

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 2009-10**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

**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) 2009-10 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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> | | |
| <p>Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10</p> | | |
| <p>Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Illinois State Board of Education</p> | | |
| <p>Address: 100 North First Street Springfield, IL 62777-0001</p> | | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Person to contact about this report:</p> | | |
| <p>Name: Connie Wise</p> | | |
| <p>Telephone: 217-782-0354</p> | | |
| <p>Fax: 217-782-5333</p> | | |
| <p>e-mail: cwise@isbe.net</p> | | |
| <p>Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Christopher A. Koch</p> | | |
| <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; height: 100px;"> <div style="width: 45%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 10px;"></div> <div style="width: 45%; border-bottom: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 10px;"></div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Signature Date </div> | | |

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Illinois is a governing state in a 26-state consortium on assessment called the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers. In June 2010 the Illinois State Board of Education adopted new mathematics and English language arts standards for K-12 education, known as the New Illinois State Learning Standards Incorporating the Common Core. The goal is to better prepare Illinois students for success in college and the workforce in a competitive global economy.

The Illinois SEA established a standards implementation team representing various divisions within the agency to provide guidance and leadership for the transition to the new Illinois learning standards incorporating the common core. A gap analysis was completed to compare the former English language arts and mathematics standards and provide insight into areas that will need focus for professional development. The analysis will be used with the assessment frameworks to prepare a comprehensive report.

The implementation of the common core will be a collaborative process. The Illinois Regional Offices of Education will play an integral part in defining and supporting the rollout by providing initial information to LEAs on short- and long-term planning and developing and on providing professional development to LEAs. It is important to understand that the implementation of common core will be a work in progress through December 2011 through June 2012. The short-term goal will be to inform all stakeholders of the common core. The rollout and implementation will include assisting and supporting local efforts in planning for full implementation. Tools will be identified, shared, and/or designed for various stages of the implementation process. The new standards will have an impact on many facets of state and local systems and will require thoughtful, collaborative work.

The transition to the new standards will not be immediate. The expectation for schools during fall 2010 and spring 2011 is to become familiar with the new standards and begin to plan for implementation. For example, grade-level teams could begin to review and discuss how the new standards will have an impact on their work and teachers at all levels could begin to identify specific professional development requirements they will need and communicate this information to their administrations.

Development and implementation will take place in phases:

Phase I: Adoption (June 2010) and communication and coordination (June 2010-end of SY 2010-11).

Phase II: Communication, resource design, and design of implementation system (ongoing).

Phase III: Transition, implementation, and technical assistance (ongoing). Development of a transition plan is an SEA priority for SY 2010-11.

The target date for implementation of the new assessment system is SY 2014-15.

More information is available at http://www.isbe.net/common_core/default.htm.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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, reading/language arts and/or 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 the most 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 is one of the governing states in Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC). The test will be administered in SY 2014-15.

http://www.isbe.net/common_core/htmls/parcc.htm

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

| Purpose | Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent) |
|--|--|
| To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b) | 30.0 |
| To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results | 70.0 |
| Comments: | |

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

| Purpose | Used for Purpose (yes/no) |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Administering assessments required by section 1111(b) | <u>Yes</u> |
| Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b) | <u>No</u> |
| Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7) | <u>No</u> |
| Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials | <u>Yes</u> |
| Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems | <u>Yes</u> |
| Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments | <u>No</u> |
| Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments | <u>Yes</u> |
| Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time | <u>Yes</u> |
| Other | <u>No</u> |
| Comments: | |

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State 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 mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *ESEA*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students | 1,068,202 | 1,060,256 | 99.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2,039 | 2,025 | 99.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 44,975 | 44,769 | 99.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 199,071 | 196,178 | 98.5 |
| Hispanic | 219,899 | 217,980 | 99.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 565,375 | 562,824 | 99.5 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 150,721 | 148,223 | 98.3 |
| Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students | 67,911 | 67,295 | 99.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 503,002 | 497,664 | 98.9 |
| Migratory students | 346 | 337 | 97.4 |
| Male | 545,784 | 541,131 | 99.1 |
| Female | 522,252 | 519,020 | 99.4 |
| Comments: | | | |

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 36,991 | 25.0 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 96,851 | 65.3 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 14,381 | 9.7 |
| Total | 148,223 | |
| Comments: Illinois does not offer alternative assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards; therefore, Row #3 and Row #4 are not applicable to Illinois. | | |

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

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students | 1,067,077 | 1,058,938 | 99.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2,038 | 2,027 | 99.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 44,566 | 44,114 | 99.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 199,002 | 196,334 | 98.7 |
| Hispanic | 219,497 | 217,388 | 99.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 565,140 | 562,578 | 99.5 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 150,709 | 148,268 | 98.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 66,786 | 65,295 | 97.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 502,159 | 496,717 | 98.9 |
| Migratory students | 342 | 334 | 97.7 |
| Male | 545,216 | 540,473 | 99.1 |
| Female | 521,695 | 518,356 | 99.4 |
| Comments: | | | |

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

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

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

| 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 | 36,987 | 24.9 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 96,892 | 65.3 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 14,401 | 9.7 |
| Total | 148,280 | |

Comments: Illinois does not offer alternative assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards; therefore, Row #3 and Row #4 are not applicable to Illinois.

The number populated in 1.2.4 by EDEN for Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (14,401) is incorrect; the correct number is 14,389. Therefore, the 1.2.4 total populated by EDEN (148,280) is also incorrect; the correct 1.2.4 total is 148,268, which is the same number reported for children with disabilities (*IDEA*) in 1.2.3.

The 90-student difference between the correct total (148,268) of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating in the state assessment and the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) reported on the reading assessments by grade level in the achievement section (1.3) is because 90 *IDEA* LEP students, who are in their first year living in the United States, took the state assessment although they were not required to, and these 90 students are not included in the achievement calculations per the State Accountability Workbook.

