

**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 2006-07

PENNSYLVANIA



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

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.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 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>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Pennsylvania Department of Education	
Address: 333 Market Street Harrisburg, PA 17126	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Veronica Shaffer	
Telephone: 717-783-2193	
Fax: 717-787-8634	
e-mail: vshaffer@state.pa.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Gerald L. Zahorchak	
_____ Signature	_____ Monday, April 21, 2008, 5:06:42 PM Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. 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 content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Pennsylvania refers to the Academic Content Standards as the Assessment Anchor Content Standards. No revisions or changes to the Assessment Anchor Content Standards taken or planned in mathematics or reading. The Assessment Anchor Content Standards in Science are in final review and action will be taken by the State Board of Education in Spring 2008.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. 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*. 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The only change Pennsylvania has undertaken to the State's assessment in mathematics and reading is to develop an alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards. This alternate assessment will be administered for the first time in 2009-2010.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards 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 content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The only change Pennsylvania is planning to the Academic Achievement Standards in mathematics and reading is to identify the modified academic achievement standards. The modified academic achievement standards will be identified in 2009-2010.
--

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. 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*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Pennsylvania will administer the science assessment (PSSA) to all students in Grades 4, 8, and 11 for the first time in the spring of 2007-2008. An alternate assessment in science based on alternate achievement standards (PASA) for students with severe cognitive disabilities will be administered for the first time in the spring of 2007-2008. An alternate assessment in science based on modified achievement standards will be administered for the first time in 2009-2010.
--

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Academic Achievement Standards in science for the state assessment (PSSA) in science in Grades 4, 8, and 11 will be set in the summer of 2008 and applied to the test results of the 2007-2008 test administration. The Academic Achievement Standards in science for the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (PASA) will be set in the summer of 2008 and applied to the test results of the 2007-2008 test administration. The Academic Achievement Standards in science for the alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards will be set in the summer of 2010 and applied to the test results of the 2009-2010 test administration.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	961468	952406	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1534	1515	98.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	25329	25234	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	148455	146022	98.4
Hispanic	64173	63404	98.8
White, non-Hispanic	714421	710127	99.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	156359	153383	98.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22508	22324	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	327603	323791	98.8
Migratory students	2241	2224	99.2
Male	493351	488923	99.1
Female	466766	463483	99.3
Comments:			

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for 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 were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	87779	57.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	54121	35.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	11491	7.5
Total	153391	
Comments: Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards and Modified Achievement Standards are not reported by PDE.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	960194	949573	98.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1532	1509	98.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	24987	24776	99.2
Black, non-Hispanic	148383	145526	98.1
Hispanic	63525	62477	98.4
White, non-Hispanic	714233	709225	99.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	156311	152938	97.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21259	20766	97.7
Economically disadvantaged students	326907	322242	98.6
Migratory students	2182	2141	98.1
Male	492667	487313	98.9
Female	466180	462260	99.2
Comments:			

