



Report Cards

Title I, Part A

Non-Regulatory Guidance



September 12, 2003

Report Cards

INTRODUCTION

A. GENERAL INFORMATION.....1

- A-1. Who must prepare and disseminate report cards?
- A-2. When should States and local educational agencies (LEAs) disseminate report cards?
- A-3. How should States and LEAs disseminate report cards?
- A-4. What format should State and local report cards use?
- A-5. What are State and LEA responsibilities for ensuring that the information on report cards is statistically reliable and does not reveal personally identifiable information about individual students?
- A-6. May States and LEAs use Title I funds to prepare and disseminate report cards?
- A-7. How can States and LEAs ensure the accuracy of report card data?

B. STATE REPORT CARDS.....4

- B-1. What information must States include on State report cards?
- B-2. What optional information may States include on the State report card?

C. LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY REPORT CARDS.....11

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- C-1. What information must LEAs include on their report cards?
- C-2. May LEAs include additional information in their report cards?

Report Cards

Deleted: Section Break (Next Page)

INTRODUCTION

State and local school district report cards are critical tools for promoting accountability for schools, local school districts, and States by publicizing data about student performance and

program effectiveness for parents, policy makers, and other stakeholders. Report cards help parents and the general public see where schools and districts are succeeding and where there is still work to do.

A well-informed public is an important resource in the school and district improvement process. In the same way that data enable educators to make better decisions about teaching and learning, data can also help parents and other community members work more effectively with educators and local school officials to promote school change. Additionally, the more parents and community members know about the academic achievement of their children and their schools, the more likely they are to be involved in their local schools and the public school system. Equipped with information on academic results and teacher quality, parents and community members can make better decisions and choices. For these reasons, States and LEAs receiving Title I funds must prepare and disseminate annual report cards.

Most States and school districts have already identified report cards as being integral to accountability and have been providing information on school and student achievement to the public for years. So long as existing State and district report cards include the information required by the *No Child Left Behind Act*, States and districts may continue to use them to meet the Title I requirements. For States and districts that have reported achievement and other data to the public in the past, the Title I requirements provide an opportunity to review and re-evaluate how data are currently provided and to identify where to make improvements.

Deleted: Many
Deleted: have report cards

This document addresses commonly asked questions about the Title I report card requirements. U.S. Department of Education officials, including the Inspector General, will consider State recipients that follow approaches contained in this guidance to be in compliance with the applicable Federal requirements that govern this program.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

A-1. Who must prepare and disseminate report cards?

All States and LEAs receiving Title I, Part A funds must prepare and distribute report cards. States have the responsibility for producing and distributing State report cards and may, as is the case in many States, prepare and produce district report cards on behalf of their LEAs. If an LEA has the responsibility for producing and disseminating a district report card, the State must ensure that the LEA's report card meets all the statutory requirements.

A-2. When should States and LEAs disseminate report cards?

States and LEAs must issue report cards annually. While States and LEAs have the flexibility to determine the exact time during the year when they will issue report cards, the best practice would be to issue report cards as early as possible, so that schools have critical information for improving instruction and parents have critical information to make decisions regarding public school choice and supplemental educational services options.

Recognizing that all the necessary data may not be available prior to the beginning of the school year, States and LEAs may want to consider issuing a two-part report card, with some data elements available earlier than others. For example, an initial report could include information on assessment data and schools and LEAs identified for improvement, while data on teacher quality might be provided as early as possible later in the school year.

A-3. How should States and LEAs disseminate report cards?

States are encouraged to disseminate State report cards in multiple ways. States might post their report cards on the State's website and make copies available in local schools, libraries, parent centers, community centers, or other public locations easily accessible to parents and others. Because not all parents and members of the public have access to the Internet, posting report cards on the Internet alone is not a sufficient means for disseminating State and district report cards.

LEAs must disseminate district and school report cards to:

- (1) All schools served by the local educational agency;
- (2) All parents of students attending those schools; and

(3) The community, through public means, such as posting on the Internet, distribution to the media, and distribution through public agencies, public libraries, etc.