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students | 449,149 | 443,438 | 98.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 898 | 888 | 98.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 19,309 | 19,159 | 99.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 81,931 | 79,819 | 97.4 |
| Hispanic | 88,351 | 86,935 | 98.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 244,235 | 242,440 | 99.3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 62,715 | 60,969 | 97.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 23,830 | 23,412 | 98.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 201,259 | 197,479 | 98.1 |
| Migratory students | 105 | 102 | 97.1 |
| Male | 228,523 | 225,172 | 98.5 |
| Female | 220,563 | 218,223 | 98.9 |
| Comments: | | | |

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|--|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 13,806 | 22.6 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 40,912 | 67.1 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 6,251 | 10.3 |
| Total | 60,969 | |
| Comments: Illinois does not offer alternative assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards; therefore, Row # 3 and Row #4 are not applicable to Illinois. | | |

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 155,489 | 133,735 | 86.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 264 | 237 | 89.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,740 | 6,413 | 95.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 29,168 | 21,089 | 72.3 |
| Hispanic | 35,141 | 27,751 | 79.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 77,782 | 72,609 | 93.3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 21,270 | 14,397 | 67.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 19,336 | 13,805 | 71.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 79,852 | 62,287 | 78.0 |
| Migratory students | 55 | 40 | 72.7 |
| Male | 79,461 | 68,214 | 85.8 |
| Female | 76,008 | 65,510 | 86.2 |
| Comments: The migratory student data are correct. | | | |

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

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 155,020 | 113,953 | 73.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 264 | 202 | 76.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,581 | 5,785 | 87.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 29,206 | 17,219 | 59.0 |
| Hispanic | 34,844 | 19,248 | 55.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 77,729 | 66,489 | 85.5 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 21,236 | 9,633 | 45.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 18,758 | 7,199 | 38.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 79,497 | 47,844 | 60.2 |
| Migratory students | 54 | 27 | 50.0 |
| Male | 79,224 | 55,798 | 70.4 |
| Female | 75,773 | 58,144 | 76.7 |
| Comments: The migratory student data are correct. | | | |

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 154,250 | 132,234 | 85.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 278 | 241 | 86.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,812 | 6,471 | 95.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 28,398 | 20,291 | 71.5 |
| Hispanic | 33,833 | 26,943 | 79.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 78,723 | 72,880 | 92.6 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 22,427 | 14,178 | 63.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 13,775 | 9,229 | 67.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 77,070 | 59,816 | 77.6 |
| Migratory students | 46 | 32 | 69.6 |
| Male | 79,170 | 67,307 | 85.0 |
| Female | 75,070 | 64,919 | 86.5 |
| Comments: The migratory data are correct. | | | |

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

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 153,848 | 113,185 | 73.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 276 | 215 | 77.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,675 | 5,921 | 88.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 28,429 | 16,166 | 56.9 |
| Hispanic | 33,597 | 19,911 | 59.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 78,670 | 66,155 | 84.1 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 22,410 | 9,339 | 41.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 13,285 | 4,834 | 36.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 76,784 | 46,168 | 60.1 |
| Migratory students | 44 | 26 | 59.1 |
| Male | 78,970 | 55,625 | 70.4 |
| Female | 74,868 | 57,552 | 76.9 |
| Comments: | | | |

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 154,113 | 118,012 | 76.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 278 | 221 | 79.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,803 | 6,071 | 89.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 28,369 | 15,074 | 53.1 |
| Hispanic | 33,800 | 21,763 | 64.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 78,675 | 69,902 | 88.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 22,387 | 12,858 | 57.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 13,753 | 6,363 | 46.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 76,984 | 48,490 | 63.0 |
| Migratory students | 47 | 26 | 55.3 |
| Male | 79,082 | 60,630 | 76.7 |
| Female | 75,021 | 57,376 | 76.5 |
| Comments: The migratory data are correct. | | | |

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 152,601 | 126,923 | 83.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 270 | 233 | 86.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,276 | 5,945 | 94.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 28,304 | 18,916 | 66.8 |
| Hispanic | 32,520 | 25,033 | 77.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 79,418 | 71,875 | 90.5 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 22,214 | 12,536 | 56.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 10,168 | 5,966 | 58.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 74,900 | 55,326 | 73.9 |
| Migratory students | 93 | 88 | 94.6 |
| Male | 78,421 | 64,472 | 82.2 |
| Female | 74,174 | 62,446 | 84.2 |
| Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native and migratory student data are correct. | | | |

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

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 152,200 | 113,447 | 74.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 270 | 202 | 74.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,138 | 5,456 | 88.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 28,335 | 16,331 | 57.6 |
| Hispanic | 32,325 | 19,715 | 61.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 79,319 | 67,226 | 84.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 22,222 | 8,863 | 39.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 9,690 | 3,081 | 31.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 74,634 | 45,717 | 61.3 |
| Migratory students | 91 | 76 | 83.5 |
| Male | 78,223 | 55,442 | 70.9 |
| Female | 73,971 | 58,001 | 78.4 |
| Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native and migratory student data are correct. | | | |

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 154,246 | 130,264 | 84.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 291 | 245 | 84.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,365 | 6,032 | 94.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 29,325 | 20,178 | 68.8 |
| Hispanic | 32,487 | 25,863 | 79.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 80,313 | 73,297 | 91.3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 21,951 | 12,184 | 55.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 8,129 | 4,589 | 56.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 74,574 | 56,537 | 75.8 |
| Migratory students | 45 | 30 | 66.7 |
| Male | 79,009 | 65,610 | 83.0 |
| Female | 75,220 | 64,641 | 85.9 |
| Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native and migratory student data are correct. | | | |

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

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 153,802 | 124,724 | 81.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 294 | 235 | 79.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,223 | 5,733 | 92.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 29,337 | 19,573 | 66.7 |
| Hispanic | 32,271 | 23,464 | 72.7 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 80,214 | 71,179 | 88.7 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 21,938 | 10,125 | 46.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 7,651 | 2,960 | 38.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 74,246 | 52,487 | 70.7 |
| Migratory students | 43 | 23 | 53.5 |
| Male | 78,780 | 61,252 | 77.8 |
| Female | 75,005 | 63,460 | 84.6 |
| Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native and migratory student data are correct. | | | |

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 153,882 | 129,554 | 84.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 304 | 257 | 84.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,444 | 6,105 | 94.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 28,989 | 19,858 | 68.5 |
| Hispanic | 31,276 | 24,948 | 79.8 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 82,009 | 74,312 | 90.6 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 21,772 | 11,363 | 52.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 6,893 | 3,819 | 55.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 72,327 | 54,535 | 75.4 |
| Migratory students | 32 | 21 | 65.6 |
| Male | 78,887 | 65,306 | 82.8 |
| Female | 74,975 | 64,236 | 85.7 |
| Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native and migratory student data are correct. | | | |

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

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 153,643 | 118,904 | 77.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 304 | 229 | 75.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,299 | 5,751 | 91.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 28,998 | 17,967 | 62.0 |
| Hispanic | 31,209 | 21,089 | 67.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 81,963 | 70,101 | 85.5 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 21,794 | 8,831 | 40.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 6,487 | 1,968 | 30.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 72,164 | 47,273 | 65.5 |
| Migratory students | 33 | 13 | 39.4 |
| Male | 78,772 | 57,896 | 73.5 |
| Female | 74,850 | 60,995 | 81.5 |
| Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native data are correct. | | | |