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	92566	60.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	48880	32.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	11498	7.5
Total	152944	
Comments: Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement and Modified Achievement Standards are not collected by PDE.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	128745	100222	77.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	204	152	74.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3759	3312	88.1
Black, non-Hispanic	20426	11215	54.9
Hispanic	9704	5691	58.6
White, non-Hispanic	93465	79069	84.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19889	10428	52.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4186	1985	47.4
Economically disadvantaged students	48368	30919	63.9
Migratory students	387	207	53.5
Male	66249	51775	78.2
Female	62393	48397	77.6
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	128331	92687	72.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	204	139	68.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3677	3011	81.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20374	10177	50.0
Hispanic	9563	4816	50.4
White, non-Hispanic	93337	73825	79.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19827	7956	40.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3932	1365	34.7
Economically disadvantaged students	48150	26982	56.0
Migratory students	376	167	44.4
Male	66007	45336	68.7
Female	62225	47305	76.0
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	129502	100265	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	187	135	72.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3731	3292	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	20364	10985	53.9
Hispanic	9509	5406	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	94620	79725	84.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21627	10907	50.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3975	1820	45.8
Economically disadvantaged students	47767	29963	62.7
Migratory students	348	179	51.4
Male	66042	51585	78.1
Female	63352	48632	76.8
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	129059	89832	69.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	187	114	61.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3635	2909	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	20303	9261	45.6
Hispanic	9346	4220	45.2
White, non-Hispanic	94505	72701	76.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21584	7829	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3672	1055	28.7
Economically disadvantaged students	47526	24702	52.0
Migratory students	332	121	36.4
Male	65796	43208	65.7
Female	63156	46585	73.8
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132936	93557	70.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	231	147	63.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3655	3085	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	20612	9204	44.7
Hispanic	9336	4515	48.4
White, non-Hispanic	98041	76002	77.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22433	8517	38.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3456	1165	33.7
Economically disadvantaged students	48367	25759	53.3
Migratory students	317	130	41.0
Male	68547	48594	70.9
Female	64291	44932	69.9
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	132527	78804	59.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	230	127	55.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3575	2583	72.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20580	6829	33.2
Hispanic	9187	3169	34.5
White, non-Hispanic	97903	65604	67.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22380	5506	24.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3195	536	16.8
Economically disadvantaged students	48173	18976	39.4
Migratory students	309	82	26.5
Male	68322	38528	56.4
Female	64109	40256	62.8
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	136837	94578	69.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	224	137	61.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3579	3069	85.8
Black, non-Hispanic	21423	9614	44.9
Hispanic	9391	4372	46.6
White, non-Hispanic	101319	76920	75.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22710	7299	32.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2988	960	32.1
Economically disadvantaged students	48958	25247	51.6
Migratory students	333	139	41.7
Male	70320	48560	69.1
Female	66348	45930	69.2
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	136413	86031	63.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	223	130	58.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3510	2670	76.1
Black, non-Hispanic	21363	7937	37.2
Hispanic	9234	3436	37.2
White, non-Hispanic	101193	71435	70.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22642	5563	24.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2734	492	18.0
Economically disadvantaged students	48686	20905	42.9
Migratory students	316	107	33.9
Male	70092	41315	58.9
Female	66155	44647	67.5
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	142235	94740	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	138	57.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3589	3040	84.7
Black, non-Hispanic	22740	8794	38.7
Hispanic	9571	4233	44.2
White, non-Hispanic	105095	78073	74.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23405	6196	26.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2891	863	29.9
Economically disadvantaged students	49395	23509	47.6
Migratory students	306	113	36.9
Male	73409	48210	65.7
Female	68651	46472	67.7
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	141852	93828	66.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	144	60.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3541	2826	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	22653	9203	40.6
Hispanic	9449	3943	41.7
White, non-Hispanic	104981	77233	73.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23336	5726	24.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2702	571	21.1
Economically disadvantaged students	49182	22877	46.5
Migratory students	290	87	30.0
Male	73186	44383	60.6
Female	68497	49387	72.1
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	144967	97671	67.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	227	143	63.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3443	2965	86.1
Black, non-Hispanic	22861	9089	39.8
Hispanic	9419	4356	46.2
White, non-Hispanic	108055	80681	74.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23841	6593	27.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2795	868	31.1
Economically disadvantaged students	48436	23570	48.7
Migratory students	303	110	36.3
Male	74590	50050	67.1
Female	70143	47535	67.8
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	144554	107527	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	227	166	73.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3397	2779	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic	22761	11491	50.5
Hispanic	9298	4659	50.1
White, non-Hispanic	107918	87905	81.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23776	8157	34.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2612	609	23.3
Economically disadvantaged students	48201	26918	55.8
Migratory students	291	95	32.6
Male	74347	52529	70.7
Female	69975	54892	78.4
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	138350	73894	53.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	98	48.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3478	2645	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	17599	4364	24.8
Hispanic	6474	1768	27.3
White, non-Hispanic	109536	64675	59.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19486	2896	14.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2033	569	28.0
Economically disadvantaged students	32503	10449	32.1
Migratory students	230	67	29.1
Male	69771	37650	54.0
Female	68308	36195	53.0
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	137978	89584	64.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	114	57.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3441	2426	70.5
Black, non-Hispanic	17494	6216	35.5
Hispanic	6400	2279	35.6
White, non-Hispanic	109392	78090	71.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19399	4051	20.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1919	301	15.7
Economically disadvantaged students	32327	13679	42.3
Migratory students	227	54	23.8
Male	69566	42330	60.8
Female	68146	47184	69.2
Comments: No explanation provided.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	3104	2404	77.5
Districts	500	455	91.0
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 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 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	1778	1357	76.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	598	308	51.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1180	1049	88.9
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

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 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
495	437	88.3
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed 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 missed 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 missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (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 the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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>.

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

PA's model is based on three tiers: Foundation Assistance, Field-Based Assistance and Targeted Assistance. A series of tools, resources, supports and programs have been developed by PDE and its partners to assist schools and districts in making decisions and research-proven changes in the educational environment to positively impact student achievement. The Bureau of Teaching & Learning Support has contracted with Delaware County IU 25 to serve as the lead in coordinating services offered by all partners, school improvement planning statewide and development and delivery of training statewide. The School Improvement Leadership Team serves to inform the policy makers in the PDE and to provide a comprehensive leadership approach to school improvement planning and implementation. The members of the team include representatives from many different educational arenas including IU Executive Directors, Superintendents, PaTTAN, professional associations, special education representatives, Delaware County IU 25 and PDE representatives. The leadership team meets regularly to discuss important school improvement issues, research-proven approaches, current issues in education and NCLB. The School Improvement Core Team is a group of PDE and Delaware County IU 25 staff who review issues brought up by the SI Leadership Team, determine if changes need to be made to policies and procedures, and provide overall management of the SSOS.