LEAs may use their regular method of communicating with parents to meet the dissemination requirement so long as it provides information to all parents.

A Guide to Effective Accountability Reporting (Council of Chief State School Officers, December 2002) suggests that States develop a dissemination plan for all their reports, including report cards. This guide lists several issues States and LEAs may wish to consider for both print and Internet dissemination of report cards. Please see <http://www.ccsso.org> for more information.

A-4. What format must State and local report cards use?

States and LEAs may use whatever format they determine to be most effective in presenting information in a concise, understandable manner. To the extent practicable, information in report cards should be provided in a language and format that parents can understand.

A Guide to Effective Accountability Reporting (CCSSO, December 2000, page 31) points out that an effective accountability report is—

- Easy to read;
- Accessible to the target audiences both physically and linguistically;
- Accompanied by adequate interpretive information;
- Supported by evidence that the indicators, other information, and suggested interpretations are valid; and
- Coordinated across paper and electronic versions of report cards.

Chapter 3 of this CCSSO guide discusses a number of factors that States and LEAs may find useful in considering how to design or modify report cards, including crafting language, using graphics, and aligning report cards with other documents.

A-5. What are State and LEA responsibilities for ensuring that the information on report cards is statistically reliable and does not reveal personally identifiable information about individual students?

When presenting disaggregated data on report cards, States and LEAs must ensure that the data presented are statistically reliable. As part of each State's approved accountability plan under Title I, each State has identified a minimum number of students for reporting purposes. For example, if a State has identified 10 as its minimum group size ("n—size") to ensure statistical reliability for reporting purposes, a State and its districts and schools will not report data for any subgroup for which there are fewer than 10 students.

In addition to ensuring that the data presented in report cards are statistically reliable, States, districts, and schools must also ensure that the data they report do not reveal personally identifiable information about individual students. Many States, for example, do not report data for any subgroup in which there are fewer than 10 students. Further, States must adopt a strategy for dealing with a situation in which all students in a particular subgroup scored at the same achievement level. One solution, referred to as “masking” the data, is to use the notation of >95% when all students in a subgroup score at the same achievement level.

A-6. May States and LEAs use Title I funds to prepare and disseminate report cards?

Yes. So long as there is no violation of the supplement, not supplant requirement, States and LEAs may use their respective administrative funds under Title I, Part A to prepare and disseminate report cards.

A presumption of supplanting exists if any of the following conditions apply:

- The State or LEA is required under State or local law to issue school/district report cards to all parents;
- The State or LEA used State or local funds to issue report cards to all parents the prior year; or
- The State or LEA is using State or local funds to issue report cards to parents of students in non-Title I schools or LEAs.

A State or LEA can rebut a presumption of supplanting if the State or LEA can demonstrate that it would not have issued report cards with State or local funds had the Title I funds not been available.

A-7. How can States and LEAs ensure the accuracy of report card data?

States and LEAs are encouraged to follow data quality provisions under the Department’s Data Quality Guidelines. On October 3, 2002, the Department of Education published in the *Federal Register* (67 FR 62043) a notice of availability of these guidelines. Both the notice and the guidelines can be found at the following site:
www.ed.gov/offices/OCIO/info_quality/final_guide.html

B. STATE EDUCATION AGENCY REPORT CARDS

Deleted: ¶
¶

B-1. What are the required data elements for State report cards?

State report cards must include information related to assessments, accountability, and teacher quality, and must include data from all LEAs in the State. A description of each of the data elements (assessments, accountability, teacher quality) for State report cards follows.

Assessment Data

The following three components of assessment data must include **all** students in the grades tested in the State, not just those students enrolled for a full academic year, as defined by the State. At a minimum, States must provide assessment data from their reading/language arts and mathematics assessments. Beginning with assessment data from the 2007-2008 school year, States must also provide data from their science assessments. An example chart with all the required assessment data elements is provided in Table 1.

