table 1.9.1.1 -290 is due to data collection input error (as noted in Table 1.9.1.1) and 270 students were reported as "unknown." In an effort to identify the residence of the 270 students, ISBE staff notified all LEAs with students reported as "unknown" to request corrections in the reported status. Although most of these LEAs did make corrections, some had not responded as of the deadline for CSPR I data revisions, and therefore 270 remain classified as "unknown."		

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	471
K	811
1	951
2	970
3	1,073
4	928
5	873
6	929
7	904
8	1,048
9	1,299
10	1,101
11	791
12	901
Ungraded	0
Total	13,050

Comments: The total of homeless children/youth served by subgrants indicates a discrepancy based on the data reporter not reporting in the correct column for subgrants/nonsubgrants. A difference of 234 students is noted between the data in 1.9.1.1 and 1.9.2.1.

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

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	3,859
Migratory children/youth	257
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,809
Limited English proficient students	800

Comments:

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	54
Expedited evaluations	54
Staff professional development and awareness	54
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	54
Transportation	54
Early childhood programs	54
Assistance with participation in school programs	54
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	54
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	54
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	54
Coordination between schools and agencies	54
Counseling	54
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	54
Clothing to meet a school requirement	54
School supplies	54
Referral to other programs and services	54
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	54
Other (optional – in comment box below)	54
Other (optional – in comment box below)	54
Other (optional – in comment box below)	54

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This table includes the number of Area Lead grants (7) AND the number of Regional Offices of Education and LEAs provided with funding by the seven Area Lead grants, with USDE approval (47), for a total of 54 subgrants in Illinois.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	54
School Selection	54
Transportation	54
School records	54
Immunizations	54
Other medical records	54
Other Barriers – in comment box below	54

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Other barriers" were not specified by reporting entities so no further information is available regarding other barriers" reported in 2007-08.

This table includes the number of Area Lead grants (7) AND the number of Regional Offices of Education and LEAs provided with funding by the seven Area Lead grants, with USDE approval (47), for a total of 54 subgrants in Illinois.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,393	652
4	1,268	629
5	1,169	578
6	1,195	695
7	1,101	651
8	1,243	800
High School	742	146
Comments: Some of the numbers are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,392	868
4	1,268	822
5	1,175	677
6	1,194	722
7	1,109	580
8	1,250	691
High School	743	122
Comments: Some of the numbers are higher than the numbers submitted via EDEN due to the fact that EDEN does not allow for the inclusion of students who took the assessment and received a score, but were not identified as full-academic-year or partial-academic-year students.		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	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	1,876
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of students reported in Category 1 is somewhat higher than the count reported last year but the change is less than 10 percent. In summer 2008, larger crews of migrant workers were brought to central Illinois to work in the corn fields. Also, the Illinois MEP funded a summer project in the East St. Louis area, where no project had been operating the previous year.

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	94
K	82
1	66
2	70
3	74
4	62
5	64
6	60
7	47
8	61
9	42
10	47
11	31
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	9
Total	816
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of students reported in Category 2 does not represent a significant change from the number reported last year.

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois used the New Generation System (NGS) to compile and generate the Category 1 and the Category 2 child count for the 2007-08 reporting period. NGS was also used to produce the child counts for the previous reporting period.
--

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Illinois migrant child count for Category 1 and Category 2 is based on information collected in the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and Supplemental Documentation. COEs are prepared only by certified migrant recruiters who successfully complete the annual state training. Local recruiters, employed by the local MEP projects, conducted face-to-face interviews with families to identify migrant children. At the state level, the Illinois Migrant Council was contracted to coordinate recruiting efforts and to conduct recruiting and complete COEs in areas of the state that local recruiters did not reach.

The eligibility of each child counted was documented with a current, valid COE and Supplemental Documentation form on file at the local level, with an approved copy of the COE on file at the statewide records office. The signature of the parent/guardian or unaccompanied youth interviewed was required on the COE. Illinois uses a three-year COE, but a new COE was completed for each migrant family who made a new, qualifying move.

The following data are collected for each child included in the count:

*Demographic information, including parents' names and the names, address, and birth dates of children/youths.

*Specific eligibility criteria, including: 1) residency date; 2) qualifying arrival date; 3) moved from where/to where; 4) whether the children moved with or to join a parent, guardian, or spouse, or on their own; 5) whether the move was to enable them to obtain or seek temporary or seasonal employment in fishing or agricultural work; 6) a description of the qualifying activity; 7) whether the work is a principal means of livelihood; 8) whether the child's schooling was interrupted; and 9) documentation of residency in the state during the year.

*Program participation data, such as enrollment and withdrawal dates and available academic and health information.

*Confirmation data, including the signature of the recruiter, the signature of the family member interviewed, the initials of the local reviewer, and the initials of the state reviewer.

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

The activities conducted to collect the data follow the guidelines included in the "Illinois Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual" (http://www.isbe.net/bilingual/htmls/migrant_resources.htm). Each COE was reviewed and approved at the local and state levels. Any questionable items on the COE were returned to the local project for correction. For each newly identified migrant child, the local project contacted the statewide records office to request a unique student identifier. The statewide records office verified that the student had not already been entered into NGS before issuing a unique student identifier and giving the local project staff permission to enter the student's information into NGS.

