

**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 2008-09**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

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

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

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

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

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

## **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 18, 2009**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 12, 2010**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 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, 2008-09 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2008-09		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Wyoming Department of Education		
Address: 2300 Capitol Avenue, Hathaway Building, 1st Floor Cheyenne, WY 82002		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Darlena Schlachter		
Telephone: 307-777-5315		
Fax: 307-777-7633		
e-mail: dschla@educ.state.wy.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Christine Steele		
		Monday, December 21, 2009, 5:13:19 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2008-09**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009  
5PM EST**

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

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

WY SS 21-2-304; by rule and regulation and in consultation and coordination with local school districts, (the Wyoming State Board of Education, SBE), prescribe uniform content and performances standards. In the rules and regulation, the State Board must review the content and performance standards every 5 years. The SBE through the Wyoming Department of Education established a 3 phase standards revision process for reviewing the 9 content areas. Once content committees under the direction of WDE have reviewed/revise the standards, the SBE posts the standards for public comment (45 days). After the public comment period the WDE reviews comments and considers recommendations, then presents the completed standards to the SBE for final adoption. The WDE establishes a steering committee with representatives of all Wyoming Stakeholders. Most of the content committees consist of content specialists from elementary through University level participants. Prior to SBE approval for the public comment period the content committees enlist a wider group of content specialists and stakeholders for feedback.

The Language Arts and Mathematics Standards will be in the second phase of our review cycle which begins in May of 2010. Each phase is scheduled for approximately 18 - 24 months. The earliest possible adoption would be November 2011. There would be an implementation period of approximately 12 - 18 months.

The Science Standards are scheduled to be reviewed/revise in the third phase of the process beginning in February of 2012 and looking at adoption no sooner than October, 2013. There would be an implementation period of approximately 12 - 18 months.

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

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

To improve the reliability of the writing assessment, the Wyoming Department of Education has worked with the assessment vendor to develop an assessment framework that will establish a vertical scale in writing, a new equating model for the writing assessment, and a establish a single scale in which to place reading, writing and language arts academic achievement scores. As a result of these improvements, we expect to see an increase in the reliability of the writing assessment at any given grade, year to year.

The PAWS 2010 writing equating model will use a set of multiple-choice writing items based on the very same benchmark skills use to score the writing prompts responses (e.g., idea, organization, voice and conventions). The multiple-choice writing items will in no way supplant or dilute the value of the student responses to writing prompts; rather, these items will provide an external bridge for equating the writing prompts horizontally (year to year) and vertically (grade to grade). The reconfiguration of the PAWS reading and writing tests into a combined language arts test will give Wyoming a unified picture of student language arts ability across grades and a clear and explicit relationship between reading, writing, and overall language arts scores.

Following the PAWS 2010 administration, a standards validation committee will meet to determine a set of recommended cut scores through an established process of setting standards. Standard setting will occur in several rounds and will include representatives from a number of demographic areas including, ethnicity, gender and school size and regions. A final set of cut score recommendations will be presented to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for final formal review and approval.

No revisions or changes to the PAWS 2010 general education mathematics assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

No revisions or changes to the PAWS-ALT 2010, alternate assessment in reading, writing, or mathematics assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

The Wyoming Department of Education joined the World Class Instruction Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium. Accessing Comprehension and Communication in English State to State for English Language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs®) will be administered to English Language Learners in the spring of 2010.

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

#### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to the PAWS 2010 general education science assessment and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

No revisions or changes to the PAWS-ALT 2010, alternate assessment in science assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

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

**1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> X081 has been submitted....data did not populate in this section.			

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

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,761	43.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,805	56.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	8,566	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> X081 has been submitted...data did not populate in this section.			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,786	44.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,780	55.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	8,566	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> X081 has been submitted...data did not populate in this section.			

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

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	530	22.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,684	70.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	174	7.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	2,388	
<b>Comments:</b> Will be resubmitting data before the CSPR opens for review and corrections.		