For each grade and subject tested, the State report card must include--

1. Information on the percentage of students tested. States must report the percentage of students not tested or the inverse, the percentage of students tested. Either approach is acceptable. This information must be disaggregated by the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Major Racial & Ethnic groups
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically disadvantaged
- Migrant¹
- Gender¹

¹ Note that the subgroups of migrant and gender are subgroups for reporting purposes only and are not among the required subgroups for adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations.

2. Information on student achievement at each proficiency level (e.g., advanced, proficient, basic, below basic)² disaggregated by the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Major Racial & Ethnic groups
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Migrant³
- Gender³

3. The most recent 2-year trend data in student achievement for each subject and for each grade.

² A State should report student assessment data for all the achievement levels of its State assessment system and should use the achievement level labels associated with that system. While a State's system of academic achievement standards must describe two levels of high achievement (proficient and advanced) that determine how well students are mastering a State's academic content standards and a third level of achievement (basic) to provide information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the proficient and advanced levels of achievement, States have the flexibility to give different names to these three levels of achievement. For example, one State calls its achievement levels: exceeds standards, meets standards, and partially meets standards. States also have the flexibility to have more than three levels of student academic achievement standards. For example, one State reports five levels of achievement: advanced, proficient, basic, approaching basic, and unsatisfactory.

³ Note that the subgroups of migrant and gender are subgroups for reporting purposes only and are not among the required subgroups for adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations.

Table 1. Example of State-Level Grade 8 Mathematics Assessment Reporting

| Student Group | School Year | Percent of Students (Not) Tested ⁴ | Percent of Students in State at Each Achievement Level | | | |
|--|-------------|---|--|------------|-------|-------------|
| | | | Advanced | Proficient | Basic | Below Basic |
| All Students | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |
| African American | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |
| American Indian/ Native Alaskan | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |
| Hispanic | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |
| White | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities ⁵ | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |
| Migrant | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |
| Male | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |
| Female | 2001-02 | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | |

SAMPLE

⁴ States must report the percentage of students not tested or the inverse, the percentage of students tested. Either approach is acceptable.

⁵ Includes results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments. Does not include results from students covered under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Accountability Data

The three components of accountability data required on State report cards are a comparison between student achievement levels and the State's annual measurable objectives in reading/language arts and mathematics, data on student performance on the State's additional academic indicators used in making adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations, and information on LEAs and schools making AYP.

1. A comparison between the actual achievement levels and the State's annual measurable objectives in reading/language arts and mathematics for the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Major Racial & Ethnic Groups
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically Disadvantaged

See Table 2 for an example of how this information might be reported.

In presenting this comparison, States should report student assessment scores used by the State to determine State AYP. In some States, this will be the scores from all students who were tested on the States academic assessments and in other States this will be the scores from all students who were enrolled in the State for a full academic year, as defined by the State in its State accountability plan. States should indicate on their State report cards whether the accountability data reported represents the assessment results of all students in the State or only the assessment results of those students enrolled in the State for a full academic year.

2. Information on the other academic indicators used by the State for AYP determinations, including the graduation rate for high schools and the State's "additional academic indicator(s)" for elementary and middle schools, as each are defined by the State in its approved accountability plan. This information must be disaggregated for the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Major Racial & Ethnic Groups
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically Disadvantaged

See Table 2 for an example of how this information might be reported.

3. Information on AYP, including the number and names of each LEA and school identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring, under Section 1116, for LEAs and schools receiving Title I, Part A funds.

Table 2. Example of State-Level Accountability (AYP) Reporting*

| Student Group | Reading/Language Arts | | Mathematics | | Additional Academic Indicators | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| | Percent Tested | Percent Proficient & Advanced | Percent Tested | Percent Proficient & Advanced | Graduation Rate | Attendance Rate |
| | Goal: 100% ⁶ | Goal: 60% | Goal: 100% ⁶ | Goal 60% | Goal: 85% | Goal 92% |
| All Students | | | | | | |
| African American | | | | | | |
| American Indian/ Native Alaskan | | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | |
| White | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities ⁷ | | | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | | |

SAMPLE

*All data are based on students enrolled for a full academic year.