The Category 2 child count includes only children with documented attendance in MEP-funded summer programs in Illinois. Local projects maintained individual student attendance records and submitted average daily attendance figures as part of the application for MEP funds. Based on their records, local projects indicated participation in the MEP-funded summer program for each eligible migrant student entered into NGS.

Residency verification was conducted between September 1 and October 31 and the verification information was entered into the NGS history line reflecting the appropriate reporting period for each eligible migrant.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The COE information is completed manually on paper by the recruiter. Trained data clerks enter the student enrollment information from the COE or Continuing Enrollment/Residency Worksheet into NGS at the local project site. The statewide records office compared COEs and NGS entries for all local projects to ensure that the data entered matched the information on the COE. If local school MEP personnel could not input student data, the state records office provided data entry assistance. The statewide records office sent reports of any discrepancies to local projects for correction. At the end of the local program grant period, a final review identified any remaining discrepancies to be resolved.

The record update process allowed the local project to include an eligible migrant child in a new funding year by recertifying that child's residency during the new year. The Illinois COE contains a space for documentation of continuing eligibility and residency verification. Each

child's residency was confirmed through personal interview, review of school attendance records, or, less frequently, via telephone.

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NGS programming uses the eligibility information entered for each child to generate an unduplicated child count report, which includes only migrant children ages 3-21 who are eligible, based on federal requirements, for at least one day during the counting period of 9/1/2007-8/31/2008.

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

The NGS query is programmed to include only children who were at least three and less than 22 years of age who had eligibility for at least one day during the period 9/1/2007-8/31/2008. During initial interviews with families, recruiters verify birth dates, the date of the last qualifying move, and the qualifying activity, and this information is entered into NGS. Recruiters use an NGS report to track two-year-olds about to turn three and to schedule visits with families to verify residency and to enroll three-year-olds into programs. NGS will count only those three-year-olds who were actually in residence in the state on or after their third birthday.

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

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

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

For the Category 2 count, the NGS query is programmed to include only eligible children who received MEP-funded services under a summer enrollment flag of "S." A summer enrollment is entered only after the student enrolls in and attends an MEP-funded summer program, as documented in local project records. Summer migrant programs operate during June, July, and, less frequently, August.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 AND the Category 2 counts were generated using the NGS system.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2008, the Illinois MEP completed a Service Delivery Plan that includes an Identification and Recruitment Plan. To ensure that accurate and well-documented eligibility determinations are made, quality control is a key component of every aspect of recruiting in Illinois.

To this end, the Illinois MEP program conducted the following activities:

***Recruiter Training, Technical Assistance and Review--**All recruiters were required to attend the annual Illinois MEP two-day Identification and Recruitment training to become authorized to complete COEs. Training emphasized eligibility determinations, documentation, quality control techniques, recruiting strategies, and programmatic and policy updates and changes. Follow-up training was offered at the Statewide MEP Workshop in June. All recruiters received a copy of the updated "Illinois Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual," which is also available online. The state Identification and Recruitment Coordinator provided ongoing technical assistance and support throughout the year. He visited local projects and reviewed their recruiting practices and documentation during the summer. Onsite monitoring of local projects includes the review of COEs and eligibility determination procedures.

***Proper Eligibility Determinations and Documentation Quality Controls--**In accordance with state guidelines, recruiters interviewed families and verified all eligibility information before entering student data into NGS. Recruiters maintained documentation to back up their recruiting activity and decisions, including: 1) a supplemental documentation form that requires additional information to support decisions about Intent to Seek Moves, Temporary Work Status, Principle Means of Livelihood, and Interrupted Schooling, and 2) a recruiter's log. Recruiters used a COE review checklist to review the COE for completeness and accuracy. Each COE was signed by the recruiter, as well as the parent, guardian, or self-eligible youth interviewed. The local project reviewer checked each COE and initialed it to indicate approval.

State NGS implementation guidelines require that a completed COE be sent promptly to the statewide records office for review. The statewide records office contacted the local program to resolve any questions. The designated SEA reviewer approved all COEs of children to be included in the child count. If the eligibility status could not be resolved, SEA staff reviewed the COE to make an eligibility determination.

***State and Local Random COE Checks--**Each MEP-funded local project was required to develop a local quality control plan that included a random check of COEs. This process involved a review of the document to determine its face validity and an interview with the family to ensure that the information recorded was verified. The local projects reported the results of their quality control review to the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator.

The state also conducted re-interviews of randomly selected migrant families. Re-interviewers were individuals familiar with the migrant community but not directly associated with the local project that initially determined MEP eligibility. A committee of reviewers determined whether the information gathered confirmed the child's eligibility. Children determined to be ineligible were removed from the NGS data and not included in the child count.

