CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17

WASHINGTON

PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2017
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2018

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (*ESEA*), as amended in 2001 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:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2016-17 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 2016-17, 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 2016-17 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 14, 2017**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 15, 2018**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2016-17, 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 2016-17 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 2016-17 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

	OMB Number: 1810-0724
	Expiration Date: 5/31/2018

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
   _X_ Part I, 2016-17   ___Part II, 2016-17

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Address:

Person to contact about this report:

Name:

Telephone:

Fax:

e-mail:

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

   Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17

☒

**PART I DUE DECEMBER 14, 2017
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA),* as amended, 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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

Response	Options
	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
No Revisions or changes	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

Academic Content Standards	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	N/A	N/A	N/A

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic content standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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*.

Response	Options
	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	N/A	N/A	SY 2017-18
Regular Assessments in High School	SY 2017-18	SY 2017-18	SY 2017-18
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	N/A	SY 2017-18	SY 2017-18

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Regular Assessment - High School Math and English Language Arts are being transitioned to Grade 10 from Grade 11 impacting expectation of student achievement standard. Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards - English Language Arts (High School only) is being transitioned to Grade 10 administration from Grade 11 requiring test design adjustments that will impact student achievement standard. NOTE: Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards - Math is also being administered at Grade 10 rather than Grade 11, but a change to student achievement standard is not anticipated. Science assessment for Regular and Alternate administration transitioning to new instrument based on state's NGSS learning standards; new achievement standards will be set at the conclusion of the testing season.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the States academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the States academic assessments were most recently approved through ED"s peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.*

Response	Options
	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	N/A	N/A	SY 2017-18
Regular Assessments in High School	N/A	N/A	SY 2017-18
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	N/A	SY 2017-18	SY 2017-18

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards - English Language Arts (High School only) will have some performance tasks modified/added to align with the administration shifting to Grade 10 from Grade 11.

Science assessment for Regular and Alternate administration transitioning to new instrument based on state's NGSS learning standards

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2016-17, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by Section 1111(b)	1.00
To administer assessments required by Section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	99.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Conducted some new assessment development work related to the state's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards, specifically for transitioning science to the new Next Generation Science Standards.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2016-17 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by Section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by Section 1111(b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (*IDEA*) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT [2]

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

2 The " Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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	609,290	537,649	88.24
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,957	6,755	84.89
Asian or Pacific Islander	52,909	47,080	88.98
Asian	45,963	41,136	89.50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	6,946	5,944	85.57
Black or African American	27,565	23,086	83.75
Hispanic or Latino	141,139	126,724	89.79
White	332,120	291,647	87.81
Two or more races	46,903	41,774	89.06
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	79,440	69,213	87.13
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	61,881	55,691	90.00
Economically disadvantaged students	268,518	239,320	89.13
Migratory students	12,046	10,714	88.94
Male	313,232	275,769	88.04
Female	296,058	261,880	88.46
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data are accurate. HS participation is lower than 95% and lowers statewide all-grades composite figures.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities *(IDEA)* 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 (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	25,588	36.97
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	38,009	54.92
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,616	8.11
Total	69,213	///
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	610,036	558,593	91.57
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,960	6,900	86.68
Asian or Pacific Islander	52,994	49,141	92.73
Asian	46,038	43,071	93.56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	6,956	6,070	87.26
Black or African American	27,562	23,898	86.71
Hispanic or Latino	141,348	129,431	91.57
White	332,514	305,332	91.83
Two or more races	46,938	43,307	92.26
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	79,378	69,756	87.88
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	62,059	55,237	89.01
Economically disadvantaged students	268,802	244,757	91.05
Migratory students	12,037	10,856	90.19
Male	313,503	285,413	91.04
Female	296,533	273,180	92.12
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data are accurate. HS participation is lower than 95% and lowers statewide all-grades composite figures.			

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities *(IDEA)* 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*.
Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities *(IDEA)* who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	31,600	45.30
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	32,545	46.66
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,611	8.04
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	69,756	///
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	260,650	234,186	89.85
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,560	2,949	82.84
Asian or Pacific Islander	22,613	20,875	92.31
Asian	19,695	18,433	93.59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,918	2,442	83.69
Black or African American	11,987	10,007	83.48
Hispanic or Latino	59,211	52,589	88.82
White	143,940	130,438	90.62
Two or more races	19,036	17,056	89.60
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	33,467	28,172	84.18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,028	17,912	85.18
Economically disadvantaged students	111,629	97,813	87.62
Migratory students	5,103	4,484	87.87
Male	134,464	120,153	89.36
Female	126,186	114,033	90.37
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data are accurate. HS participation is lower than 95% and lowers statewide all-grades composite figures.			