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 153,548 | 126,385 | 82.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 303 | 250 | 82.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,437 | 5,978 | 92.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 28,856 | 18,643 | 64.6 |
| Hispanic | 31,225 | 22,967 | 73.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 81,878 | 74,519 | 91.0 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 21,682 | 12,183 | 56.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 6,880 | 2,951 | 42.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 72,131 | 51,597 | 71.5 |
| Migratory students | 34 | 20 | 58.8 |
| Male | 78,685 | 64,162 | 81.5 |
| Female | 74,843 | 62,213 | 83.1 |
| Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native data are correct. | | | |

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 153,988 | 128,670 | 83.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 311 | 268 | 86.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,212 | 5,863 | 94.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 29,386 | 20,003 | 68.1 |
| Hispanic | 30,817 | 24,421 | 79.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 82,680 | 74,299 | 89.9 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 21,675 | 10,607 | 48.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 6,217 | 3,358 | 54.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 70,561 | 52,621 | 74.6 |
| Migratory students | 45 | 30 | 66.7 |
| Male | 78,763 | 64,227 | 81.5 |
| Female | 75,206 | 64,431 | 85.7 |
| Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native and migratory student data are correct. | | | |

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

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 153,849 | 129,244 | 84.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 309 | 266 | 86.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 6,078 | 5,655 | 93.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 29,409 | 21,206 | 72.1 |
| Hispanic | 30,778 | 23,846 | 77.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 82,692 | 74,359 | 89.9 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 21,712 | 10,664 | 49.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5,812 | 2,289 | 39.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 70,469 | 52,914 | 75.1 |
| Migratory students | 42 | 29 | 69.0 |
| Male | 78,698 | 63,446 | 80.6 |
| Female | 75,132 | 65,785 | 87.6 |
| Comments: The American Indian/Alaska Native and migratory student data are correct. | | | |

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

| High School | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|---|---|---|
| All students | 135,800 | 71,959 | 53.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 307 | 162 | 52.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 5,920 | 4,577 | 77.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 22,608 | 4,893 | 21.6 |
| Hispanic | 21,906 | 7,518 | 34.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 81,899 | 53,138 | 64.9 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 16,914 | 3,511 | 20.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,777 | 534 | 19.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 48,380 | 14,537 | 30.0 |
| Migratory students | 21 | 2 | 9.5 |
| Male | 67,420 | 37,217 | 55.2 |
| Female | 68,367 | 34,736 | 50.8 |
| Comments: The migratory student data are correct. | | | |

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

| High School | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|---|---|---|
| All students | 135,591 | 73,569 | 54.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 305 | 170 | 55.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 5,874 | 3,885 | 66.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 22,574 | 6,466 | 28.6 |
| Hispanic | 21,858 | 7,365 | 33.7 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 81,825 | 53,868 | 65.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 16,866 | 4,025 | 23.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,627 | 207 | 7.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 48,262 | 15,836 | 32.8 |
| Migratory students | 18 | 3 | 16.7 |
| Male | 67,304 | 34,870 | 51.8 |
| Female | 68,274 | 38,693 | 56.7 |
| Comments: The migratory student data are correct. | | | |

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

| High School | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 135,777 | 71,603 | 52.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 307 | 162 | 52.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 5,919 | 4,204 | 71.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 22,594 | 4,751 | 21.0 |
| Hispanic | 21,910 | 6,696 | 30.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 81,887 | 54,046 | 66.0 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 16,900 | 3,688 | 21.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,779 | 309 | 11.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 48,364 | 13,668 | 28.3 |
| Migratory students | 21 | 3 | 14.3 |
| Male | 67,405 | 37,467 | 55.6 |
| Female | 68,359 | 34,128 | 49.9 |
| Comments: The migratory student data are correct. | | | |

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| Entity | Total # | Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10 | Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10 |
|------------------|---------|--|---|
| Schools | 3,807 | 1,808 | 47.5 |
| Districts | 868 | 309 | 35.6 |
| Comments: | | | |

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 2009-10 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 2009-10 | Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10 |
|---|-------------------|---|--|
| All Title I schools | 2,422 | 1,061 | 43.8 |
| Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools | 1,117 | 281 | 25.2 |
| Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools | 1,305 | 780 | 59.8 |
| Comments: The number of all Title I schools that made AYP in SY 2009-10 is correct; the state AYP target increased by 7.5 percent. | | | |

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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| # Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10 | # Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10 | Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10 |
|--|---|---|
| 823 | 282 | 34.3 |
| Comments: | | |

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School 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 2010-11 (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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

| Corrective Action | # of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10 |
|---|---|
| Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program | 61 |
| Extension of the school year or school day | 10 |
| Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance | 13 |
| Significant decrease in management authority at the school level | 10 |
| Replacement of the principal | 14 |
| Restructuring the internal organization of the school | 18 |
| Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school | 3 |
| Comments: | |

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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) | 2 |
| Reopening the school as a public charter school | 10 |
| Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school | 8 |
| Takeover the school by the State | 7 |
| Other major restructuring of the school governance | 289 |
| Comments: | |

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 high schools in restructuring have been shifting the organizational structures of their schools and using staff to focus on learning. Typically, in the larger schools, the school moves to operating as smaller learning communities. The school schedule is becoming more flexible to ensure that students have multiple opportunities to achieve. This means that the school day is often extended and that school staff duties are changed to enable more opportunities for tutoring, and student time with instructional staff focused on achievement is broadened. Many of the restructuring schools are shifting to co-teaching for students with disabilities to ensure more equitable access to the general education curriculum. Across the board, the restructuring schools are becoming more purposeful in collecting and using data and in building shared responsibility for learning with learning communities at grades, for teams, for in-learning areas. The high schools are eliminating lower level course offerings, particularly in math, and providing supports for students to ensure that they will be able to meet the requirements. These staffs are paying greater attention to low achievement early on. In addition, the high school districts are stepping up efforts to work collaboratively with feeder districts and providing transitions for students to high school.

