

**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 2012-13

OKLAHOMA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014

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:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2012-13 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, 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 2012-13 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 2012-13 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2012-13



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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.
State has revised or changed	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., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2014-2015 (PK-12)	2014-2015 (PK-12)	2015-2016 (PK-12)

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
State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	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., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	2016-2017
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2016-2017
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	2012-2013 (Biology I)
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	2011

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.

Mathematics: State will begin assessing CCSS in 2014-2015 with its own tests. No changes have occurred since the previous CSPR report
 Reading/Language Arts: State will begin assessing CCSS in 2014-2015 with its own tests. No changes have been made since the previous CSPR report was submitted.
 Science: New standards were set on regular assessments for grades 5 and 8 science and end-of-instruction Biology I in 2013. New standards were also set on Alternate Assessments based on Modified Achievement Standards for end-of-instruction Biology I in 2013.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's 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 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.
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014 - 2015	2014 - 2015	2012 - 2013
Regular Assessments in High School	2014 - 2015	2014 - 2015	2012 - 2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	2012 - 2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014 - 2015	2014 - 2015	2015-2016

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.

Mathematics: Will begin assessing Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in 2014-15 with the development of own assessments. New standards to be set in summer of 2015. Will begin assessing the CCSS based on Alternate Achievement Standards as part of the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) consortium in 2014-15. New standards to be set in 2015.

Reading/Language Arts: Will begin assessing CCSS with the development of own assessment in 2014-15. New standards will be set summer of 2015. Will begin assessing the CCSS based on Alternate Achievement Standards as part of the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) consortium in 2014-15. New standards to be set in 2015.

Science: New standards were set on regular Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests for grades 5 and 8 science and End-of-Instruction Biology I in summer of 2013. New standards were set on Alternate Assessment, Oklahoma Modified Alternate Assessment Program, based on Modified Achievement standards for End-of-Instruction Biology I in summer 2013.

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 2012-13, 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)	20.00
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	80.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2012-13 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)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
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 (<i>IDEA</i>) 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 ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; 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 has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	344,541	339,545	98.55
American Indian or Alaska Native	54,997	54,234	98.61
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,380	7,316	99.13
Asian	6,383	6,333	99.22
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	997	983	98.60
Black or African American	33,020	32,162	97.40
Hispanic or Latino	48,152	47,272	98.17
White	178,804	176,813	98.89
Two or more races	22,188	21,748	98.02
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	60,279	58,617	97.24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,024	20,530	97.65
Economically disadvantaged students	199,819	196,431	98.30
Migratory students	271	264	97.42
Male	176,453	173,683	98.43
Female	167,851	165,641	98.68

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to a disruption in testing caused by a server error on multiple days during Oklahoma's testing window, the Oklahoma State Board of Education made the decision to credit the students who tested on the days in question as participants, but not include them in the performance calculations if they did not achieve a proficient score. The data in the table reflect this policy decision and are consistent with what was reported in Oklahoma's state and local report cards. The numbers below reflect the number of students participating excluding the disrupted students who did not achieve a proficient score (percentages in parentheses):

All Students - 333,105 (96.70%)
 American Indian or Alaska Native - 53,194 (96.70%)
 Asian or Pacific Islander - 7,211 (97.70%)
 Asian - 6,247 (97.70%)
 Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander - 964 (96.70%)
 Black or African American - 31,208 (94.50%)
 Hispanic or Latino - 46,284 (96.10%)
 White - 173,928 (97.30%)
 Two or More Races - 21,280 (95.90%)
 Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) - 57,965 (96.20%)
 Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students - 20,186 (96.00%)
 Economically Disadvantaged students - 192,450 (96.30%)
 Migratory students - 261 (96.30%)
 Male - 170,493 (96.60%)
 Female - 162,401 (96.80%)

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	12,631	21.55
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	17,237	29.41
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	24,312	41.48
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,437	7.57
Total	58,617	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to a disruption in testing caused by a server error on multiple days during Oklahoma's testing window, the Oklahoma State Board of Education made the decision to credit the students who tested on the days in question as participants, but not include them in the performance calculations if they did not achieve a proficient score. The data in the table reflect this policy decision and are consistent with what was reported in Oklahoma's state and local report cards. The numbers below reflect the number of students participating excluding the disrupted students who did not achieve a proficient score (percentages in parentheses):

Regular Assessment without Accommodations - 12,357 (21.30%)
 Regular Assessment with Accommodations - 16,859 (29.10%)
 Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards - 24,312 (41.90%)
 Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards - 4,437 (7.70%)
 Total - 57,965

Also, Oklahoma did not report medical emergencies in the questioned categories because Oklahoma only had 2 medical emergencies, and they were in Grade 8 and 11.