Programs, initiatives and tools provided and available at the Foundation Assistance level to ALL schools and/or districts:

• Getting Results! Framework for School Improvement Planning: Template used by schools to develop school improvement plans.

• School Improvement Plan Review and Continuous Improvement: Support from IUs and PDE during the development of the plans.

• Pennsylvania Value Added Assessment System (PVAAS): A measure of growth/ progress intended to serve as a complement to existing achievement measures.

• Voluntary Model Curriculum: A differentiated approach to instructional design for the needs of a diverse student population.

• Assessment Anchors: Focus on a set of core standards that can be measured by a large-scale assessment.

• Adopt-an Anchor Program: Design and implement a "reading and mathematics across the curriculum" at the secondary level targeted to the assessment anchors.

• Pennsylvania Inspired Leadership Program (PIL): Statewide, standards-based leadership development and support system for school leaders at all levels.

• Project 720 (High School Reform Model): State grant to promote high schools that are student-centered, data-informed and personalized in the delivery of services to students.

• Classrooms for the Future: Funding for technology equipment, infrastructure, and support to foster 21st Century teaching and learning.

• Dual Enrollment: College courses and postsecondary credit while completing high school graduation requirements.

• Early College, Middle College and Gateway to College Programs: Support at-risk students who are not succeeding in their traditional high school environments and help them to finish high school and enter college.

• Accountability Block Grant (ABG): Effective educational practices and initiatives to improve student achievement in the core subject areas of math, literacy and science.

• Academy for Urban Teaching: Challenging minority youth in urban inner-city schools to consider teaching as a profession.

• College and Career Counseling Grants: Student-centered 8-12 career development system for preparing high school graduates for college and career success.

Different professional development opportunities available to all schools within the Foundation Assistance tier of PA's SSOS:

â€¢Getting Results! Professional Development

â€¢Pennsylvania Value Added Assessment System (PVAAS) Training
Pennsylvania Inspired Leadership (PIL) Professional Development:

â€¢4 Sight Benchmark Assessment Training

â€¢Center for Data Driven Reform in Education (CDDRE)

â€¢Response to Intervention State Alignment & Support

â€¢PA Governor's Institutes

â€¢Online Professional Development

â€¢PDE Professional Development & Support

â€¢PaTTAN Professional Development: Three regional locations (Pittsburgh, Harrisburg and King of Prussia) provide ongoing training for parents and educators.

The Field-Based Assistance (Tier 2) level of supports provides more targeted, focused support to schools identified as School Improvement I or School Improvement II.

â€¢Education Assistance Program (EAP): Requires school districts identified for improvement or higher to develop and implement tutoring programs for students failing to score at or above the proficient level on the PSSA

â€¢IU Capacity Building Support
â€¢Field-Based Assistance (Level 2): State funds are provided to LEAs for their schools identified for improvement or corrective action (\$9500 per building).

â€¢Title I School Improvement Funding: Title I SI set aside funds are made available to all Title I buildings identified for School Improvement I or II. All schools in these levels of improvement received a "Base" allocation of \$40,000 to support the activities outlined within each schools' approved school improvement plans.

â€¢Required Attendance at Model 1 Governor's Institutes: School districts with one or more schools in school improvement or higher are required to send school-based teams of educators to the Data Driven Decision Making Governor's Institute facilitated by CDDRE staff, distinguished educators, EAP Technical Assistants, PDE and IU curriculum and special education advisors.

â€¢Bureau of Teaching & Learning Supports: When schools are identified for improvement, the Division of Federal Programs provides assistance in the development of school improvement plans, parent notification letters and budgets for required federal fund set asides. In addition, the Division of Continuous School and District Improvement provides technical assistance regarding plan development and timelines for plan development, submission and implementation.

The top of the three-tiered model, the assistance to schools and districts is the most personalized and intensive. High levels of corrective action receive more customized, directed assistance from SSOS partners.

â€¢Distinguished Educator Initiative (DE): The PDE has developed the DE program to recruit, train and assign experienced educators to struggling schools and districts in planning and implementing effective school reform efforts. Depending on the needs of the areas to which they are assigned, DEs may serve as coaches or mentors for administrators, assist in the development of prescriptive solutions to student achievement problems and provide budget and financial assistance. DEs are assigned for a minimum of a year and work one-on-one with school personnel as an integral participant in reform efforts.