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

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,613	5,369	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	228	130	57.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	63	52	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	116	80	69.0
Hispanic	710	510	71.8
White, non-Hispanic	5,496	4,597	83.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,454	936	64.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	348	214	61.5
Economically disadvantaged students	2,478	1,808	73.0
Migratory students	12	6	50.0
Male	3,445	2,806	81.4
Female	3,168	2,563	80.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,606	3,556	53.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	228	63	27.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	60	33	55.0
Black, non-Hispanic	116	53	45.7
Hispanic	702	257	36.6
White, non-Hispanic	5,500	3,150	57.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,456	490	33.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	337	69	20.5
Economically disadvantaged students	2,474	1,029	41.6
Migratory students	12	3	25.0
Male	3,441	1,798	52.2
Female	3,165	1,758	55.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> X081 file was submitted...data did not populate			

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

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,585	4,955	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	217	109	50.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	82	67	81.7
Black, non-Hispanic	102	69	67.6
Hispanic	713	456	64.0
White, non-Hispanic	5,471	4,254	77.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,433	833	58.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	288	153	53.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2,466	1,621	65.7
Migratory students	16	10	62.5
Male	3,440	2,610	75.9
Female	3,145	2,345	74.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,571	4,668	71.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	217	101	46.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	79	57	72.2
Black, non-Hispanic	102	61	59.8
Hispanic	706	400	56.7
White, non-Hispanic	5,467	4,049	74.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,432	677	47.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	278	106	38.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2,460	1,499	60.9
Migratory students	16	10	62.5
Male	3,435	2,321	67.6
Female	3,136	2,347	74.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,577	3,314	50.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	59	27.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	81	48	59.3
Black, non-Hispanic	102	32	31.4
Hispanic	712	230	32.3
White, non-Hispanic	5,466	2,945	53.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,431	523	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	289	59	20.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,464	956	38.8
Migratory students	16	5	31.2
Male	3,436	1,696	49.4
Female	3,141	1,618	51.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,630	4,783	72.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	260	117	45.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	67	52	77.6
Black, non-Hispanic	104	73	70.2
Hispanic	730	438	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	5,469	4,103	75.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,378	672	48.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	263	116	44.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2,434	1,521	62.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	3,409	2,483	72.8
Female	3,221	2,300	71.4
<b>Comments:</b> Will be resubmitting these files before the CSPR opens for review. However, migrant data of 0 is correct.			

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

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,613	4,153	62.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	260	90	34.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	64	39	60.9
Black, non-Hispanic	104	60	57.7
Hispanic	719	358	49.8
White, non-Hispanic	5,466	3,606	66.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,377	487	35.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	249	63	25.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,425	1,214	50.1
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	3,398	2,018	59.4
Female	3,215	2,135	66.4
<b>Comments:</b> Will be resubmitting these files before the CSPR opens for review. However migrant data of 0 is correct.			

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

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> X081 was submitted, data did not populate			

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

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,435	4,981	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	219	131	59.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	69	63	91.3
Black, non-Hispanic	109	66	60.6
Hispanic	695	427	61.4
White, non-Hispanic	5,343	4,294	80.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,129	576	51.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	224	106	47.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,212	1,469	66.4
Migratory students	11	7	63.6
Male	3,256	2,517	77.3
Female	3,179	2,464	77.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,427	4,529	70.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	220	99	45.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	68	59	86.8
Black, non-Hispanic	109	57	52.3
Hispanic	691	374	54.1
White, non-Hispanic	5,339	3,940	73.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,128	417	37.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	220	74	33.6
Economically disadvantaged students	2,206	1,271	57.6
Migratory students	11	5	45.4
Male	3,252	2,198	67.6
Female	3,175	2,331	73.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> X081 was submitted, data did not populate			

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

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,463	4,679	72.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	222	112	50.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	98	82	83.7
Black, non-Hispanic	108	66	61.1
Hispanic	651	370	56.8
White, non-Hispanic	5,384	4,049	75.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,138	459	40.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	216	88	40.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2,148	1,290	60.1
Migratory students	16	9	56.2
Male	3,271	2,351	71.9
Female	3,192	2,328	72.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,464	3,675	56.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	222	88	39.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	98	68	69.4
Black, non-Hispanic	108	52	48.2
Hispanic	648	255	39.4
White, non-Hispanic	5,388	3,212	59.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,140	288	25.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	211	40	19.0
Economically disadvantaged students	2,145	923	43.0
Migratory students	16	4	25.0
Male	3,270	1,734	53.0
Female	3,194	1,941	60.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> X081 was submitted...data did not populate			