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	339,615	334,412	98.47
American Indian or Alaska Native	54,130	53,327	98.52
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,342	7,248	98.72
Asian	6,346	6,264	98.71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	996	984	98.80
Black or African American	32,359	31,527	97.43
Hispanic or Latino	47,201	46,181	97.84
White	176,652	174,605	98.84
Two or more races	21,931	21,524	98.14
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	59,360	57,745	97.28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,589	19,047	97.23
Economically disadvantaged students	196,209	192,807	98.27
Migratory students	273	262	95.97
Male	173,685	170,819	98.35
Female	165,724	163,422	98.61

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to a disruption in testing caused by a server error on multiple days during Oklahoma's testing window, the Oklahoma State Board of Education made the decision to credit the students who tested on the days in question as participants, but not include them in the performance calculations if they did not achieve a proficient score. The data in the table reflect this policy decision and are consistent with what was reported in Oklahoma's state and local report cards. The numbers below reflect the number of students participating excluding the disrupted students who did not achieve a proficient score (percentages in parentheses):

- All Students - 330,353 (97.30%)
- American Indian or Alaska Native - 52,855 (97.60%)
- Asian or Pacific Islander - 7,108 (96.80%)
- Asian - 6,177 (97.30%)
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander - 931 (93.50%)
- Black or African American - 30,938 (95.60%)
- Hispanic or Latino - 45,535 (96.50%)
- White - 172,827 (97.80%)
- Two or More Races - 21,090 (96.20%)
- Children with Disabilities (IDEA) - 57,151 (96.30%)
- Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students - 18,760 (95.80%)
- Economically Disadvantaged students - 190,403 (97.00%)
- Migratory students - 250 (91.60%)
- Male - 168,642 (97.10%)
- Female - 161,546 (97.50%)

Also, the section 1.2.3.1 (below) is blank because the count is zero.

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13,370	23.15
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,688	25.44
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	25,364	43.92
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,323	7.49
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	57,745	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to a disruption in testing caused by a server error on multiple days during Oklahoma's testing window, the Oklahoma State Board of Education made the decision to credit the students who tested on the days in question as participants, but not include them in the performance calculations if they did not achieve a proficient score. The data in the table reflect this policy decision and are consistent with what was reported in Oklahoma's state and local report cards. The numbers below reflect the number of students participating excluding the disrupted students who did not achieve a proficient score (percentages in parentheses):

Regular Assessment without Accommodations - 13,137 (23.00%)
 Regular Assessment with Accommodations - 14,327 (25.10%)
 Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards - 25,364 (44.40%)
 Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards - 4,323 (7.60%)
 Total - 57,151

Also, Oklahoma did not report medical emergencies in the questioned categories because Oklahoma only had 2 medical emergencies and they were in Grade 8 and 11.

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	143,091	140,537	98.22
American Indian or Alaska Native	23,246	22,872	98.39
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,243	3,201	98.70
Asian	2,736	2,701	98.72
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	507	500	98.62
Black or African American	14,081	13,562	96.31
Hispanic or Latino	19,106	18,556	97.12
White	75,104	74,196	98.79
Two or more races	8,311	8,150	98.06
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,810	23,280	97.77
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,036	6,765	96.15
Economically disadvantaged students	79,544	77,846	97.87
Migratory students	95	90	94.74
Male	72,651	71,330	98.18
Female	70,336	69,114	98.26

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to a disruption in testing caused by a server error on multiple days during Oklahoma's testing window, the Oklahoma State Board of Education made the decision to credit the students who tested on the days in question as participants, but not include them in the performance calculations if they did not achieve a proficient score. The data in the table reflect this policy decision and are consistent with what was reported in Oklahoma's state and local report cards. The numbers below reflect the number of students participating excluding the disrupted students who did not achieve a proficient score (percentages in parentheses):