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities *(IDEA)* 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 (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	23,348	82.88
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,537	9.01
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,287	8.12
Total	28,172	///
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT [3]

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

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.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the States reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the States reading/language arts assesment. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

---

[3] The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	84,818	49,787	58.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,020	362	35.49
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,373	5,480	74.33
Asian	6,461	5,132	79.43
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	912	348	38.16
Black or African American	3,527	1,410	39.98
Hispanic or Latino	20,890	8,719	41.74
White	44,573	29,354	65.86
Two or more races	7,337	4,406	60.05
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,415	3,498	30.64
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,880	3,818	29.64
Economically disadvantaged students	40,276	17,209	42.73
Migratory students	1,645	543	33.01
Male	43,162	25,739	59.63
Female	41,656	24,048	57.73
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	84,736	45,272	53.43
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,025	292	28.49
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,275	4,813	66.16
Asian	6,362	4,526	71.14
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	913	287	31.43
Black or African American	3,533	1,278	36.17
Hispanic or Latino	20,867	7,156	34.29
White	44,592	27,528	61.73
Two or more races	7,342	4,153	56.56
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,446	3,028	26.45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,712	2,196	17.28
Economically disadvantaged students	40,242	14,540	36.13
Migratory students	1,637	360	21.99
Male	43,116	21,488	49.84
Female	41,620	23,784	57.15
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. these data are accurate. lower performance than previous year.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. science administered in grades 5, 8, 10			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	84,317	46,477	55.12
American Indian or Alaska Native	996	295	29.62
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,195	5,123	71.20
Asian	6,237	4,826	77.38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	958	297	31.00
Black or African American	3,642	1,255	34.46
Hispanic or Latino	20,698	7,631	36.87
White	44,499	27,978	62.87
Two or more races	7,188	4,157	57.83
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,566	2,928	25.32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,065	2,393	21.63
Economically disadvantaged students	39,488	15,172	38.42
Migratory students	1,684	456	27.08
Male	43,350	24,548	56.63
Female	40,967	21,929	53.53
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data are accurate.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	84,165	47,158	56.03
American Indian or Alaska Native	993	292	29.41
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,139	4,914	68.83
Asian	6,179	4,597	74.40
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	960	317	33.02
Black or African American	3,642	1,333	36.60
Hispanic or Latino	20,660	7,717	37.35
White	44,432	28,561	64.28
Two or more races	7,202	4,292	59.59
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,573	2,802	24.21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,934	1,747	15.98
Economically disadvantaged students	39,457	15,149	38.39
Migratory students	1,679	414	24.66
Male	43,277	22,663	52.37
Female	40,888	24,495	59.91
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data are accurate.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. science administered in grades 5, 8, and 10			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	81,850	40,508	49.49
American Indian or Alaska Native	996	251	25.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,859	4,662	67.97
Asian	6,008	4,415	73.49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	851	247	29.02
Black or African American	3,565	1,021	28.64
Hispanic or Latino	19,776	6,096	30.83
White	43,888	25,039	57.05
Two or more races	6,701	3,401	50.75
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,241	2,277	20.26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,106	1,141	12.53
Economically disadvantaged students	37,753	12,009	31.81
Migratory students	1,653	308	18.63
Male	42,083	21,435	50.94
Female	39,767	19,073	47.96
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	81,848	48,609	59.39
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,001	324	32.37
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,818	4,942	72.48
Asian	5,963	4,619	77.46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	855	323	37.78
Black or African American	3,571	1,444	40.44
Hispanic or Latino	19,764	8,092	40.94
White	43,914	29,644	67.50
Two or more races	6,714	4,119	61.35
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,282	2,662	23.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,007	1,186	13.17
Economically disadvantaged students	37,789	15,792	41.79
Migratory students	1,642	406	24.73
Male	42,074	22,915	54.46
Female	39,774	25,694	64.60
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	81,522	52,461	64.35
American Indian or Alaska Native	987	375	37.99
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,835	4,939	72.26
Asian	5,989	4,652	77.68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	846	287	33.92
Black or African American	3,543	1,428	40.30
Hispanic or Latino	19,654	8,669	44.11
White	43,765	32,577	74.44
Two or more races	6,673	4,428	66.36
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,172	3,724	33.33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,025	1,696	18.79
Economically disadvantaged students	37,505	17,653	47.07
Migratory students	1,640	460	28.05
Male	41,885	26,504	63.28
Female	39,637	25,957	65.49