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

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,263	3,872	61.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	65	32.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	66	52	78.8
Black, non-Hispanic	80	35	43.8
Hispanic	640	288	45.0
White, non-Hispanic	5,275	3,432	65.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	966	271	28.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	192	52	27.1
Economically disadvantaged students	1,915	926	48.4
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	3,194	1,942	60.8
Female	3,069	1,930	62.9
<b>Comments:</b> This data will be resubmitted before the CSPR reopens for review. However, migrant data of 0 is correct.			

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

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,253	4,046	64.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	90	44.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	64	53	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	80	44	55.0
Hispanic	637	297	46.6
White, non-Hispanic	5,270	3,562	67.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	965	272	28.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	184	55	29.9
Economically disadvantaged students	1,911	974	51.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	3,189	1,919	60.2
Female	3,064	2,127	69.4
<b>Comments:</b> This data will be resubmitted before the CSPR reopens for review. However, migrant data of 0 is correct.			

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

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,256	2,663	42.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	33	16.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	66	41	62.1
Black, non-Hispanic	80	15	18.8
Hispanic	640	159	24.8
White, non-Hispanic	5,268	2,415	45.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	964	167	17.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	192	30	15.6
Economically disadvantaged students	1,912	544	28.4
Migratory students			
Male	3,189	1,399	43.9
Female	3,067	1,264	41.2
<b>Comments:</b> This data will be resubmitted before the CSPR reopens for review. However, migrant data of 0 is correct.			

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

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,575	3,640	48.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	264	51	19.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	88	60	68.2
Black, non-Hispanic	120	28	23.3
Hispanic	745	248	33.3
White, non-Hispanic	6,358	3,253	51.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,068	180	16.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	166	38	22.9
Economically disadvantaged students	1,714	564	32.9
Migratory students	2	1	50.0
Male	3,857	1,885	48.9
Female	3,718	1,755	47.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,544	3,917	51.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	262	90	34.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	88	55	62.5
Black, non-Hispanic	113	32	28.3
Hispanic	751	264	35.2
White, non-Hispanic	6,330	3,476	54.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,068	211	19.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	170	35	20.6
Economically disadvantaged students	1,712	664	38.8
Migratory students	2	1	50.0
Male	3,984	1,900	47.7
Female	3,560	2,017	56.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	5,920	2,666	45.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	160	28	17.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	68	34	50.0
Black, non-Hispanic	79	20	25.3
Hispanic	512	127	24.8
White, non-Hispanic	5,101	2,457	48.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	652	79	12.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	106	16	15.1
Economically disadvantaged students	1,134	348	30.7
Migratory students	3	1	33.3
Male	3,052	1,438	47.1
Female	2,868	1,228	42.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	347	252	72.6
Districts	48	44	91.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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 2008-09 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 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	178	120	67.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	72	39	54.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	106	81	76.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. 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 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
48	44	91.7
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

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

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup> 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/quid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	2
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
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	
<b>Comments:</b> During SY 2008-2009 there were no schools in Wyoming in Year 2, Implementation of Restructuring Plan.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The technical assistance provided varies depending on district/school needs. While Wyoming's small educational population would like one-on-one contact with Regional Contacts, distances pose obstacles. Therefore, the District Support and Coordination Team supports Districts and district/schools as they develop and implement their district/school improvement plans through email, phone, WEN and Webinars as well as on-site visits. If the district needs are determined to be at Level III, a WDE coach is assigned to work with the district leadership team. The coach helps the district develop Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) forms for 60-day periods to guide their work in partnership to improve school improvement efforts.