â€¢Distinguished School Leaders Program (DSL): The DSL program provides schools with experienced special educators to work directly with them if their IEP subgroup is the focus of school improvement efforts. These DSLs work out of the regional PaTTAN offices and are available to their assigned schools at any time. They work along side of the DEs so that reform efforts are coordinated and complimentary.

â€¢IU Capacity Building Support
â€¢Targeted Assistance (Level 3): In addition to Levels I and II supports to schools, schools in corrective action are awarded \$10,000 in state funding through the schools' local IU. The IU staff, DE, DSL and school administration must plan and coordinate the use of these funds.

â€¢Title I School Improvement Funds: Schools in Corrective Action also receive "Targeted" funds of \$58,000. Schools in Restructuring with highest need receive an additional \$50,000. Total amount of funds available to schools at the highest levels of corrective action exceeds \$140,000.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: PA Department of Education did not collect this data as it was a new data collection for the 06-07 school year. We will work on providing this data for the SY 07-08 CSPR.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: PA Department of Education did not collect this data as it was a new data collection for the 06-07 school year. We will work on providing this data for the SY 07-08 CSPR.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed 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 missed 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 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 Identified for Improvement

In the space below, 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.

Data was not received by submission time.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	
Comments: PA Department of Education did not collect this data as it was a new data collection for the 06-07 school year. We will work on providing this data for the SY 07-08 CSPR.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations		
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)		
Comments: Data was not received by submission time.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
Comments: Data was not received by submission time.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	
---	--

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data was not received by submission time.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	
Comments: We do not collect this data.	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	162001
Who applied to transfer	1015
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	881

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	No Response
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	No Response
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No Response
Comments: We do not collect this data.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$
Comments: We do not collect this data.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	34
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	162
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" 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	89971
Who applied for supplemental educational services	
Who received supplemental educational services	4121
Comments: We do not collect data for students who applied for SES	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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	\$
Comments: We do not collect this data.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	103805	100163	96.5	3642	3.5
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	17890	16184	90.5	1706	9.5
Low-poverty schools	17037	16925	99.3	112	0.7
All elementary schools	63723	61544	96.6	2179	3.4
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	5154	4493	87.2	661	12.8
Low-poverty schools	14885	14652	98.4	233	1.6
All secondary schools	40082	38619	96.3	1463	3.7
Comments:					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

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.

PA's data collection currently limits the information being submitted by school districts to 3 assignments for each educator. However, a new data system is being designed and implemented that will enable the PA Department of Education to report HQT for each class taught by PA educators. Changes to our data collection and reporting were described in PA's revised State Plan and was approved by the US Department of Education.
--

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

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 percent 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	81.6
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	7.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.3
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	18.3
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	63.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	18.8
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	55.7	16.9
Poverty metric used	Low poverty quartile: 0% low-income enrollments to 16.9% High poverty quartile: 55.7% low-income enrollments to 100% low-income enrollments	
Secondary schools	43.1	15.0
Poverty metric used	Low poverty quartile: 0% low-income enrollments to 15% High poverty quartile: 43.1% low-income enrollments to 99% low-income enrollments	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

- # Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
- Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
- Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
- % Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
- OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
4	Dual language			
1	Two-way immersion			
1	Transitional bilingual			
1	Developmental bilingual			
2	Heritage language			
49	Sheltered English instruction			
34	Structured English immersion			
24	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
128	Content-based ESL			
245	Pull-out ESL			
93	Other (explain)			

Comments: The PDE collected types of programs but did not collect the "other language" and "% language of instruction" for the 2005-2006 school year. These data elements were a new request from USDE shared with states in the fall of 2007 at the beginning of the 2007-2008 school year. Due to the time of the notification for the data elements to be collected, PDE did not have these two data collection elements incorporated in the data collection system. Therefore, LEAs were unable to report this additional level of detail. Please note that the additional data collection elements, "other language" and "% language of instruction", will not be available for the 2007-2008 school year either due to the significant change that it requires to our data system. PDE IT staff is working to incorporate the new elements. PDE will have this data element in place beginning with the 2008-2009 school year.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	42167
<p>Comments: The number of students in who are LEP and the number of students tested differs because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the PA total number of students reported in 1.6.3.1.1 (43,739) reflects all LEP students in PA regardless of Title III status as stated in the header for the data element ALL LEP STUDENT ELP TESTING STATUS. 2. LEA failure to accurately report LEP students as Title III served. PDE has addressed this issue by providing clarifications to LEAs for the definition of Title III served. 3. data collection of total LEP population takes place prior to the assessment. Some students included in the total LEP/Title III student count have exited programs, withdrawn from schools and moved, or dropped out and therefore were not assessed and counted in the assessment totals. 4. analysis of the assessment results incomplete tests and/or improperly coded demographic information. PA is in the first phase of implementation of the PA Information Management System (PIMS). Going forward, improperly coded demographic information should become less problematic. 5. PA did not have a unique student identification system in place until the 2006-2007 school year. PA will have the ability to resolve data discrepancies from this point forward. 	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	27731
Russian	1330
Chinese (Mandarin)	1194
Arabic	1156
Ukranian	1021