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79,382	38,933	49.05
American Indian or Alaska Native	985	215	21.83
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,162	4,892	68.30
Asian	6,216	4,633	74.53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	946	259	27.38
Black or African American	3,389	957	28.24
Hispanic or Latino	18,766	5,689	30.32
White	42,971	24,172	56.25
Two or more races	6,071	2,998	49.38
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,490	1,645	15.68
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,935	948	11.95
Economically disadvantaged students	35,518	10,978	30.91
Migratory students	1,604	330	20.57
Male	40,791	19,539	47.90
Female	38,591	19,394	50.26
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. these data are accurate.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79,458	44,546	56.06
American Indian or Alaska Native	989	265	26.79
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,132	5,030	70.53
Asian	6,180	4,700	76.05
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	952	330	34.66
Black or African American	3,393	1,256	37.02
Hispanic or Latino	18,773	6,927	36.90
White	43,040	27,535	63.98
Two or more races	6,092	3,513	57.67
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,530	1,828	17.36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,848	860	10.96
Economically disadvantaged students	35,564	13,397	37.67
Migratory students	1,598	350	21.90
Male	40,825	20,506	50.23
Female	38,633	24,040	62.23
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. science is administered in grades 5, 8, and 10			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,962	40,209	50.92
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,049	259	24.69
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,193	4,967	69.05
Asian	6,340	4,726	74.54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	853	241	28.25
Black or African American	3,420	967	28.27
Hispanic or Latino	18,140	5,802	31.98
White	43,414	25,152	57.94
Two or more races	5,687	3,038	53.42
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,873	1,430	14.48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,477	648	10.00
Economically disadvantaged students	34,403	11,234	32.65
Migratory students	1,632	365	22.37
Male	40,421	20,490	50.69
Female	38,541	19,719	51.16
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. these data are accurate.			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79,069	48,127	60.87
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,054	366	34.72
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,164	5,294	73.90
Asian	6,307	4,952	78.52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	857	342	39.91
Black or African American	3,422	1,353	39.54
Hispanic or Latino	18,145	7,697	42.42
White	43,523	29,723	68.29
Two or more races	5,702	3,665	64.28
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,921	1,728	17.42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,386	642	10.05
Economically disadvantaged students	34,470	14,820	42.99
Migratory students	1,631	474	29.06
Male	40,484	22,239	54.93
Female	38,585	25,888	67.09
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. these data are accurate			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. science is administered in grades 5, 8, and 10			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,038	38,211	48.96
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,058	285	26.94
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,109	4,832	67.97
Asian	6,250	4,638	74.21
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	859	194	22.58
Black or African American	3,359	929	27.66
Hispanic or Latino	17,457	5,378	30.81
White	43,415	23,970	55.21
Two or more races	5,498	2,722	49.51
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,607	1,251	13.02
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,250	596	11.35
Economically disadvantaged students	32,707	10,086	30.84
Migratory students	1,459	318	21.80
Male	40,026	18,971	47.40
Female	38,012	19,240	50.62
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,224	46,548	59.51
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,065	374	35.12
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,082	5,192	73.31
Asian	6,220	4,889	78.60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	862	303	35.15
Black or African American	3,376	1,339	39.66
Hispanic or Latino	17,489	7,274	41.59
White	43,553	28,882	66.31
Two or more races	5,516	3,383	61.33
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,669	1,706	17.64
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,182	500	9.65
Economically disadvantaged students	32,804	13,796	42.06
Migratory students	1,453	420	28.91
Male	40,112	21,241	52.95
Female	38,112	25,307	66.40
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,022	52,349	67.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,057	461	43.61
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,100	5,471	77.06
Asian	6,246	5,141	82.31
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	854	330	38.64
Black or African American	3,382	1,483	43.85
Hispanic or Latino	17,421	8,182	46.97
White	43,428	32,848	75.64
Two or more races	5,491	3,793	69.08
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,583	2,628	27.42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,194	768	14.79
Economically disadvantaged students	32,626	16,261	49.84
Migratory students	1,444	480	33.24
Male	39,984	26,380	65.98
Female	38,038	25,969	68.27
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	50,282	21,207	42.18
American Indian or Alaska Native	651	145	22.27
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,189	2,535	60.52
Asian	3,624	2,426	66.94
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	565	109	19.29
Black or African American	2,184	462	21.15
Hispanic or Latino	10,997	2,459	22.36
White	28,887	14,129	48.91
Two or more races	3,292	1,458	44.29
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,021	691	13.76
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,978	270	9.07
Economically disadvantaged students	19,175	4,826	25.17
Migratory students	1,037	150	14.46
Male	25,936	10,924	42.12
Female	24,346	10,283	42.24