All Students - 137,023 (95.80%)
 American Indian or Alaska Native - 22,314 (96.00%)
 Asian or Pacific Islander - 3,104 (95.70%)
 Asian - 2,647 (96.70%)
 Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander - 457 (90.10%)
 Black or African American - 12,999 (92.30%)
 Hispanic or Latino - 18,055 (94.50%)
 White - 72,621 (96.70%)
 Two or More Races - 7,930 (95.40%)
 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) - 23,073 (96.90%)
 Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students - 6,626 (94.20%)
 Economically Disadvantaged students - 75,734 (95.20%)
 Migratory students - 84 (88.40%)
 Male - 69,686 (95.90%)
 Female - 67,244 (95.60%)

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	4,777	20.52
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,632	32.78
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	9,185	39.45
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,686	7.24
Total	23,280	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to a disruption in testing caused by a server error on multiple days during Oklahoma's testing window, the Oklahoma State Board of Education made the decision to credit the students who tested on the days in question as participants, but not include them in the performance calculations if they did not achieve a proficient score. The data in the table reflect this policy decision and are consistent with what was reported in Oklahoma's state and local report cards. The numbers below reflect the number of students participating excluding the disrupted students who did not achieve a proficient score (percentages in parentheses):

Regular Assessment without Accommodations - 4,732 (20.50%)
 Regular Assessment with Accommodations - 7,470 (32.40%)
 Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards - 9,185 (39.80%)
 Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards - 1,686 (7.30%)
 Total - 23,073

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; 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 has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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 academic achievement 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 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 State's 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 unless a state chooses to include these students. 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 State's science assessment administered at least one 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.

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	49,309	33,748	68.44
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,453	5,056	67.84
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,093	844	77.22
Asian	963	778	80.79
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	130	66	50.77
Black or African American	4,570	2,185	47.81
Hispanic or Latino	7,733	4,434	57.34
White	25,204	18,954	75.20
Two or more races	3,256	2,275	69.87
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,771	4,531	51.66
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,151	2,533	49.17
Economically disadvantaged students	30,392	18,421	60.61
Migratory students	44	30	68.18
Male	25,355	17,657	69.64
Female	23,907	16,065	67.20
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.			

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	49,230	34,036	69.14
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,455	5,052	67.77
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,070	821	76.73
Asian	942	748	79.41
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	128	73	57.03
Black or African American	4,570	2,416	52.87
Hispanic or Latino	7,667	4,297	56.05
White	25,208	19,140	75.93
Two or more races	3,260	2,310	70.86
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,767	3,817	43.54
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,021	2,222	44.25
Economically disadvantaged students	30,349	18,552	61.13
Migratory students	43	22	51.16
Male	25,306	16,622	65.68
Female	23,889	17,400	72.84
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.			

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. Oklahoma does not give a science test in the 3rd grade.			

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	48,972	35,005	71.48
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,488	5,239	69.97
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,026	857	83.53
Asian	880	761	86.48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	146	96	65.75
Black or African American	4,562	2,436	53.40
Hispanic or Latino	7,395	4,614	62.39
White	25,393	19,629	77.30
Two or more races	3,108	2,230	71.75
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,039	4,782	52.90
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,526	1,757	49.83
Economically disadvantaged students	29,980	19,251	64.21
Migratory students	43	27	62.79
Male	25,035	17,966	71.76
Female	23,894	17,008	71.18

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.

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	48,865	32,632	66.78
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,484	4,803	64.18
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,011	754	74.58
Asian	868	667	76.84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	143	87	60.84
Black or African American	4,557	2,299	50.45
Hispanic or Latino	7,339	4,039	55.03
White	25,389	18,634	73.39
Two or more races	3,085	2,103	68.17
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,010	4,028	44.71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,361	1,236	36.77
Economically disadvantaged students	29,881	17,426	58.32
Migratory students	42	17	40.48
Male	24,961	15,838	63.45
Female	23,870	16,774	70.27

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.

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. Oklahoma does not give a science test in the 4th grade.			

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	48,358	32,783	67.79
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,750	4,926	63.56
Asian or Pacific Islander	998	799	80.06
Asian	881	735	83.43
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	117	64	54.70
Black or African American	4,610	2,346	50.89
Hispanic or Latino	7,103	4,246	59.78
White	24,858	18,397	74.01
Two or more races	3,039	2,069	68.08
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,094	4,039	44.41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,121	1,294	41.46
Economically disadvantaged students	29,493	17,723	60.09
Migratory students	19	14	73.68
Male	24,628	16,619	67.48
Female	23,695	16,144	68.13
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.			