⁶ While the goal for percent of students tested is 100%, a State, district, or school will meet AYP requirements for participation if 95% or greater of all students and all subgroups of students are assessed.

⁷ Includes results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments. Does not include results from students covered under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

Teacher Quality Data

For public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State, States must provide information for the following three components:

1. The professional qualifications of all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State, as defined by the State (e.g., bachelors and advanced degrees, licensure);
2. The percentage of all public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials; and
3. The percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9103(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers who teach a core academic subject.⁸ For purposes of reporting information on the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers, States must only report on elementary and secondary classes in the core academic subjects.

Table 3. Example of State-Level Teacher Quality Reporting

| | B.A. | B.A. + 15 credit hours | M.A. | M.A. + 15 credit hours | M.A. + 30 credit hours | Ph.D. |
|---|------|------------------------|------|------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the State ⁹ | | | | | | |
| Percentage of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the State with Emergency/Provisional Certification | | | | | | |

SAMPLE

⁸ The term “core academic subject” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Title IX, Section 9101(11)*).

⁹ Professional Qualifications are defined by the State and may include information such as the degrees of public school teachers (e.g., percentage of teachers with Bachelors Degrees or Masters Degrees) or the percentage of fully certified teachers.

| Percentage of Core Academic Subject Elementary and Secondary School Classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers | State Aggregate | High-Poverty Schools | Low -Poverty Schools |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| SAMPLE | | | |

B-2. What optional information may States include on the State report card?

The State may include in its annual report card any other information it believes will best inform parents, students, and other members of the public regarding the progress of each of the State’s public elementary and secondary schools. Section 1111(h)(1)(D) lists the following “optional information” States might include:

- School attendance rates
- Average class size in each grade
- Achievement and gains in English proficiency of limited English proficient students
- The incidence of school violence, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, student suspensions, and student expulsions
- The extent and type of parental involvement in the schools
- The percentage of students completing advanced placement courses, and the rate of passing advanced placement tests (such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and courses for college credit)
- A clear and concise description of the State’s accountability system, including a description of the criteria by which the State evaluates school performance, and the criteria that the State has established to determine the status of schools regarding school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Deleted: ¶
¶
¶
¶
¶

Inserted: ¶
¶
¶
¶

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

C. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY REPORT CARDS

C-1. What information must LEAs include on their report cards?

Similar to State report cards, LEA report cards must include information related to assessments, accountability, and teacher quality as that information applies to the LEA as a whole and as it applies to each school served by the LEA. Individual school report cards are not required, but information about each school must be included in the LEA report card. Example charts with all the required assessment data elements at the LEA and school level are provided in Tables 4 and 5. A description of each of these data elements for LEA report cards follows.

Assessment Information

The following four components of assessment data must include **all** students in the grades tested in the LEA as a whole and **all** students in the grades tested in each school served by the LEA, not just those students enrolled for a full academic year, as defined by the State. At a minimum, an LEA must provide assessment data from its State's reading/language arts and mathematics assessments. Beginning with assessment data from the 2007-2008 school year, an LEA must also provide data from its State's science assessments. An example chart with all the required assessment data elements for the LEA as a whole is provided in Table 4 and an example chart with the required assessment data elements for an individual school is provided in Table 5.

For each grade and subject tested, the LEA report card must include for the LEA as a whole and for each school served by the LEA, including non Title-I schools:

1. Information on the percentage of students tested. LEAs must report the percentage of students not tested or the inverse, the percentage of students tested. Either approach is acceptable. This information must be disaggregated by the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Major Racial & Ethnic groups
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Migrant¹⁰
- Gender¹⁰

2. Information on student achievement at each proficiency level (e.g., advanced, proficient, basic, below basic)¹¹, disaggregated by the following subgroups:

¹⁰ Note that the subgroups of migrant and gender are subgroups for reporting purposes only and are not among the required subgroups for adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations.