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: Vietnamese 1,009

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	42942
Not tested/State annual ELP	797
Subtotal	43739
LEP/One Data Point	13870

Comments: The number of students in who are LEP and the number of students tested differs because:

1. the PA total number of students reported in 1.6.3.1.1 (43,739) reflects all LEP students in PA regardless of Title III status as stated in the header for the data element ALL LEP STUDENT ELP TESTING STATUS.
2. LEA failure to accurately report LEP students as Title III served. PDE has addressed this issue by providing clarifications to LEAs for the definition of Title III served.
3. data collection of total LEP population takes place prior to the assessment. Some students included in the total LEP/Title III student count have exited programs, withdrawn from schools and moved, or dropped out and therefore were not assessed and counted in the assessment totals.
4. analysis of the assessment results incomplete tests and/or improperly coded demographic information. PA is in the first phase of implementation of the PA Information Management System (PIMS). Going forward, improperly coded demographic information should become less problematic.
5. PA did not have a unique student identification system in place until the 2006-2007 school year. PA will have the ability to resolve data discrepancies from this point forward.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	38301
Not tested/State annual ELP	770
Subtotal	39071
LEP/One Data Point	11704

Comments: The number of students in who are LEP and the number of students tested differs because:

1. the PA total number of students reported in 1.6.3.1.1 (43,739) reflects all LEP students in PA regardless of Title III status as stated in the header for the data element ALL LEP STUDENT ELP TESTING STATUS.
2. LEA failure to accurately report LEP students as Title III served. PDE has addressed this issue by providing clarifications to LEAs for the definition of Title III served.
3. data collection of total LEP population takes place prior to the assessment. Some students included in the total LEP/Title III student count have exited programs, withdrawn from schools and moved, or dropped out and therefore were not assessed and counted in the assessment totals.
4. analysis of the assessment results incomplete tests and/or improperly coded demographic information. PA is in the first phase of implementation of the PA Information Management System (PIMS). Going forward, improperly coded demographic information should become less problematic.
5. PA did not have a unique student identification system in place until the 2006-2007 school year. PA will have the ability to resolve data discrepancies from this point forward.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress		38366		
No progress		0		
ELP attainment		3646		

Comments: The number of students in who are LEP and the number of students tested differs because:

1. the PA total number of students reported in 1.6.3.1.1 (43,739) reflects all LEP students in PA regardless of Title III status as stated in the header for the data element ALL LEP STUDENT ELP TESTING STATUS.
2. LEA failure to accurately report LEP students as Title III served. PDE has addressed this issue by providing clarifications to LEAs for the definition of Title III served.
3. data collection of total LEP population takes place prior to the assessment. Some students included in the total LEP/Title III student count have exited programs, withdrawn from schools and moved, or dropped out and therefore were not assessed and counted in the assessment totals.
4. analysis of the assessment results incomplete tests and/or improperly coded demographic information. PA is in the first phase of implementation of the PA Information Management System (PIMS). Going forward, improperly coded demographic information should become less problematic.
5. PA did not have a unique student identification system in place until the 2006-2007 school year. PA will have the ability to resolve data discrepancies from this point forward.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does **not** count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress		35175		
No progress		0		
ELP attainment		537		

Comments: The number of students in who are LEP and the number of students tested differs because:

1. the PA total number of students reported in 1.6.3.1.1 (43,739) reflects all LEP students in PA regardless of Title III status as stated in the header for the data element ALL LEP STUDENT ELP TESTING STATUS.
2. LEA failure to accurately report LEP students as Title III served. PDE has addressed this issue by providing clarifications to LEAs for the definition of Title III served.
3. data collection of total LEP population takes place prior to the assessment. Some students included in the total LEP/Title III student count have exited programs, withdrawn from schools and moved, or dropped out and therefore were not assessed and counted in the assessment totals.
4. analysis of the assessment results incomplete tests and/or improperly coded demographic information. PA is in the first phase of implementation of the PA Information Management System (PIMS). Going forward, improperly coded demographic information should become less problematic.
5. PA did not have a unique student identification system in place until the 2006-2007 school year. PA will have the ability to resolve data discrepancies from this point forward.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does **not** count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	
MFLEP/AYP grades	5997
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	15994
LEP HS/Non-AYP	6025
LEP other grades	2831
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No Response
Comments: State does not collect data for Native Language Assessments.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments: State does not collect data for Native Language Assessments.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments: State does not collect data for Native Language Assessments.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: State does not collect data for Native Language Assessments.		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: State does not collect data for Native Language Assessments.		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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
3473	2582	6055
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
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. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5975	3648	61.1	