In 2008-2009, the WDE began offering Organizational Assessments (OA) at the District level. This assessment is a process of gathering and analyzing information collected from various stakeholders to assess a District's performance from a systems perspective. The assessment instrument consists of 7 core components and 26 elements. The instrument is research-based and modeled after the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award as well as various state awards. The DSC Team has been trained in this process and will be conducting OA's for Districts across the State. There will be a continued "systems" focus in Districts in the technical assistance that will be provided.

The districts have been the 10% set aside for professional development in a variety of areas, all with the ultimate intent of improving student achievement. Some examples are:

- School and district level leadership have focused on to provide an aligned model of leadership behaviors and practices that have a significant impact on student learning.
- Training has been provided in formative assessment that is used to measure progress on essential skills and guide instruction
- Teachers and coaches have received training on research based strategies that have been identified that support and cause student learning
- In an effort to monitor the implementation of the strategies principals will be trained to implement classroom walk-throughs which will provide teachers with formative feedback to guide instructional planning and delivery
- Continued instruction in the development of assessment and data interpretation has also been a part of the district professional development efforts
- Discipline and management strategies have been an area of focus to improve student achievement
- Implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model
- Curriculum alignment working and training

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b> During SY 2008-2009, no Distrcts were in Corrective Action status.	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	0	0
Schools	2	0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	08/05/09
---	----------

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2008-09.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

*Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2008-09.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2008-09.
  - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

*States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2009.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2009.
  - In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the <b>mathematics</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	1,861	1,398
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	933	704
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	50.1	50.4
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	1,859	1,411
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	891	654
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	47.9	46.4
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2008-09	1
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2008-09	1
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that <b>did not make adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2008-09	7
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		4	0	0	A	
2		8	2	1	A	
4		3	0	0	A	
5	Extended Learning Opportunities	3	0	0	A	
5	Parent Involvement	2	0	0	C	
5	Support for SES, Corrective Actions, or Restructuring	2	0	0	D	Did not have to use Title I funds for implementation of SES or their Corrective Action
6 = Combo 1	Combination of 1,2, and 3	3	0	0	D	Narrowed the focus on the reasons school missed AYP
7 = Combo 2	Combination of 1 and 2	1	0	0	D	Narrowed the focus on the reasons school missed AYP
<b>Comments:</b>						

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

**1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies**

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

These schools have the opportunity to present at the NCA School Improvement Conference which is held twice per year, in the Fall and in the Spring. Other avenues are sharing what works with our district support teams, that information is then used in improvement efforts around the state; state Title I meetings; and state Federal Programs Meetings.

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

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

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

**Comments:**

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

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

These funds were used to provide on-site technical assistance to these schools and districts. Monitoring will occur this year as SY 2008-2009 was the first year Wyoming distributed the 1003 g funds.
--

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

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2008-09 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2008, the District/school Improvement Technical Assistance Team (SITAT) evolved into the District Support and Coordination (DSC) Team. As SITAT, the technical assistance focus was at the school level; while the DSC Team's focus is on District improvement and guiding districts to help their own schools' improvement efforts.

Everyone at the Wyoming Department of Education provides some form of TA. Our District Support and Coordination Team was also tasked with "coordinating" all TA efforts to better serve our customers. As the pilot year, we are exploring options for efficient and effective technical assistance. WDE has access to supportive partners like McREL, who has done a study throughout the state that surfaced to guide WDE technical assistants to improve the relevance, responsiveness, and quality of its services to Wyoming schools, districts, and educators. The Northwest Regional Comp Center (NWRCC) in Portland, Oregon helps us with services to better deliver Statewide Systems of Support (SSOS). Lawrence Picus and Allan Odden, consultants to Wyoming through Lawrence O. Picus and Associates, offer 10 strategies to double student performance. These strategies are shared with districts to review their practices in keeping the focus on student achievement. A wide selection of consultants and experts are available to WDE staff to access services, reports, research, and other resources that help us build the capacity of districts to better serve Wyoming students.