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District 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 2010-11 (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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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 State Board of Education has established a system of support for school districts that do not make AYP. If a school district does not make AYP for two consecutive years it is required to develop a district improvement plan to assist the district in making AYP. The plan must include an objective established for each area in which the district is not making AYP. 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 have a current, locally approved district improvement plan submitted for review by the Illinois State Board of Education 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 and Year 2 districts submitted progress reports to the Illinois State Board of Education to explain how the district is going to work toward making AYP or showing marked improvement. Although this is not the only sanction to be imposed by the Illinois State Board of Education, it is the one that is chosen most often. The RESPRO teams work with their assigned school districts until AYP is made for two consecutive years.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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 2009-10 |
|--|---|
| Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards | 91 |
| 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 | 0 |
| Restructured the district | 0 |
| Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action) | 0 |
| Comments: | |

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

| | # Appealed Their AYP Designations | # Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation |
|------------------|--|--|
| Districts | 2 | 0 |
| Schools | 2 | 0 |
| Comments: | | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete | 09/30/10 |
|---|----------|

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 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2009-10.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
 - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

| Category | SY 2009-10 | SY 2008-09 |
|---|------------|------------|
| Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10 | 185,762 | 319,547 |
| Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10 | 119,087 | 200,323 |
| Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10 | 64.1 | 62.7 |
| Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10 | 185,272 | 318,894 |
| Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10 | 103,915 | 182,755 |
| 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 2009-10 | 56.1 | 57.3 |
| Comments: The EDEN file has not populated the SY 2008-09 column correctly. The correct SY 2008-09 figures are included below: | | |
| Math SY 2008-09 # students who completed the math assessment = 191,774 # students who were proficient or above in math = 117,604 % students who were proficient or above in math = 61.3 | | |
| Reading SY 2008-09 # students who completed the reading assessment = 191,166 # students who were proficient or above in reading = 106,480 % students who were proficient or above in reading = 55.7 | | |

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 2009-10 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 2009-10 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10 | 16 |
| Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2009-10 | 3 |
| Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10 | 471 |
| Comments: | |

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.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

| Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 | Column 5 | Column 6 | Column 7 |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (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. | Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters. | Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used | Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance | Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status | Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies) (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below) | Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters. |
| 5 | Combination of planning, training, coaching, mentoring, and monitoring. All schools outside City of Chicago School District 299 were served by a partnership among the SEA, districts, and the regional system providers. Data analysis and improvement planning served as the core; consultants customized services to develop the capacity of the LEA and school, focused on strategies to change instructional practices related to AYP, and implemented other statewide strategies. | 274 | 3 | 15 | A | |
| 5 | The City of Chicago School District 299 used strategies that include literacy and math initiatives and high school transformation. Chicago 200 also partnered with other entities. | 278 | 1 | 2 | A | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 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 |

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 State Board of Education staff have shared "tips" for planning at statewide and area conferences through the work of the RESPRO consultant network. Illinois State Board of Education 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. Following these meetings, the area RESPROs meet with the consultants who work in the field with the schools and districts. In addition, the Illinois State Board of Education showcases districts and schools at conferences and meetings in order to share best practices.

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) 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:

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

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Illinois State Board of Education engaged in a multipronged approach to ensure that each School Improvement Grant funded under Section 1003(g) received up-to-date information and ongoing technical assistance that was aligned with the evaluation processes. Illinois State Board of Education SIG 1003(g) principal consultants provided direct services to the 82 funded projects in collaboration with assigned consultants representing the 10 statewide Regional System of Support Providers (RESPROs).

The awarded projects, which are located in each of the 10 Illinois RESPRO areas, received a comprehensive FY 2010 School Improvement Plan 1003(g) Resource Manual and individualized technical assistance that focused on the implementation of their projects during face-to-face meetings in August and September. These sessions were conducted by the Illinois State Board of Education consultants and assigned RESPRO consultants within the districts' regions, and follow-up site-based sessions were scheduled. The projects also engaged in statewide teleconferences and individualized technical assistance was provided by the SIG 1003(g) principal consultants.

The RESPRO consultants provided the ongoing individualized support for the Title I LEAs with the lowest achieving schools and for the lowest achieving schools themselves. The consultants provide technical assistance, as needed, to ensure that the schools meet their goals according to the school and LEA improvement, corrective action, and restructuring plans required under Section 1116. This includes working with the schools and LEAs to develop plans that meet the federal requirements; providing training for leadership and staff in areas of need, as defined by the plans; and providing resources and assistance with development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan 1003(g) grant projects.

Monitoring of the projects included the use of the FY 2010 Illinois State Board of Education SIG 1003(g) Monitoring Instrument that aligns with the goals of Section 1003(g). The instrument included 19 open-ended questions that related to the four general areas of the school improvement process, including use of the funds, use of data, proposed activities, and improvement of instruction efforts. The projects submitted written responses to the instrument to the Illinois State Board of Education. The SIG 1003(g) consultant and RESPRO consultant for each project conducted telephone conferences with the school improvement teams to review the responses and then scheduled onsite monitoring visits. During the visits, each project provided evidence that supported the implementation of their SIG-funded improvement efforts, and if indicated, follow-up technical assistance was provided to support the school's efforts. The FY 2010 outcomes indicate that the projects focused their efforts on improving instructional practices; aligning the curriculum with standards; improving the reading and mathematics curriculum and instruction; collecting, using, and analyzing data; implementing differentiated instruction; and developing and implementing professional learning communities. Resources to support the curriculum, instruction, and interventions were expanded. Schools engaged in extended-day and after-school student learning opportunities, as well as provided time for staff to engage in curriculum mapping, review and analysis of data, and student progress monitoring. Efforts to actively engage parents and the community in the school improvement efforts were also expanded.

The Illinois State Board of Education contracted with an external evaluator, Measurement, Inc., to analyze SEA implementation and the progress made by the FY 2010 SIG 1003(g) projects. The outcomes indicate that 52 percent of the projects, which received two years of funding, increased student reading and 39 percent increased mathematics proficiencies, as identified by the state assessments. Projects that received one year of funding also made gains in reading (48 percent) and 65 percent of the schools showed an increase in student proficiency in mathematics.

Presentations on the School Improvement Plan 1003(g) project expectations were included in the fall and spring Title I Directors Conferences in Springfield, Illinois, and at the Committee of Practitioners sessions.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2009-10 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). The Illinois State Board of Education uses other available federal (such as Title II and Title IV) and state funds to provide technical assistance to Title I schools that have been identified for improvement. Technical assistance includes assisting with development of the improvement and restructuring plans and overseeing review of the plans, including written feedback.