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: There is a difference of 80 between 1.6.3.4.3 - row 2 (6,055) and 5,975 because the former data counts students who took both math and reading assessments. Some of those students may not have participated in the math assessment.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
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
5971	3088	51.7	

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: There is a difference between 1.6.3.4.3 - row 2 (6,055) and 5,795 because the former data counts students who took both math and reading assessments. Some of those students may not have participated in the math assessment.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). 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. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) reserved funds 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	94
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	7
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	36
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	24
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	26
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	7
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	51
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	51
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	<u>Yes</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	5
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
17049	14635	56

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

Comments:

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No Response</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>No Response</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	0
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	3536
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1338

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

Comments: PA does not collect teacher data by Title III designation only. ESL is a curriculum requirement in PA. Therefore, the total teacher numbers reflect teachers certified for both core ESL curricular programs and Title III supplemental programs. PA will collect teacher data by Title III designation in 07-08.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students (formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	0	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	0	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	0	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	77	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	69	0
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	77	0
PD provided to principals	72	0
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	71	0
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	69	0
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	31	0
Total		0

Comments: LEA reported PD activities and total subgrantees for each are as follows:

Multi-intelligence - 24

Curriculum alignment development - 72

Classroom management - 71

Data Interpretation - 59

Research based effective practices - 75

Technology Integration - 58

Other - 23

Explanation of "0" for participant # in PD activities - LEAs reported general participant groups to whom PD was provided; however, LEAS have not collected and reported participant numbers.

The reported PD audience includes teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, community-based organizations personnel.

The PDE collected "ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED" with Title III funding as requested and outlined by USDE in the past reporting years. The past reporting years included the following ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED categories:

Because Professional Development (PD) was not previously broken down as now requested by USDE, PDE did not collect the

updated PD categories outlined under TYPE OF PD ACTIVITY nor did PDE collect specific participant information and numbers according to the categories in this data element for the 2005-2006 school year. This is why PDE checked "OTHER". OTHER represents general professional development as formerly listed in the CSPR or T3BR report. The reported number of 77 reflects subgrantees that reported providing professional development in 2005-2006. Please note: The comment section already includes information on the PD that LEAs offered in 2005-2006.

The updated PD data elements are a new request from USDE shared with states in the fall of 2007 at the beginning of the 2007-2008 school year. Due to the time of the USDE notification for the updated PD data elements, PDE did not have the data collection elements incorporated into its past data collection years. Therefore, LEAs were unable to report this additional level of detail. Please note that this information will not be available for the 2006-2007 school year due to the USDE final notification of the updated elements and details in the fall of 2007. The updated data collection elements requested, the updated PD categories outlined under TYPE OF PD ACTIVITY along with the specific breakdown on participant information and numbers, will be collected for the 2007-2008 school year.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/07	7/1/07	45
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

PDE's goal is to inform LEAs of their allocation and make the Title III application available by the 1st week in June of every year. LEAs in turn will have the opportunity to apply at an earlier date which will decrease the amount of time that the state needs to distribute the allocations to the LEAs.

Questions on the allocation process may be directed to Maria Garcia-Morales, Division of Federal Programs, at mgarcia-mo@state.pa.us or 717-783-6903.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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	12
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	88.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	75.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	75.7
Hispanic	69.9
White, non-Hispanic	91.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	81.1
Limited English proficient	70.5
Economically disadvantaged	79.9
Migratory students	76.6
Male	86.5
Female	90.0
Comments: There were relatively more graduates reported in the American Indian/Alaskan Native category for 2004-05.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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.

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 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4.0
Hispanic	4.8
White, non-Hispanic	1.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7.4
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	1.0
Male	2.1
Female	1.6
Comments: There were relatively more dropouts reported in the American Indian/Alaskan Native category and All students for 2005-06.	
Limited English proficient and Economically disadvantaged students dropout rates are not available until May or June, so PA Department of Education cannot report these rates at this time.	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	0	0
LEAs with subgrants	8	8
Total	8	8
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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)		1835
K		5917
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		3143
7		
8		
9		2040
10		
11		
12		
Ungraded		
Total		12935

Comments: Pennsylvania does not separate data out for each grade. Pennsylvania collects data for age 3&4, grades K-5, grades 6-8, and grades 9-12. This data does not reflect Region 1 and Region 4 data because it was not provided to the Department. Region 1 covers Philadelphia School District and Region 4 covers Pittsburgh School District. Pennsylvania does not collect data for LEAs without subgrants.