The technical assistance provided varies depending on district/school needs. While Wyoming's small educational population would like one-on-one contact with Regional Contacts, distances pose obstacles. Therefore, the DSC Team supports Districts and district/schools as they develop and implement their district/school improvement plans through email, phone, WEN and Webinars as well as on-site visits. If the district needs are determined to be at Level III, a WDE coach is assigned to work with the district leadership team. The coach helps the district develop Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) forms for 60-day periods to guide their work in partnership to improve school improvement efforts.

In 2008-2009, the WDE began offering Organizational Assessments (OA) at the District level. This assessment is a process of gathering and analyzing information collected from various stakeholders to assess a District's performance from a systems perspective. The assessment instrument consists of 7 core components and 26 elements. The instrument is research-based and modeled after the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award as well as various state awards. The DSC Team has been trained in this process and will be conducting OA's for Districts across the State. There will be a continued "systems" focus in Districts in the technical assistance that will be provided.

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

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	1,514
Applied to transfer	75
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	75

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 21,492

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	7

**FAQs about public school choice:**

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

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

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

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

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	1,836
Applied for supplemental educational services	50
Received supplemental educational services	50
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 130,185
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	19,128	18,611	97.3	517	2.7
All elementary classes	3,160	3,120	98.7	40	1.3
All secondary classes	15,968	15,491	97.0	477	3.0

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A full day self-contained classroom equals one class for counts of elementary classes.
--

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	72.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	28.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	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)	67.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	33.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	1,039	1,018	98.0
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	2,238	2,194	98.0
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	2,242	2,160	96.3
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	9,958	9,710	97.5

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	47.9	24.2
Poverty metric used	The poverty metric used is the number of students eligible for free and reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	36.6	19.5
Poverty metric used	The poverty metric used is the number of students eligible for free and reduced lunch.	

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language\\_Instruction\\_Educational\\_Programs.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

no comments

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

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	2,318
<b>Comments:</b> no comments	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	1,743
<b>Comments:</b> no comments	

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

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	2,096
Arapaho	131
Korean	12
Filipino; Pilipino	8
Japanese	8

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

X141 has been submitted...data did not populate in this section
---

**1.6.3 Student Performance Data**

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,318
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	17
Total	2,335
<b>Comments:</b> No comments	

**1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results**

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	347
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	19.4
<b>Comments:</b> no comments	

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

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

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,791
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	16
Total	1,807
<b>Comments:</b> no comments	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	<b>#</b>
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	687

**1.6.3.2.2**

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	332	29.7	670	60.00
ELP attainment	339	30.4	88	5.00
<b>Comments:</b> 16 Title III served ELL students not tested on the State's ELP assessment not included in the above figures. 33 students in Title III districts whose parents refused English Language Learner services are not included in these figures. 641 Title III served ELL students with one data point whose progress cannot be determined are not included in the "Making Progress" figures above.				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

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

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> None



**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

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

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
582	398	980
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number 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
538	338	62.8	200
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
539	225	41.7	314
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
175	53	30.3	122
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	12
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	6
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	6
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	12
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	12
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	6
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	4
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	3
# - Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	0
<b>Comments:</b> no comments	

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> Met AMAO 1 and AMAO 2, but not AMAO 3	

**1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

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

### 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

#### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

##### **Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
447	447	5

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

no comments

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

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

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

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	36
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	33

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

no comments

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

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

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	12	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	8	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	8	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	5	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	6	
Other (Explain in comment box)	2	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	11	614
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	42
PD provided to principals	11	71
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	6	21
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	7	217
PD provided to community based organization personnel		
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>965</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One district's professional development involved cultural training to help educators understand the cultural factors involving education of English Language Learners.  
One district provided training for teachers working in the Native American Indian language program on collaboration of what they were teaching with the language arts program.

### 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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/09	07/28/09	28
<b>Comments:</b> no comments		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

On-line consolidated grant application available for preloading of information in April so that districts can input information prior to funds being available so that they can gain access to funds as quickly as possible.
--

**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	
<b>Comments:</b> There are no persistently dangerous schools in Wyoming.	