The City of Chicago School District 299 receives an allocation to provide system of support services for its schools in academic status. During SY 2009-10, the menu of support included parent, restructuring, "Fresh Start," area instructional officers, and school improvement coordinator support activities. The district differentiated these activities according to the level of academic status.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

| | # Students |
|---|------------|
| Eligible for public school choice | 545,665 |
| Applied to transfer | 3,561 |
| Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions | 1,191 |
| Comments: | |

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

| | Amount |
|--|--------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice | \$ 7,009,459 |

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

| | # LEAs |
|---|--------|
| LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice | 139 |

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments:

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 | 337,481 |
| Applied for supplemental educational services | 85,326 |
| Received supplemental educational services | 47,571 |
| Comments: | |

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 | \$ 70,082,493 |
| Comments: | |

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

| | Number of Core Academic Classes (Total) | Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified |
|------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| All classes | 158,699 | 157,660 | 99.3 | 1,039 | 0.7 |
| All elementary classes | 119,070 | 118,501 | 99.5 | 569 | 0.5 |
| All secondary classes | 39,629 | 39,159 | 98.8 | 470 | 1.2 |
| | | | | | |

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.

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For grades K-5, a classroom is counted as a full-day, self-contained classroom and equals one class.

Grades 6-8 classrooms may be counted as a full-day, self-contained classroom that equals one class, OR may be counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

| | Percentage |
|--|------------|
| Elementary School Classes | |
| Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE | 29.3 |
| 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 | 12.0 |
| Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 28.0 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 30.7 |
| Total | 100.0 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: substitute teachers, exchange certificate for visiting teachers, out-of-state certificate, Type 29 certificate.

| | 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) | 47.8 |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects | 41.3 |
| Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 10.9 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

| School Type | Number of Core Academic Classes (Total) | Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Elementary Schools | | | |
| High Poverty Elementary Schools | 21,339 | 20,985 | 98.3 |
| Low-poverty Elementary Schools | 37,963 | 37,918 | 99.9 |
| Secondary Schools | | | |
| High Poverty secondary Schools | 10,785 | 10,475 | 97.1 |
| Low-Poverty secondary Schools | 13,304 | 13,294 | 99.9 |

1.5.4 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 | 71.1 | 21.4 |
| 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 | 53.1 | 20.1 |
| Poverty metric used | Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches. High-poverty schools are the lowest 25 percent; low-poverty schools are the highest 25 percent. | |

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
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 |
|-------------------------|--|----------------|
| Yes | Dual language | Spanish |
| Yes | Two-way immersion | Spanish |
| Yes | Transitional bilingual programs | Spanish |
| Yes | Developmental bilingual | Spanish |
| Yes | Heritage language | Spanish |
| Yes | Sheltered English instruction | |
| Yes | Structured English immersion | |
| No | Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE) | |
| Yes | Content-based ESL | |
| Yes | Pull-out ESL | |
| Yes | Other (explain in comment box below) | |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

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

| | |
|---|---------|
| Number of ALL LEP students in the State | 176,262 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

| | # |
|--|---------|
| LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year. | 153,328 |
| Comments: | |

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

| Language | # LEP Students |
|--------------------|----------------|
| Spanish; Castilian | 141,794 |
| Polish | 5,355 |
| Arabic | 3,943 |
| Urdu | 2,371 |
| Chinese | 2,346 |

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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(a)(2).

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

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

| | # |
|---|---------|
| Number tested on State annual ELP assessment | 155,849 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 15,001 |
| Total | 170,850 |
| <p>Comments: EDEN file N137, where test participation is reported, asked for ALL LEP students in grades K-12 who were enrolled during the state annual English language proficiency assessment, whereas EDEN file N141 asked for ALL K-12 students enrolled in the district regardless of whether they were enrolled during the testing period or not. Therefore, the total in N141 will not be equal to the total in N137.</p> <p>Of the total reported in N141 (176,262), 170,850 were enrolled during the testing period and 5,412 were not enrolled during the testing period.</p> <p>Of the total reported in N137 (170,850), 155,849 participated in the test and 15,001 did not participate for the following reasons:</p> <p>7,813 = Erroneously marked LEP in SIS--attained proficiency in ACCESS in previous years and WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test (WAPT) in SY 2010. 3,408 = With disability 251 = Parents refused services 627 = No record--dropped out, expelled, moved out, and transferred 2,902 = Not enrolled in bilingual programs during testing window</p> <p>There were 237 students in eight districts whose ELP assessments were lost in transit to the test contractor before they could be scored; these students have been reported as not having attained proficiency.</p> | |

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

| | # |
|---|--------|
| Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment | 23,120 |
| Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment | 14.8 |
| <p>Comments: There were 237 students in eight districts whose ELP assessments were lost in transit to the test contractor before they could be scored; these students have been reported as not having attained proficiency.</p> | |

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

| | # |
|--|---------|
| Number tested on State annual ELP assessment | 140,611 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 8,689 |
| Total | 149,300 |
| <p>Comments: EDEN file N138, where test participation is reported, asked for ALL LEP students in grades K-12 who were served in Title III and who were enrolled during the state annual English language proficiency assessment, whereas EDEN file N116 asked for ALL K-12 Title III served students enrolled in the district regardless if they were enrolled during the testing period or not. Therefore, the total in N116 will not be equal to the total in N138.</p> <p>Of the total reported in N116 (153,328), 149,300 were enrolled during the testing period.</p> <p>Of the total reported in N138 (149,300), 140,611 participated in the test and 8,689 did not participate for the following reasons</p> <p>3,616 = Erroneously marked LEP in SIS--attained proficiency in ACCESS in previous years and WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test (WAPT) in SY 2010. 1,957 = With disability 546 = No record--dropped out, expelled, moved out, and transferred 2,570 = Not enrolled in bilingual programs during testing window</p> <p>There were 237 students in eight districts whose ELP assessments were lost in transit to the test contractor before they could be scored; these students have been reported as not having attained proficiency.</p> <p>In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).</p> | |
| | # |
| Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. | 30,887 |

1.6.3.2.2**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

| | Results | | Targets | |
|----------------------|---------|------|---------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % |
| Making progress | 102,120 | 93.1 | | 91.00 |
| Attained proficiency | 17,738 | 12.6 | | 6.00 |

Comments: Illinois has target percentages only, no target numbers.

There were 237 students in eight districts whose ELP assessments were lost in transit to the test contractor before they could be scored; these students have been reported as not having attained proficiency.