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data are accurate. Our HS testing requirements toward state grad requirements have created variability in these figures and as stated in previous years' submissions, we expect these to be resolved in Spring 2018 once the system is stable.

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	71,093	59,839	84.17
American Indian or Alaska Native	773	521	67.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,531	5,682	87.00
Asian	5,860	5,260	89.76
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	671	422	62.89
Black or African American	2,961	2,011	67.92
Hispanic or Latino	13,733	9,804	71.39
White	42,278	37,658	89.07
Two or more races	4,739	4,118	86.90
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,335	2,013	37.73
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,168	734	23.17
Economically disadvantaged students	24,431	17,480	71.55
Migratory students	1,216	658	54.11
Male	35,525	28,659	80.67
Female	35,568	31,180	87.66

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data are accurate. Our HS testing requirements toward state grad requirements have created variability in these figures and as stated in previous years' submissions, we expect these to be resolved in Spring 2018 once the system is stable.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74,642	57,732	77.35
American Indian or Alaska Native	905	480	53.04
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,940	5,658	81.53
Asian	6,198	5,309	85.66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	742	349	47.04
Black or African American	3,082	1,706	55.35
Hispanic or Latino	15,514	9,146	58.95
White	43,245	36,751	84.98
Two or more races	4,892	3,954	80.83
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,417	2,764	37.27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,693	788	21.34
Economically disadvantaged students	27,682	17,002	61.42
Migratory students	1,400	612	43.71
Male	38,284	29,372	76.72
Female	36,358	28,360	78.00

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These data are accurate. Our HS testing requirements toward state grad requirements have created variability in these figures and as stated in previous years' submissions, we expect these to be resolved in Spring 2018 once the system is stable.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on accountability.

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 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2016-17
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	108
Extension of the school year or school day	28
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	17
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	3
Replacement of the principal	22
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	31
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	66
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 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)	28
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	205
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

1.4.5.2 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.

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 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2016-17
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	50
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	16
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	2
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	10
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	6
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2015-16 and beginning of SY 2016-17 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* .

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 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 2016 (SY 2016-17) 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*:   4.00 %

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

The data for this question are reported through ED*Facts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the ED*Facts* Reporting System (ERS). The ED*Facts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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) <u>evaluation</u> and <u>technical assistance</u> activities that your State conducted during SY 2016-17.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Washington State reserved the allowable 5% of 1003(g) funds for administration to assist selected districts/schools with evaluation, monitoring, intervention, and technical assistance in support of the SEA's School Improvement Grant (SIG) Cohort III.

Purpose and Background:
The major shift in Federal policy focuses on the bottom 5% of Title I and Title I-eligible secondary schools identified through a composite score on reading/language arts and math achievement measured by the state assessment over the past three consecutive years and graduation rate of less than 60% has allowed the Office of Student and School Success to provide continued support to 13 schools statewide identified as SIG Cohort III.

In the 2016-17 school year, OSPI's Office of Student and School Success continued their current work in the SIG Cohort III schools based on an approved state application for SIG funds that has allowed the SEA to provide continued support and services to implement required elements aligned to the LEAs selected intervention model (transformation, turnaround, closure, and restart).