**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 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	48.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	66.0
Hispanic	64.0
White, non-Hispanic	82.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	81.0
Limited English proficient	43.0
Economically disadvantaged	63.0
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.8.2 Dropout Rates**

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	5.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	12.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.0
Black, non-Hispanic	8.8
Hispanic	8.6
White, non-Hispanic	4.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1.0
Limited English proficient	0.3
Economically disadvantaged	1.9
Migratory students	0.0
Male	6.1
Female	4.5
<b>Comments:</b> Grades 9-12	

**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	4	4
LEAs with subgrants	44	44
Total	48	48
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4	4
K	21	51
1	20	29
2	24	37
3	20	31
4	16	33
5	16	28
6	14	40
7	19	31
8	28	41
9	30	24
10	14	27
11	22	21
12	35	36
Ungraded	0	8
Total	283	441
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	29	149
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	185	177
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	33	33
Hotels/Motels	36	82
Total	283	441
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 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)	4
K	51
1	29
2	37
3	31
4	33
5	28
6	40
7	31
8	41
9	24
10	27
11	21
12	36
Ungraded	
Total	433
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	6
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11
Limited English proficient students	2
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	3
Expedited evaluations	1
Staff professional development and awareness	1
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	2
Transportation	2
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	3
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	2
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	1
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	2
Coordination between schools and agencies	3
Counseling	1
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	1
Clothing to meet a school requirement	3
School supplies	3
Referral to other programs and services	2
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School Selection	1
Transportation	2
School records	1
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	15	10
4	13	5
5	2	1
6	13	4
7	8	4
8	3	1
High School	17	7
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *ESEA* 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	15	11
4	13	5
5	2	1
6	13	6
7	8	3
8	3	1
High School	18	5
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS**

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

**FAQs on Child Count:**

*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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	34
K	28
1	18
2	18
3	16
4	15
5	18
6	15
7	16
8	10
9	9
10	10
11	8
12	2
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	
Total	218

**Comments:** One "out-of-school" student was recruited, but did not attend.

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

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Although projected numbers looked solid, decline in student numbers attributed to decline of families; two of the three districts beginning to see "settling out" numbers increasing but not an equal number of incoming MEP eligible students; also, we believe the economy MAY have impacted numbers this year.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	22
K	23
1	17
2	15
3	13
4	14
5	15
6	12
7	6
8	4
9	4
10	7
11	3
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	157

**Comments:** The one "out-of-school" youth recruited did not attend because parent reported the shortened length of the site's summer session and needed to help family earn money this year. If the family returns, both student and parent indicated student may attend.

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

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Although there was a decrease in the number of students reported, the number was/is within the ten percent parameter.

**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.

Wyoming has used the COEStar/TROMIK system to compile and generate the Category I and Category II child counts for this, and the previous, reporting period.

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data is collected onto a state Certification of Eligibility (COE) form. Data includes student information (name, birthdate, gender, birthplace; parent/guardian names, and a number assigned by the database), eligibility information (qualifying arrival date, residency date, withdrawal date, qualifying activity(ies)), and school information (enrollment date, withdrawal date). A COE is completed for each student every year; the previous year's is kept as a locating tool.

Each program has a recruiter with years of familiarity with the geographic area and its citizens. The recruiters actively recruit from early March through August while a passive recruiting takes place September through December; communities keep in touch with the recruiters of newcomers who may be eligible to qualify for migrant education support. Recruiters visit area schools, churches, stores/businesses, gas stations, social services offices, farms, NOWCAP, and post posters in their quest for families and referrals for potential families. Upon receipt of a referral, the family is visited to verify eligibility and the COE completed as outlined above. The COE is kept on-site for verification, data from the COE is entered into COEStar/TROMIK by the recruiter and/or data entry person and hard copies sent to the State with the end-of-year reports.

All children identified as migrant based on family information obtained during the interview receive a hard copy of the COE from the recruiter. Data are entered into the COEStar/TROMIK system and a unique identification number is assigned to each student. The software prevents duplication based on student information entered annually. There are safeguards within the system to ensure reliability in the child count. Spring training is provided annually for data entry personnel to ensure only new students are added yearly. Trainers, recruiters, on-site directors, and most data entry personnel from the sites have had little turnover to date, ensuring continuity.

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.