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: Illinois does not administer native language assessments. | |

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

| Language(s) |
|---|
| NA |
| NA |
| NA |
| NA |
| NA |
| Comments: This table is not applicable because Illinois does not administer native language mathematics assessments. |

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

| Language(s) |
|---|
| NA |
| NA |
| NA |
| NA |
| NA |
| Comments: This table is not applicable because Illinois does not administer native language reading/language arts assessments. |

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

| Language(s) |
|---|
| NA |
| NA |
| NA |
| NA |
| NA |
| Comments: This table is not applicable because Illinois does not administer native language science assessments. |

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

| # Year One | # Year Two | Total |
|------------------|------------|--------|
| 15,337 | 15,238 | 30,575 |
| Comments: | | |

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 30,394 | 26,175 | 86.1 | 4,219 |
| Comments: | | | |

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) 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 |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 30,430 | 21,982 | 72.2 | 8,448 |
| Comments: | | | |

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are 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 total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 11,561 | 8,295 | 71.7 | 3,266 |
| Comments: | | | |

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 | 177 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs | 86 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1 | 168 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2 | 173 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3 | 54 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs | 0 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10) | 38 |
| # - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years | 32 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10) | 4 |

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: There are 12 consortia representing 27 districts, with each consortia considered to be a subgrantee. The 177 subgrantees represent 192 districts.

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: | |

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: | |

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 schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

| # Immigrant Students Enrolled | # Students in 3114(d)(1) Program | # of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 18,257 | 4,690 | 34 |

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction 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 under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

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

| | # |
|--|-------|
| Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs. | 4,091 |
| Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*. | 2,853 |

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.

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee 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 activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

| Type of Professional Development Activity | # Subgrantees | |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Instructional strategies for LEP students | 169 | |
| Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students | 96 | |
| Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students | 108 | |
| Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards | 99 | |
| Subject matter knowledge for teachers | 43 | |
| Other (Explain in comment box) | 170 | |
| Participant Information | # Subgrantees | # Participants |
| PD provided to content classroom teachers | 160 | 15,078 |
| PD provided to LEP classroom teachers | 169 | 4,726 |
| PD provided to principals | 143 | 972 |
| PD provided to administrators/other than principals | 139 | 794 |
| PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative | 107 | 1,702 |
| PD provided to community based organization personnel | 32 | 258 |
| Total | 175 | 23,530 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Other" includes school/program improvement plans, technology for ELL programs, and training in meeting teacher certification requirements.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be 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 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

| Date State Received Allocation | Date Funds Available to Subgrantees | # of Days/\$\$ Distribution |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 07/01/09 | 10/01/09 | 90 |
| Comments: | | |

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.

In order to shorten the distribution of Title III funds to subgrantees the Illinois State Board of Education embarked upon a massive conversion of the FY11 LEA plans and applications for funding from a paper-based system to an electronic grants management system (eGMS). The first year of this conversion has streamlined the application review and approval process. The Illinois State Board of Education will continue to update the application format and to review the approval process to make revisions as needed on an annual basis.

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 | |
| Comments: Although EDEN file N130 was submitted, the system has not populated the answer to this question, which is zero. | |

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 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Graduation Rate |
|--|-----------------|
| All Students | 87.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 79.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 94.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 76.7 |
| Hispanic | 76.8 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 92.3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 78.1 |
| Limited English proficient | 63.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 76.6 |
| Migratory students | 27.8 |
| Male | 84.5 |
| Female | 89.7 |
| Comments: | |

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 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Dropout Rate |
|--|--------------|
| All Students | 3.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 3.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7.1 |
| Hispanic | 4.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 1.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 5.1 |
| Limited English proficient | 4.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 5.2 |
| Migratory students | 5.6 |
| Male | 3.8 |
| Female | 2.9 |
| Comments: | |

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 | 868 | 868 |
| LEAs with subgrants | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 868 | 868 |
| Comments: Illinois uses a regional service system for subgrants. Funding is awarded through seven regional service centers, not directly to LEAs. The regional service centers have provided assistance to 868 Illinois LEAs through McKinney-Vento program funds. Although the subgrants are not awarded directly to LEAs, all schools in the 868 LEAs were provided with McKinney-Vento services. | | |

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) | 0 | 1,746 |
| K | 0 | 2,657 |
| 1 | 0 | 2,719 |
| 2 | 0 | 2,659 |
| 3 | 0 | 2,622 |
| 4 | 0 | 2,330 |
| 5 | 0 | 2,297 |
| 6 | 0 | 2,261 |
| 7 | 0 | 2,112 |
| 8 | 0 | 2,178 |
| 9 | 0 | 2,514 |
| 10 | 0 | 2,745 |
| 11 | 0 | 1,848 |
| 12 | 0 | 2,679 |
| Ungraded | 0 | |
| Total | 0 | 33,367 |
| Comments: Subgrants are made to regional service centers, not directly to LEAs. The regional service centers provide McKinney-Vento program services to LEAs. Illinois does not have ungraded students. | | |

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 | 0 | 5,103 |
| Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family) | 0 | 26,840 |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings) | 0 | 560 |
| Hotels/Motels | 0 | 864 |
| Total | 0 | 33,367 |
| Comments: Subgrants are made to regional service centers, not directly to LEAs. The regional service centers provide McKinney-Vento program services to LEAs. | | |

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) | 1,746 |
| K | 2,657 |
| 1 | 2,719 |
| 2 | 2,659 |
| 3 | 2,622 |
| 4 | 2,330 |
| 5 | 2,297 |
| 6 | 2,261 |
| 7 | 2,112 |
| 8 | 2,178 |
| 9 | 2,514 |
| 10 | 2,745 |
| 11 | 1,848 |
| 12 | 2,679 |
| Ungraded | |
| Total | 33,367 |

Comments: Illinois does not have ungraded students.

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

| | # Homeless Students Served |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Unaccompanied youth | 5,032 |
| Migratory children/youth | 138 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,332 |
| Limited English proficient students | 1,634 |

Comments:

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 | 868 |
| Expedited evaluations | 868 |
| Staff professional development and awareness | 868 |
| Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services | 868 |
| Transportation | 868 |
| Early childhood programs | 868 |
| Assistance with participation in school programs | 868 |
| Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs | 868 |
| Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment | 868 |
| Parent education related to rights and resources for children | 868 |
| Coordination between schools and agencies | 868 |
| Counseling | 868 |
| Addressing needs related to domestic violence | 868 |
| Clothing to meet a school requirement | 868 |
| School supplies | 868 |
| Referral to other programs and services | 868 |
| Emergency assistance related to school attendance | 868 |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois is a regional service state and subgrants are made to regional service centers, not directly to LEAs. The regional service centers have provided assistance to 868 Illinois LEAs through McKinney-Vento program funds.