In addition, the Washington State Service Delivery Model continued to support a variety of services to identified SIG districts/schools. These services included but were not limited to needs assessments, contextual survey data and assessment analytic support, classroom walkthrough training/PD, improvement planning support and monitoring/tracking for accountability purposes, onsite visits to SIG districts and schools, and executive coaching from the Office of Student and School Success FTEs.

Evaluation and Technical Assistance:
The SEA continues to provide evaluation and technical assistance support through agency FTEs and third-party contractors. Data from the evaluation of SIG are assisting the SEA in continued funding decisions while providing evidence of effective structures and conditions that is essential for continuous improvement of teaching and learning and to help sustain reforms once the grant funding is no longer available.

Continued technical assistance from agency FTE and third-party contractors that is in alignment with Turnaround Principles described in Federal guidance and helps target specific outcomes within the themes of:
• Providing strong leadership;
• Ensuring that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction;
• Redesigning the school day/week/year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration;
• Strengthening the school's instructional program based on student needs and ensure that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards;
• Using data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including providing time for collaboration on the use of data;
• Establishing a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addresses other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students' social, emotional, and health needs;
• Providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

Enhanced Technical Assistance Efforts:
The implementation of effective instruction, assessment, and intervention systems is essential to enabling all students to achieve at high levels. OSPI's Student and School Success FTE and third-party contractors continue to provide technical assistance in the content areas of English Language Arts, Mathematics, English Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Positive Behavior Supports. All professional learning and technical assistance offered are aligned to both Washington State Teacher Criteria and School Success Principles.

Specific areas of continued focus will depend on district context relative to implementation of Common Core State Standards, aligned instructional materials, assessment and intervention systems. Ongoing training for key district staff in accessing, using, and analyzing data continues to supplement content-specific activities.

The Office of Student and School Success third-party contractors with both leadership and instructional expertise have been assigned to each of our SIG schools. These experienced, exemplary educators work in an ongoing capacity with district personnel, supporting the effective implementation of strategies in leadership, instruction, data analysis, assessment, intervention, and the alignment of district and school improvement plans. Our ability to maintain this level of technical assistance will be critical to sustain the ongoing efforts to the existing districts and schools.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2016-17 that were supported by **funds other than Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Sections 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Background and Purpose:
1. The 2015 Washington State Legislature provided proviso language in its 2015 Operating Budget (ESSB 6052, Section 513 (17)) to provide grants that support three main performance outcomes within the public schools in Washington State.
a. Create a differentiated system of accountability and support that permeates all schools in Washington State. Rewarding exemplar schools and identifying schools that are under-performing, both Title I and non-Title.
b. Recommend to the State Board of Education those schools within Washington State that, despite significant intervention, continue to be amongst the lowest performing, for RAD (Required Action District).
c. Support through targeted investment: Fiscal Grant, Leadership and Instructional Coaching to ensure the success of all Non-Title Priority, Focus, and RAD schools statewide.

Services Provided:
The services provided to schools as a result of ESSB 6052 legislation include: fiscal grants to identified schools to support their Student and School Success Action Plan, leadership coaching provided to the building principals of identified schools and targeted district staff, instructional coaching provided in the classrooms of identified schools, and data analysis/assessment to support the improvement planning process. In addition, a fixed amount is also assigned to support the administrative expenses and investment within OSPI related to the growth in program by increasing the number of schools identified statewide and differentiating the fiscal support.

Criteria for receiving services and/or grants include the following:
a. Priority Schools: Based on low performance in the "All Students" category
I. Schools with proficiency in ELA/Math (combined) over 3 years that is less than 40% (federal guidance).
ii. Schools with an adjusted 5-year Graduation Rate over 3 years that is less than 60% (state/federal guidance).
iii. Lowest performing schools based on Achievement Index (state guidance).
iv. Current Priority schools continuing forward in 2015-16 (federal guidance).
v. Lowest 5% of persistently lowest achieving schools (PLAs) in ELA and Math over 3 years (federal guidance).

b. Focus Schools: Based on Subgroup performance in the "All Students" Category
i. Schools with an adjusted 5-year Graduation Rate over 3 years that is less than 60% (state/federal guidance).
ii. Lowest 10% of schools based on subgroup performance in ELA/Math (combined). Proficiency in ELA/Math (combined) over 3 years for these schools is less than or equal to 13.82% for at least one subgroup (state/federal guidance).
iii. Current Focus schools continuing forward in 2015-16 (federal guidance).

c. RAD (Required Action District)
i. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) is required to annually recommend to the State Board of Education (SBE) school districts for designation as required action districts. A district with at least one school identified as persistently lowest achieving will be designated as required action district. The SBE may designate a district that received a school improvement grant as a required action district if after three years of voluntarily implementing a plan the district continues to have a school identified as persistently lowest achieving and meets the criteria for designation established by the superintendent of public instruction.