All Students
Major Racial & Ethnic groups
Students with Disabilities
Limited English Proficient
Economically Disadvantaged
Migrant¹²
Gender¹²

3. Information that shows how students in the LEA achieved on State academic assessments as compared to students in the State as a whole; and for each school in the LEA information that shows how students in the school achieved on State assessments as compared to students in the LEA as a whole and as compared to students in the State as a whole.
4. The most recent 2-year trend data in student achievement for each subject and for each grade.

¹¹ An LEA should report student assessment data for all the achievement levels of its State assessment system and should use the achievement level labels associated with that system. While a State's system of academic achievement standards must describe two levels of high achievement (proficient and advanced) that determine how well students are mastering a State's academic content standards and a third level of achievement (basic) to provide information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the proficient and advanced levels of achievement, States have the flexibility to give different names to these three levels of achievement. For example, one State calls its achievement levels: exceeds standards, meets standards, and partially meets standards. States also have the flexibility to have more than three levels of student academic achievement standards. For example, one State reports five levels of achievement: advanced, proficient, basic, approaching basic, and unsatisfactory.

¹² Note that the subgroups of migrant and gender are subgroups for reporting purposes only and are not among the required subgroups for adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations.

Table 4. Example of LEA-Level Grade 8 Mathematics Assessment Reporting

| Student Group | School Year | District Percent of Students Proficient & Advanced | State Percent of Students Proficient & Advanced | Percent (Not) ¹³ Tested in District | Percent of Students in District at Each Achievement Level | | | |
|---|-------------|--|---|--|---|------------|-------|-------------|
| | | | | | Advanced | Proficient | Basic | Below Basic |
| All Students | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |
| African American | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |
| American Indian/ Native Alaskan | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |
| White | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities ¹⁴ | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |
| Migrant | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |
| Male | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |
| Female | 2001-02 | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | |

SAMPLE

¹³ States must report the percentage of students not tested or the inverse, the percentage of students tested. Either approach is acceptable.

¹⁴ Includes results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments. Does not include results from students covered under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Table 5. Example of School-Level Grade 8 Mathematics Assessment Reporting

| Student Group | School Year | School Percent of Students Proficient & Advanced | District Percent of Students Proficient & Advanced | State Percent of Students Proficient & Advanced | Percent (Not) ¹⁵ Tested in School | Percent of Students in School at Each Achievement Level | | | |
|---|-------------|--|--|---|--|---|------------|-------|-------------|
| | | | | | | Advanced | Proficient | Basic | Below Basic |
| All Students | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| African American | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| American Indian/ Native Alaskan | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| White | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities ¹⁶ | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| Migrant | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 2001-02 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2002-03 | | | | | | | | |

SAMPLE

¹⁵ States must report the percentage of students not tested or the inverse, the percentage of students tested. Either approach is acceptable.

¹⁶ Includes results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments. Does not include results from students covered under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Accountability Data

The three components of accountability data required on LEA report cards are a comparison between student achievement levels and the State's annual measurable objectives in reading/language arts and mathematics, data on student performance on the State's additional academic indicators used in making AYP determinations, and information on LEAs and schools making AYP. An example chart of accountability information at the LEA level is presented in Table 6. An example chart of the accountability information at the individual school level is presented in Table 7.

1. A comparison between the actual achievement levels of students in the LEA as a whole and for each school within the LEA and the State's annual measurable objectives in reading/language arts and mathematics for the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Major Racial & Ethnic Groups
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically Disadvantaged

In presenting this comparison, LEAs should report student assessment scores used by the LEA to make AYP determinations at the LEA level. Schools should report student assessment scores used to make AYP determinations at the school level. These are the assessment scores of students enrolled for a full academic year, as defined by the State in its approved accountability plan.

2. Information on the other academic indicators used for AYP determinations, including the graduation rate for high schools and the State's "additional academic indicator(s)" for elementary and middle school, as each are defined by the State in its approved accountability plan. This information must be disaggregated for the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Major Racial & Ethnic Groups
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically Disadvantaged

3. Additional accountability information that must be included on the LEA report card includes:
 - The total number of schools identified for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116, and the percentage of the schools in the LEA they represent.

- The name of each school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and how long each school has been identified. Information on schools identified as being in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring must be provided for schools receiving Title I, Part A funds.