State and local re-interviews were conducted systematically and independently from the original eligibility determination interviews. The re-interview subjects were identified randomly and to represent all funded projects. Individuals who were not involved in making the initial eligibility determination conducted re-interviews using a standard instrument and protocol designed to review all of the items that had been used to make the original eligibility decision. The State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator provided training for state-level re-interviewers, as well as ongoing guidance and support during the process. Whenever possible, re-interviews were conducted in person, but telephone interviews were used on occasion if the family could not be contacted in person.

***Monitoring--**The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator examined COEs and eligibility documentation and procedures during onsite visits to local projects. Review of eligibility documentation was also included in the SEA monitoring of local projects.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Illinois MEP Quality Control Plan is designed to strengthen the accuracy of the State's Identification and Recruitment processes through use of a variety of checks and balances, including validations of child eligibility determinations involving re-interviews of families previously identified. The State Quality Control Plan, revised annually, establishes the minimum quality control requirements of all MEP Identification and Recruitment efforts throughout the state. The Plan and the Identification and Recruitment component of the Illinois MEP is managed through a contract with the Illinois Migrant Council (IMC), where the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator is employed. The Quality Control Plan operates at the state and local levels. Together, state and local Quality Control Plans act as early warning systems to identify problems in the Identification and Recruitment process.

The State Quality Control Plan requires that the eligibility of 3 percent of the children currently enrolled in the MEP be verified annually by

validating each MEP eligibility criterion for every child selected. A sample is generated by randomly selecting 3 percent of the children from each project site. A trained recruiter independent of the original eligibility determination conducts the validation through a re-interview.

Each local MEP project is required to develop its own plan to ensure that only eligible children are recruited and served. The SEA approves the local plan before it is implemented. Local projects must validate the eligibility of 3 percent of a project's COEs completed during the current program year by conducting re-interviews of a random sample of families (COEs). Validations, or re-interviews, are made by a trained recruiter independent of the original eligibility determination.

To ensure the most complete results, re-interviews are scheduled when most migrant families have been recruited for the season but have not yet left the state. High-quality data collection is ensured by using standardized documentation for all interviews throughout the state. The State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator oversees the process and provides ongoing support to those involved in the re-interviewing.

State and local interview results are submitted to IMC for review, with final eligibility determinations made by a Review Committee. Children who are determined to be ineligible were removed from the NGS data and not included in the child count. Local projects were informed of any ineligible children and they, in turn, communicated this decision to the affected families.

Summary of State and Local Quality Control Results--

Total number of children represented by interviews: 151

Total number and percentage of eligible children represented by interviews: 150 (99.34%)

State Results--

Number reviewed of target children in sample: 47

Number and percentage of eligibility confirmed of target children in sample: 46 (97.87%)

Number reviewed of siblings of target children in sample: 62

Number and percentage of eligibility confirmed of siblings of target children in sample: 62 (100%)

Number reviewed of total children in sample: 109

Number and percentage of eligibility confirmed of total children in sample: 108 (99.08%)

Local Results--

Number and percentage of COEs examined: 25 (100%)

Number of eligible COEs: 25

Number of children represented by interviews: 42

Number and percentage of eligible children represented by interviews: 42 (100%)

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NGS data entry specialists receive annual training at the Statewide Migrant Education Workshop and individual technical assistance throughout the year. The Illinois Migrant Council resource staff responds to questions and provides written guidelines to all local data entry specialists. The statewide migrant records office reviews the NGS data entered by local projects to ensure that the NGS record matches the information collected on the COE and sends reports of discrepancies to all migrant-funded sites. Sites use this information to verify migrant student data against COEs on file and to assess identification and recruitment procedures. The Illinois Migrant Council uses these reports to provide technical assistance and to design follow-up training. The SEA uses these reports to monitor child counts and the provision of services to eligible children by local MEP-funded projects.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

To verify that the children included in the child count meet the eligibility criteria, the statewide migrant records office and the SEA conduct ongoing substantiation of data by cross-checking the COEs against reports generated by NGS. When discrepancies are identified, local programs are contacted to provide additional information and NGS data are corrected.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Annual recruiter training will incorporate areas of concern identified through the re-interview results, along with recruiter questions, onsite technical assistance findings, and feedback and updates from the Office of Migrant Education. The Identification and Recruitment

Coordinator provided technical assistance to the local district that completed the incorrect COE identified through the re-interview process. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator attended the National Identification and Recruitment Forum to hear OME policy presentations, network with other states, and identify exemplary and innovative practices to strengthen Illinois' migrant identification and recruitment efforts.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois allocates resources to implement a state quality control system for identification and recruitment that focuses heavily on recruiter training, ongoing technical assistance and support for recruiters, and timely review of COEs at the state and local levels. This year, the state completed the Service Delivery Plan for the Migrant Education Program, which includes a plan for Identification and Recruitment. The state and local eligibility verifications conducted each year measure the effectiveness of these efforts and point to areas where additional training or modifications are warranted. The 2007-08 eligibility verifications yielded a result of 99.08 percent of the children included with confirmed eligibility. Illinois will continue to monitor and improve the controls that are in place and update the plan as needed to maintain high-quality eligibility determinations.

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