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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		5795
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)		2755
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)		38
Hotels/Motels		783
Total		9371

Comments: Data not collected for # of homeless children/youths-LEAs without subgrants. We have 646 children under other. PA does not collect disaggregated data.

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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)	1835
K	5917
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	3143
7	
8	
9	2040
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Total	12935

Comments: Pennsylvania does not separate data out for each grade. Pennsylvania collects data for age 3& 4, grades K- 5; grades 6-8 and grades 9 - 12. This data does not reflect Region 1 and Region 4 data because it was not provided to the Department. Region 1 covers Philadelphia School District and Region 4 covers Pittsburgh School District.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	375
Migratory children/youth	18
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	374
Limit English proficient students	274

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

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
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	8
2. Expedited evaluations	8
3. Staff professional development and awareness	8
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
5. Transportation	8
6. Early childhood programs	8
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	8
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	8
12. Counseling	8
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	8
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
15. School supplies	8
16. Referral to other programs and services	8
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	8
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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
1. Eligibility for homeless services	0
2. School Selection	6
3. Transportation	7
4. School records	5
5. Immunizations	3
6. Other medical records	3
7. Other Barriers	8
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	119	54
4	148	61
5	146	38
6	126	51
7	138	51
8	115	50
High School	54	15
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	123	67
4	153	79
5	148	63
6	131	56
7	138	47
8	115	37
High School	58	12
Comments:		

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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)	1093
K	459
1	503
2	475
3	454
4	434
5	392
6	406
7	406
8	377
9	415
10	364
11	274
12	205
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	2025
Total	
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education Migrant Education Program (PDE MEP) experienced a roughly 30% drop in Category 1 Count due to lower ID&R results deriving from various factors including changes in migratory patterns immigration issues and tighter interpretation of MEP eligibility regulations.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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)	618
K	272
1	264
2	254
3	249
4	240
5	207
6	235
7	233
8	211
9	225
10	186
11	122
12	<N
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	455
Total	3779
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

PDE MEP experienced an approximately 29% drop in Category 2 Count due to having a smaller population available to serve as indicated in the explanation for the Category 1 Count.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

PDE MEP Category 1 and Category 2 counts were generated using MIS2000 in the same manner as has been done for many years and is anticipated for future years.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Both counts were collected from the State MIS2000 Database. This is a consolidated database from the Five regional MIS2000 systems. This data is assimilated daily into the state database. The system collects a variety of demographic and MEP eligibility enrollment data to be used for generating the childcounts. The data is collected and examined throughout the year and after the data is run through all automatic and manual edit and error checks the final reports are run in early December and submitted to the CSPR via the EDEN X/N 121 and 122 files as well as manually entered on this report for verification.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

After going through a rigorous quality control process COE's are entered into the MIS2000 system by trained data specialists who provide another level of quality control especially checking for duplication of students. Reports are generated and reviewed by Student Support Specialists and Recruiters to make sure the students match their records. Verification is also performed to make sure that students recruited in previous years are still residing in the state. It is required that a Needs Assessment is completed annually on every student and this is a method of verifying that they are still here. If a child is found to not be here any longer that enrollment is totally removed from the system resulting in that child no longer being counted on the reports. Reports are run that uniquely count a child only once and only in a single (highest) grade for reporting these counts.

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.

This is the same as Category 1 except that students are only counted if they are marked as being enrolled in a MEP funded summer program. Strict guidelines have been issued as to what constitutes a summer service based on OME guidance and documentation that such service was provided using attendance lists or other methods documenting the service delivery are required for backup justification purposes.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For over 10 years PDE MEP has been using the same basic tried and true algorithm to count the students. In addition many edit reports are created to verify that students who show on the count are truly eligible. For the 2006-07 count the first thing the system checks is to make sure the Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) is after 9/1/03 and that Residency and QAD are before 8/31/07. ONLY students who meet all of the criteria of being a migrant student including having a qualifying activity are included in the MIS2000 system. We also only count students who reached age 3 prior to 9/1/06 or if they reach age 3 between 9/1/06 and 8/31/07 they must still be residing in the state as of their third birthday. Reports are run on a regular basis and staff assigned to serve the children must verify that they are still a resident. In addition a Needs Assessment is required to be completed every year and the child/youth must actually be encountered to complete this form. If a child turns age 22 prior 9/1/06 or before they are residing and enrolled in PA they are excluded. If a child became a PA resident after 8/31/07 or left residency before 9/1/06 they are not counted. The general logic system of the reporting mechanism is designed to only count a student once per each child count category by assigning a single calculated grade per student and performing a distinct count by student.