Evaluation and Technical Assistance:
Each identified school in Washington State is required to submit a Student and School Success Action Plan that is reviewed at least three times annually by the Office of Student and School Success. These plans, along with ongoing data analysis provide the "prescription" to ensure ongoing growth and proficiency of the students in identified schools. In addition to the student performance gains, the Office of Student and School Success monitor changes/improvements in educator practice of both the building leadership and teaching staff. Through the formalized Instructional Review Process, all Priority, Focus, and RAD schools who are not exhibiting growth will continually be both scrutinized and supported for growth and targeted intervention. In addition, continued Technical Assistance from FTE and third-party contractors is in alignment with school structures and practices Turnaround Principles described in state and federal guidance

Enhanced Technical Assistance Efforts:
The implementation of effective instruction, assessment and intervention systems in reading/language arts and mathematics is essential to enabling all students to achieve at high levels. Within the context of Student and School Success district action plans, OSPI staff are providing technical assistance in the content areas of reading and mathematics and in meeting the needs of English Learners and Students with Disabilities.

Specific areas of continued focus will depend on district context relative to implementation of Common Core State Standards, aligned instructional materials, assessment and intervention systems. Ongoing training for key district staff in accessing, using, and analyzing data continues to supplement content-specific activities.

The Office of Student and School Success Coaches with both leadership and instructional expertise have been assigned to each of our Non-Title Priority, Focus, and RAD schools/districts. These experienced, exemplary educators work in an ongoing capacity with district personnel, supporting the effective implementation of strategies in leadership, instruction, data analysis, assessment, intervention, and the alignment of district and school improvement plans. Our ability to maintain this level of technical assistance will be critical to sustain the ongoing efforts to the existing districts and schools.

1.6   TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational program

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational program implemented in the State, as defined under 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.us/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the October 1 count 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	122,600
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of LEP students in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	122,354
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Washington has been experiencing an increased number of eligible students who are served in program. Last year's increase over the prior year was 8.7%.	

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	79,716
Russian	4,863
Vietnamese	3,653
Chinese	3,168
Somali	2,853

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	127,259
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,825
Total	130,084
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Reported in file C141 are 122,600 students enrolled on 1st day in Oct. 2016 Reported in file C137 are 127,259 ELPA21 student participants and 2,825 non-participants that were enrolled during the testing window (February 1 to March 30 during 2017 SY). The enrollment is different is because C141 reports a single day of enrollment and C137 accounts for approximately two month of enrollment during the ELPA 21 assessment window. Based on testing window enrollment (130,084) reported with file 137, 2.17% of students did not test. Based on testing window enrollment (127,033) reported with file C138, 1.65% of students did not test.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17,754
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	13.95
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This was the second year of administering our new language assessment, ELPA21. This reflects an increase in students attaining proficiency from the prior year of 0.75% (prior year 13.2% proficiency).	

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

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	124,943
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,090
Total	127,033
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 them in the calculations for making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined.	31,690

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **Attained Proficiency =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **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 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.

Title III Results	Results #	Results %
Making progress	17,374	18.63
Attained proficiency	17,374	13.91
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This was the second year of administering our new language assessment, ELPA21. This reflects an increase in students attaining proficiency from the prior year of 0.71% (prior year 13.2% proficiency). We are still working on our ESSA plan for implementing progress calculations, so we did not calculate progress this year. Instead, we are counting all students attaining proficiency as making progress, and our numbers next year will reflect our new EL Progress calculations.		

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)).

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used.