On-site computers are downloaded each spring to COEStar/TROMIK for updates while training is taking place with the data entry personnel. As data is submitted into the COEStar/TROMIK system, TROMIK reviewers contact on-site data entry for updated verifications or missing data and eliminate duplicate counts. Upon completion of verifications and other updates, TROMIK submits count sheets to Wyoming's State Department of Education for reporting in the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).

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.

Wyoming has used COEStar/TROMIK for several years; the data collection procedures remain unchanged from year to year, category to category, unless so noted from the US Department of Education/Office of Migrant Education.

**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.

All interviewed families' children may be entered into the database, but only those who meet the eligibility criteria are counted in the final report. Information is uploaded into COEStar/TROMIK by recruiters/data entry personnel, checked and approved by on-site program directors and submitted to COEStar/TROMIK by means of the software that has filters for the Migrant Education Program eligibility requirements. COEStar/TROMIK conducts further verification and clarification steps before returning the data to the State for reporting purposes.

The on-site program managers keep COE hard copies for their records and send copies to the Wyoming Department of Education migrant education office. If any COE is in need of correction or clarification, the program manager contacts individual recruiters/data entry personnel and/or on-site directors to seek corrections. Corrections are entered on both on-site and State copies.

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.

Wyoming has used the COEStar/TROMIK system for several years for all counts pertaining to the Migrant Education Program; the same system is used for both Category I and II.

**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.

Wyoming uses three approaches to verify student eligibility: (1)COEStar/TROMIK system; (2)on-site recruiters and reviewers; and, (3)the State program manager. The COEStar/TROMIK Performance Reporter scans databases, locates eligible COEs for the federal reporting, and tabulates the data into reports so that COEStar/TROMIK users may complete the Federal report. COEStar/TROMIK selects all COEs that show eligibility for part of, or all of, the performance report period. Each child's record in the superset is tested for the following:

\*Current Resident of the State of Wyoming

\*Qualifying Arrival Date

\*Candidates who become 22 years of age during the year

\*Departure Date

\*Residency Date

\*Enrollment Date

\*Withdrawal Date

\*Compares 3-21 year olds with birth-21 year olds for identification; there is a new COE on each child each year

\*Gender and Race/Ethnicity

\*Participates in School-wide Programs

\*Participates by Grade and Term

\*Program Services

\*Instructional Services

\*Support Services

The on-site data entry personnel and state office personnel handling the Migrant Education Program have been trained, and will continue to be trained and updated, regarding the capacity of running analysis reports on data to locate possible duplication, eligibility, misinformation, and/or other problems. These tasks are on-going throughout the summer sessions and are completed at the close of each migrant summer school program prior to final data transmission to COEStar/TROMIK to verify accuracy. The Wyoming Department of Education is notified of any irregularities that need addressed. The state program manager for migrant education is responsible for addressing any inconsistencies.

Records are filtered again to obtain a non-duplicated list of participants between the ages of 3 and 21 years, inclusive. Wyoming ensures, through the use of the database, that it does not count children who are below the age of 22, but are no longer eligible for the Migrant Education Program because they have graduated high school.

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.

Unfortunately, there were no official re-interviewing procedures used this reporting period. Verification of student data from the COEs is conducted throughout the summer sessions by on-site personnel before sending the final report to the State's Migrant Education Program manager. A newly revised Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Service Delivery Plan with Evaluation, and a Re-interviewing process has been completed. The re-interviewing procedure will be implemented during the 2009-2010 summer session for the 2009-2010 CSPR reporting period. Review and further revisions will take place after the initial implementation.

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.

Wyoming has only three summer/intersession migrant programs so verification of student data occurs during the programs in the summer or immediately after.

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.

As previously noted, Wyoming's data are checked and cross-checked at the local program level and at the State level through COEStar/TROMIK.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State, with input from participating district/sites, has revised its Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Service Delivery Plan with Evaluation, and a re-interviewing process.

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.

Wyoming will continue to avail itself of the services of COEStar/TROMIK; the State has a revised, and update, Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Service Delivery Plan with Evaluation, re-interviewing process for implementation in order to improve its delivery of supports and services for migrant children.