The individual school data provided here are collected from the schools. Although LEAs do not directly receive subgrant funds, all schools in the 868 LEAs were provided with McKinney-Vento services.

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 | 868 |
| School Selection | 868 |
| Transportation | 868 |
| School records | 868 |
| Immunizations | 868 |
| Other medical records | |
| Other Barriers – in comment box below | 868 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois is a regional service state and subgrants are made to regional service centers, not directly to LEAs. The regional service centers have provided assistance to 868 Illinois LEAs through McKinney-Vento program funds.

The individual school data provided here are collected from the schools. Although LEAs do not directly receive subgrant funds, all schools in the 868 LEAs were provided with McKinney-Vento services. Illinois does not collect information on "Other medical records." "Other Barriers" include such things as clothing, child care, and work responsibilities.

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 *ESEA* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

| Grade | # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|------------------|---|---|
| 3 | 2,808 | 1,445 |
| 4 | 2,714 | 1,403 |
| 5 | 2,645 | 1,332 |
| 6 | 2,551 | 1,599 |
| 7 | 1,952 | 1,106 |
| 8 | 1,965 | 1,324 |
| High School | 2,011 | 616 |
| Comments: | | |

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 *ESEA* mathematics assessment.

| Grade | # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|------------------|---|---|
| 3 | 2,820 | 1,921 |
| 4 | 2,731 | 1,874 |
| 5 | 2,649 | 1,693 |
| 6 | 2,570 | 1,741 |
| 7 | 1,959 | 1,269 |
| 8 | 1,973 | 1,280 |
| High School | 2,016 | 553 |
| Comments: | | |

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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) | 249 |
| K | 103 |
| 1 | 133 |
| 2 | 121 |
| 3 | 108 |
| 4 | 116 |
| 5 | 92 |
| 6 | 102 |
| 7 | 108 |
| 8 | 111 |
| 9 | 135 |
| 10 | 110 |
| 11 | 79 |
| 12 | 54 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 298 |
| Total | 1,919 |
| Comments: | |

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of students reported in Category 1 reflects a small decrease (less than 10 percent) from the number reported last year. While the state has experienced a decline in the number of migrants identified at several sites that had attracted larger numbers in the past, recruiting has expanded to focus on communities where small numbers of migrant children and youth may be found. The number of out-of-school youth identified was comparable to the number recruited last year.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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) | 83 |
| K | 65 |
| 1 | 81 |
| 2 | 62 |
| 3 | 62 |
| 4 | 59 |
| 5 | 43 |
| 6 | 47 |
| 7 | 45 |
| 8 | 44 |
| 9 | 56 |
| 10 | 32 |
| 11 | 27 |
| 12 | 13 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 92 |
| Total | 811 |
| Comments: | |

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 decreased by 10 percent from the number reported last year. The number of migrant-eligible children and youth declined in several communities that have larger concentrations of migrant children where center-based summer school programs are offered. The State continues to expand the summer services offered to communities with small numbers of migrant-eligible children and youth through itinerant teachers and outreach projects.

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 counts for the 2009-10 reporting period. NGS was also used to produce the child counts for the previous reporting period.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

At the beginning of the 2009-10 school year Illinois adopted a new COE that contains all the data sections and elements required by the national COE, as well as additional information used by the state MEP, including student enrollment, legal parent identification, home base, and continued residency verification.

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

The "Illinois Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual 2010" (http://www.isbe.net/bilingual/htmls/migrant_resources.htm) stipulates that all COEs be prepared by certified migrant recruiters who have successfully completed the required annual state training. Each COE was reviewed and approved at the local and state levels, with any questionable items returned to the local project for correction. Illinois uses a three-year COE to document continued residency during annual residency verification efforts. A new COE was completed for each migrant family that made a new, qualifying move.

The Category 2 child count includes only children who were served for one or more days in MEP-funded summer programs in Illinois. Local projects maintained records of individual student enrollment, attendance, and services. Based on their records, local projects indicated participation in the MEP-funded summer program for each eligible migrant student on NGS. Average daily attendance figures are submitted each year as part of the application for MEP funds.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count data were entered into NGS by local project staff. The statewide records office was responsible for managing the COE verification and the NGS data entry for the State to ensure the accuracy and consistency of child eligibility determinations and the data collected.

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

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

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

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

For each new or updated COE, NGS created a history line that was coded to identify eligible children to be included in the Category 1

count. A history line was created for each child enrolled in summer school to be included in the Category 2 count. NGS assigned a unique student identifier to each child so that an unduplicated count could be produced.

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

Illinois established a deadline for entering into the system and cleaning all data for the reporting year. After all data were entered, NGS produced a snapshot of the data for the reporting year. The State 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 elsewhere in 1.10.3.2.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NGS programming used the eligibility information entered for each child to generate an unduplicated child count report, which includes only migrant children ages 3-21 who were eligible, based on federal requirements, for at least one day during the counting period of 9/1/2009 to 8/31/2010.

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

The NGS query was programmed to include only children who were at least three and fewer than 22 years of age who had not graduated from high school and who had eligibility for at least one day during the period 9/1/2009-8/31/2010 based on the date of the last qualifying move. Recruiters verified birth dates, the date of the last qualifying move, and the qualifying activity through initial interviews with families, and this information was entered into NGS. Recruiters use an NGS report to track two-year-olds about to turn three and scheduled visits with families to verify residency and to enroll three-year-olds into programs. NGS counts only those three-year-olds who were actually in residence in the state on or after their third birthday.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Illinois adopted a new COE that contains the required sections and data elements of the national COE, as well as additional fields for information collected by the SEA. All recruiters in the state received training on the completion of the new COE. The "Illinois Migrant Service Delivery Plan" specifies the components of the state quality control efforts and the "Illinois Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual" provides the guide for implementation.

Each year the state reviews the quality control efforts and modifies activities to address any issues identified during the previous year.

Recruiter Training, Technical Assistance, and Review: All recruiters participated in the mandatory 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. A make-up training was held for those unable to attend the original identification and recruitment training. Additional training was offered at the statewide MEP workshop in June 2010. At the June workshop, training and an implementation handbook were also provided to NGS data entry specialists who input child eligibility and summer enrollment data. 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 by telephone, e-mail, and in person. He also hosted an online, professional networking site for recruiters and other migrant program staff to exchange ideas and ask questions. He visited local projects, reviewed their recruiting practices and documentation, and, in some instances, conducted joint recruiting with staff during the summer. The state records office identified local projects in need of additional technical assistance based on the quality of their COEs submitted for approval.