Native Language Testing	Yes/No
State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 <u>unduplicated </u>count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in all grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
11,908	13,948	25,856

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of students attaining proficiency is down the last two school years due to the implementation of our new language assessment, ELPA21. The test was first administered in the 15-16 school year. Because students are transitioning at a slower rate, the number of students monitored post-transition has decreased. Students graduate, drop out, or move out of the state causing a natural decline in cohort counts when looking at the trend data. The 2014-2015 SY rise in Proficiency status counts (19,020) created a rise in 1st year former counts in 2015-2016 SY and then a drop in the 1st year former in 2016-2017 SY as this cohort moved from 1st year to 2nd year of academic assistance. This cohort is still evident in the nearly 14,000 students reported in 2016-2017 SY for 2nd year Monitored.

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics.
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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
23,023	11,751	51.04	11,272

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

<u>**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**</u>

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts.
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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
22,683	13,069	57.62	9,614
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

<u>**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**</u>

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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,497	3,887	51.85	3,610
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

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).

Termination of Title III Programs	Yes/No
Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> 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 <u>not</u> include immigrant students who only 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 <u>not</u> 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
35,864	2,798	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.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,189
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	500

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.

In past years, we have mistakenly added the number of additional teachers to the current number of teachers and reported that in the second box. This year, we are correcting our reporting to show just the additional teachers needed over the next 5 years in the second box.

* 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).

<u>Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:</u>

1. **Professional Development Topics =** Subgrantee 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 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.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	197
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	127
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	161
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	111
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	111
Other (Explain in comment box)	55

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	187	16,627
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	141	4,340
PD provided to principals	121	938
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	138	786
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	177	4,837
PD provided to community based organization personnel	15	129
Total	/////////////////////////////////////	27,657

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 <u>intended school year</u>. Dates must be submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

<u>**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**</u>

1. **Date State Received Allocation =** Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from U.S. 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 2016-17 funds July 1, 2016, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2016, for SY 2016-17 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/2016	7/1/2016	30
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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.

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.doc.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 **E**DUCATION FOR **H**OMELESS **C**HILDREN AND **Y**OUTHS **P**ROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	282	282
LEAs with subgrants	50	50
Total	332	332
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	410	431
K	1,547	1,677
1	1,502	1,688
2	1,630	1,675
3	1,606	1,645
4	1,491	1,645
5	1,437	1,529
6	1,405	1,490
7	1,262	1,363
8	1,282	1,361
9	1,282	1,356
10	1,195	1,499
11	1,286	1,576
12	1,884	2,776
Ungraded	0	0
Total	19,219	21,711
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing	2,051	3,459
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	14,615	15,471
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	1,310	1,443
Hotels/Motels	1,243	1,338
Total	19,219	21,711
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

FAQ on reporting homeless students:

When should States use S or STH to report homeless students? The primary nighttime residence of students who are deemed homeless under the awaiting foster care provision should be indicated as "S" for shelters, transitional housing, and awaiting foster care. After a state is no longer permitted to use the awaiting foster care placement designation for students, the primary nighttime residence of students who are in shelters or transitional housing should be coded as "STH". The majority of states may only include children and youth identified as homeless due to their status as awaiting foster care placement if they were identified prior to December 10, 2016. States covered under P.L. 114-95, Section 9105(c) may include children awaiting foster care placement until December 10, 2017. Covered states are those states that have a law that describes or defines the phrase awaiting foster care placement for the purposes of a program under the McKinney-Vento Act.

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,571	3,627
Migratory children/youth	1,170	564
Children with disabilities *(IDEA)*	4,050	4,394
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	3,293	3,786
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Young Homeless Children Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	426
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	865
Total	1,291
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youth.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,230	365	29.67	1,294	366	28.28
4	1,156	376	32.53	1,312	367	27.97
5	1,133	358	31.60	1,219	414	33.96
6	1,090	303	27.80	1,189	349	29.35
7	963	310	32.19	1,042	342	32.82
8	994	332	33.40	1,012	337	33.30
High School	731	459	62.79	870	559	64.25
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.						

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,224	426	34.80	1,292	434	33.59
4	1,159	364	31.41	1,309	340	25.97
5	1,131	262	23.17	1,216	280	23.03
6	1,088	247	22.70	1,182	240	20.30
7	967	217	22.44	1,036	238	22.97
8	984	217	22.05	1,004	229	22.81
High School	534	91	17.04	601	110	18.30
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.						

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	1,127	440	39.04	1,208	488	40.40
6						
7						
8	977	382	39.10	1,008	389	38.59
High School	718	369	51.39	804	377	46.89
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.						