Table 6. Example of LEA-Level Accountability (AYP) Reporting*

| Student Group | Reading/Language Arts | | | | Mathematics | | | | Additional Academic Indicators | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| | Percent Tested | | Percent Proficient & Advanced | | Percent Tested | | Percent Proficient & Advanced | | Graduation Rate | | Attendance Rate | |
| | Goal: 100% ¹⁷ | | Goal: 60% | | Goal: 100% ¹⁷ | | Goal: 60% | | Goal: 85% | | Goal: 92% | |
| | District | State | District | State | District | State | District | State | District | State | District | State |
| All Students | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| African American | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| American Indian/ Native Alaskan | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities ¹⁸ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SAMPLE

*All data are based on students enrolled for a full academic year.

¹⁷ While the goal for percent of students tested is 100%, a State, district, or school will meet AYP requirements for participation if 95% or greater of all students and all subgroups of students are assessed.

¹⁸ Includes results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments. Does not include results from students covered under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Table 7. Example of School-Level Accountability (AYP) Reporting*

| Student Group | Reading/Language Arts | | | | | | Mathematics | | | | | | Additional Academic Indicator | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------|--------------------------|----------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------|
| | Percent Tested | | | Percent Proficient & Advanced | | | Percent Tested | | | Percent Proficient & Advanced | | | Graduation Rate | | |
| | Goal: 100% ¹⁹ | | | Goal: 60% | | | Goal: 100% ¹⁹ | | | Goal: 60% | | | Goal: 85% | | |
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| All Students | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| African American | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| American Indian/ Native Alaskan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities ²⁰ Limited English Proficient Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SAMPLE

*All data are based on students enrolled for a full academic year.

¹⁹ While the goal for percent of students tested is 100%, a State, district, or school will meet AYP requirements for participation if 95% or greater of all students and all subgroups of students are assessed.

²⁰ Includes results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments. Does not include results from students covered under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Teacher Quality Data

For every public elementary and secondary school teacher in an LEA, the LEA must provide, for the district as a whole and for each school within the district, information for the following three components:

1. The professional qualifications of all public elementary and secondary school teachers, as defined by the State (e.g., bachelors and advanced degrees, licensure);
2. The percentage of all public elementary and public school teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials; and
3. The percentage of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers who teach a core academic subject.²¹ For purposes of reporting information on the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers, LEAs must only report on elementary and secondary classes in the core academic subjects.

Table 8. Example of LEA-Level Teacher Quality Reporting

| | B.A. | B.A. + 15 credit hours | M.A. | M.A. + 15 credit hours | M.A. + 30 credit hours | Ph.D. |
|--|------|------------------------|------|------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the District ²² | | SAMPLE | | | | |
| Percentage of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the District with Emergency/Provisional Certification | | | | | | |

²¹ The term “core academic subject” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Title IX, Section 9101(11)*).

²² Professional Qualifications are defined by the State and may include information such as the degrees of public school teachers (e.g., percentage of teachers with Bachelors Degrees or Masters Degrees) or the percentage of fully certified teachers.

| | | | |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Percentage of Core Academic Subject Elementary and Secondary School Classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers | District Aggregate | High-Poverty Schools | Low-Poverty Schools |
| | SAMPLE | | |

Table 9. Example of School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting

| | B.A. | B.A. + 15 credit hours | M.A. | M.A. + 15 credit hours | M.A. + 30 credit hours | Ph.D. |
|--|---------------|------------------------|------|------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School ²³ | SAMPLE | | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Percentage of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School with Emergency/Provisional Certification | |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Percentage of Core Academic Subject Elementary and Secondary School Classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers | School Aggregate |
| | SAMPLE |

C-2. May LEAs include additional information in their report cards?

Yes. An LEA may include any other information it determines is appropriate whether or not that information is included in the State report card.

²³ Professional Qualifications are defined by the State and may include information such as the degrees of public school teachers (e.g., percentage of teachers with Bachelors Degrees or Masters Degrees) or the percentage of fully certified teachers.