Proper Eligibility Determinations and Documentation Quality Controls: Recruiters conducted personal interviews with families and verified all eligibility information before student data were entered into NGS. Recruiters maintained documentation to back up their recruiting activity and decisions, including recruiters' logs. Recruiters used a COE review checklist to review the COE for completeness and accuracy. The trained local project COE reviewer checked each COE for accuracy. NGS data entry specialists were provided training to enable them to conduct initial reviews of all COEs as they prepared for entering COE data into NGS.

Following State NGS implementation guidelines, local projects sent the completed COE 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. Questionable COEs were returned to the local project recruiter for further clarification or documentation of eligibility. 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 developed a local quality control plan that included a systematic, random check of COEs. A trained individual who had not made the initial eligibility determination reviewed the COE document to determine its face validity and conducted an interview with the family to verify all eligibility information recorded, following a set protocol. Local projects reported the results of their quality control reviews to the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator.

The State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator also coordinated re-interviews of migrant families across the state chosen through random selection. Re-interviewers were individuals familiar with the migrant community but not directly associated with the local project that initially determined MEP eligibility. Re-interviewers received training to follow an established protocol to ensure that they asked stipulated questions that covered all required eligibility criteria in a face-to-face meeting with families or by telephone. A committee of reviewers determined whether the information gathered confirmed the child's eligibility. Any children determined to be ineligible were removed from the NGS data and not included in the child count.

In accordance with federal requirements, the State will conduct a statewide independent re-interview process in summer 2011.

Monitoring: The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator examined COEs and eligibility documentation and procedures during onsite visits to local projects. Review of eligibility documentation, as well as student attendance documentation in summer programs, was also included in the SEA monitoring of local projects.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Illinois MEP Quality Control Plan is designed to strengthen and maintain the accuracy of the State 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 plan, which is updated 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 are managed through a contract with the Illinois Migrant Council, where the State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator is employed.

The Quality Control Plan operates at the state and local levels. Each locally funded MEP is required to develop its own plan to ensure that only eligible children are recruited and served. These plans are approved by the SEA and are implemented at the local level. Together,

state and local quality control plans act as early warning systems to detect problems in the identification and recruitment process.

Re-interviews to verify the accuracy of the original COE form part of the state and local quality control plans and are conducted each year. All re-interviews are conducted systematically following established protocol. The State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator provides training and guidance to re-interviewers, who were not involved in the original eligibility determination.

The state quality control plan requires that the eligibility of 50 children with current year eligibility determinations be verified annually by validating each MEP-eligibility criterion for every child selected. Samples are generated by randomly selecting 50 children on a statewide basis or within categories associated with identified risk factors. Eligibility verifications are divided proportionally among the state's projects and recruiters. A trained recruiter independent of the original eligibility determination conducts the validation through a re-interview. Independent re-interviews are used at least once every three years; independent re-interviews will be conducted in summer 2011.

Aligned with the state quality control plan, local quality control plans require that the eligibility of 3 percent of a project's COEs completed during the current program year be verified by validating each criterion that makes children eligible for the MEP. Validations, or re-interviews, are made by a trained, bilingual recruiter independent of the original eligibility determination. Samples are generated by randomly selecting 3 percent of the project's COEs. Eligibility verifications are divided as evenly as possible among a project's recruiters.

To ensure the most complete results, re-interviews are scheduled when nearly all migrant families have been recruited for the season and therefore are more easily accessible. High-quality data collection is ensured by using standardized documentation for all interviews throughout the state. Comprehensive support is available to those involved in the re-interview process at any point along the way.

The state Identification and Recruitment Coordinator monitors the re-interview process on an ongoing basis. State and local interview results are submitted for review, with final eligibility determinations made by a review committee. Any inaccuracies detected by quality control measures are appropriately resolved in a timely manner. In addition, all results are entered into a statewide database that is maintained by the state Identification and Recruitment Coordinator. The re-interview process is continually assessed and any needed changes to improve the process are implemented promptly.

Though all children included in the re-interviews this year were found to be eligible, the plan states that any children determined to be ineligible would be removed from NGS data and not included in the child count.

Summary of State and Local Quality Control Results:

Total Children Represented in Interviews = 187

Total Percentage of Eligible Children Represented by Interviews = 100%

State Results:

Number Reviewed of Target Children in Sample = 50

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

Number Reviewed of Siblings of Target Children in Sample = 65

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

Number Reviewed of Total Children in Sample = 115

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

Local Results:

Number of COEs Examined = 42 (100%)

of Eligible COEs = 42

Number of Children Represented by Interviews = 72

Number of Eligible Children Represented by Interviews = 72 (100%) Eligibility

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 through individual technical assistance throughout the year. The Illinois Migrant Council statewide migrant records office staff distributes a data entry manual to all local projects and responds to questions by telephone and e-mail throughout the year.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

To verify the accuracy of the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Counts, the statewide migrant records office and the SEA conduct ongoing substantiation of data by running preliminary federal report data, including the aggregate counts and the list of the individual migrant children included in the counts, and checking these reports for inconsistencies or inaccuracies. To address any discrepancies, staff may consult source documents, including the COEs, and contact local projects to provide any additional information needed to correct the NGS data.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the 2009-10 school year the Illinois MEP began to use a new COE that incorporates the national COE required sections and data elements. Migrant recruiters were trained in the use of the COE at the annual required recruiter training. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and Statewide Recruiter offers individual mentoring to new recruiters and technical assistance in response to recruiter requests or identified needs for assistance. The Illinois MEP completed the second year of participation in the Out-of-School Youth (OSY) Consortium Incentive Grant, which provided resources and training for outreach to OSY. With the award of a new consortium incentive grant for Services for Out-of-School Youth (SOSY), Illinois will continue to develop strategies and resources for recruiting this migrant population.

In summer 2011 Illinois will conduct the independent re-interview process required every three years. This will provide the MEP with additional information about the accuracy of MEP eligibility determinations made by recruiters in the state.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2009-10 eligibility verifications yielded a result of 100 percent of the children included with confirmed eligibility. The Illinois MEP identification and recruitment procedures incorporate the development of qualified, well-trained, and well-supported recruiting staff, as well as the systematic and timely review of eligibility decisions and recruiting processes at the state and local levels. It is important that the state MEP maintain the resources necessary to respond quickly to any emerging areas of concern by working directly with local projects to modify their procedures to avoid errors in eligibility determination. The state and local re-interview processes conducted each year measure the effectiveness of these efforts and point to areas where additional training or modifications are warranted. 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.