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.

Same as Category 1 except only counting those enrolled as receiving a summer service as documented above. The summer enrollment must also have started prior to reaching three years past their qualifying move or before reaching age 22 or before graduating or receiving a GED. Even if a student meeting any of these criteria is accidentally entered into the system as receiving a summer enrollment the system would exclude them anyhow from the count. For students who turn age 3 between 9/1/06 and 8/31/07 the delivery of summer service must be after turning age 3 to count on the Category 2 report.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

PDE MEP has developed an extensive ID&R quality control process. Only those students recruited using this process including extensive verification and review are ever entered into the data system. Tests are run to make sure that family made a move within the past 36 months across school district lines where the move was the result of the intent to seek or obtain qualifying seasonal or temporary agricultural or fishing work that plays an important role in providing a living to the family that any child has not reached age 22 or completed high school or equivalence. A series of questions and documentation of the results are recorded. This may include copies of pay stubs and contact with schools to verify the move in addition to the standards Certificate of Eligibility. If a student is ever later determined to be ineligible they are completely removed from the system and will not be counted on any reports.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

PDE MEP did not conduct a formal reinterview process during 2006-07 and is waiting on formal guidance from OME before completing one in 2007-08. However despite that our quality control process reviews 100% of the COE's as mentioned in the previous question. In addition 20% of the COEs are re-verified by a state recruitment coordinator or auditor. In the past year absolutely none of those audited were found to be not eligible. All questionable cases were determined ineligible during initial Quality Control and never reached MIS2000. Between 9/1/06 and 8/31/07 1558 COE's with 2324 unique students were completed and passed Quality Control and 20% (approximately 312 COEs) were then state audited. Of those audited NONE were determined to be ineligible. In addition only one other COE was determined to be ineligible after initial entry when it was determined that the Emancipated Youth provided incorrect information on the nature of their last move during a subsequent visit and was hence removed from MIS2000.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Recruitment verification is monitored throughout the entire year. In addition reports are generated throughout the year for support staff to compare that the children in the database are indeed those who they are serving/are resident. A state monitoring team annually visits field offices and makes random verification of eligibility as well. If at any time a student is determined not to be eligible they are simply and totally deleted from the regional database which in turn is deleted from the state database system. Regional and State staff also monitor summer programs via several methods including attendance rosters and portfolio summary sheets. Written guidelines based on OME guidance are distributed to staff dealing with summer enrollments. These were reviewed at trainings and/or meetings held for staff involved (e.g. Project Managers Summer Teachers Data Specialists). Lists are generated throughout the year and sent to the student support specialists who see the children on a regular basis. Any discrepancies between the lists and students actually enrolled in the program are noted and returned to the Data Specialist to make changes in the data system. Any changes made to the local database automatically propagate to the state database system. Periodically reports are run at the state and regional level and compared. If there are any discrepancies they are researched and corrected. State Office staff provide an annual monitoring audit to all project areas. COE's and student records are randomly audited as part of this monitoring process. Throughout the enrollment process trained Data specialists ensure that students are not duplicated in the system at the regional or statewide level. If two enrolled students are determined to be the same student they are merged into one single student. Reports are run periodically and especially immediately prior to the reporting of Category 1 and Category 2 counts that looks at students who have similar names and Birth dates and then manually compared to see if they are in fact the same student. This is done regionally and statewide as well and if students are found to be the same they are merged into one single student and as such only counted once on the final Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

State staff thoroughly review all edit reports and compare Category 1 and 2 reports run from the state database with those run at the regional level. Any discrepancies are researched and resolved. On a monthly basis trial numbers are shared with Regional Project Managers in comparison to previous year counts taking into account known factors such as changes in recruitment results and changes in summer programs. The State Director and staff review all of these results with Project Managers to research that the counts verify that the numbers are accurate and as expected.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

There have been no indications of any major problems since the adoption of the new quality control process. When minor/borderline cases are encountered they are addressed with the individual recruiter and also shared with all five regional recruitment staff and all recruiters who meet quarterly for training.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 PDE MEP has no concerns in reference to the accuracy of the non-duplicated Category 1 or Category 2 child counts we have presented or the eligibility of the students thus counted and reported. The presented numbers are complete and accurate to the best of our ability and our stringent quality recruitment and data controls and procedures.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.