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	48,287	31,804	65.86
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,746	4,856	62.69
Asian or Pacific Islander	981	723	73.70
Asian	866	661	76.33
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	115	62	53.91
Black or African American	4,612	2,212	47.96
Hispanic or Latino	7,060	3,675	52.05
White	24,847	18,298	73.64
Two or more races	3,041	2,040	67.08
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,094	3,525	38.76
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,986	831	27.83
Economically disadvantaged students	29,427	16,744	56.90
Migratory students	18	10	55.56
Male	24,580	15,315	62.31
Female	23,676	16,474	69.58
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.			

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	48,303	25,519	52.83
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,743	3,911	50.51
Asian or Pacific Islander	996	611	61.35
<i>Asian</i>	880	565	64.20
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	116	46	39.66
Black or African American	4,607	1,449	31.45
Hispanic or Latino	7,099	2,745	38.67
White	24,826	15,189	61.18
Two or more races	3,032	1,614	53.23
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,072	4,261	46.97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,066	783	25.54
Economically disadvantaged students	29,467	12,957	43.97
Migratory students	19	6	31.58
Male	24,581	13,586	55.27
Female	23,687	11,918	50.31

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data. Standards for Science increased in rigor for the current year data causing scores to decrease.

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	47,622	33,288	69.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,741	5,180	66.92
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,036	860	83.01
<i>Asian</i>	917	788	85.93
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	119	72	60.50
Black or African American	4,343	2,218	51.07
Hispanic or Latino	6,588	4,040	61.32
White	24,774	18,840	76.05
Two or more races	3,140	2,150	68.47
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,337	3,703	44.42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,342	1,003	42.83
Economically disadvantaged students	27,779	17,101	61.56
Migratory students	33	23	69.70
Male	24,504	17,216	70.26
Female	23,103	16,068	69.55
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.			

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	47,564	30,469	64.06
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,738	4,720	61.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,011	753	74.48
<i>Asian</i>	891	687	77.10
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	120	66	55.00
Black or African American	4,382	2,099	47.90
Hispanic or Latino	6,514	3,307	50.77
White	24,739	17,581	71.07
Two or more races	3,180	2,009	63.18
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,322	3,056	36.72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,212	575	25.99
Economically disadvantaged students	27,810	15,127	54.39
Migratory students	32	16	50.00
Male	24,426	14,916	61.07
Female	23,121	15,543	67.22
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.			

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			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma does not give a science test in the 6th grade.			

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	48,619	32,309	66.45
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,919	5,066	63.97
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,090	929	85.23
Asian	980	867	88.47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	110	62	56.36
Black or African American	4,512	2,119	46.96
Hispanic or Latino	6,363	3,597	56.53
White	25,605	18,614	72.70
Two or more races	3,130	1,984	63.39
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,140	2,746	33.73
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,261	809	35.78
Economically disadvantaged students	27,319	15,547	56.91
Migratory students	49	23	46.94
Male	24,955	16,365	65.58
Female	23,646	15,938	67.40

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In grade 7 and 8, students in Oklahoma have the opportunity to take the Algebra I EOI. There are no additional English opportunities for these students. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.

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	47,639	32,829	68.91
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,914	5,350	67.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	937	735	78.44
Asian	833	665	79.83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	104	70	67.31
Black or African American	4,514	2,336	51.75
Hispanic or Latino	6,249	3,529	56.47
White	24,950	18,806	75.37
Two or more races	3,075	2,073	67.41
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,122	3,171	39.04
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,170	622	28.66
Economically disadvantaged students	27,266	16,496	60.50
Migratory students	47	24	51.06
Male	24,419	15,856	64.93
Female	23,200	16,962	73.11

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.

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. Oklahoma does not give a science test in the 7th grade.			

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	54,627	38,188	69.91
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,652	5,639	65.18
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,320	1,149	87.05
Asian	1,172	1,057	90.19
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	148	92	62.16
Black or African American	4,908	2,691	54.83
Hispanic or Latino	6,541	3,874	59.23
White	29,593	22,308	75.38
Two or more races	3,613	2,527	69.94
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,603	2,971	39.08
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,170	770	35.48
Economically disadvantaged students	27,829	16,470	59.18
Migratory students	36	18	50.00
Male	27,599	19,007	68.87
Female	26,999	19,167	70.99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In grade 7 and 8, students in Oklahoma have the opportunity to take the Algebra I EOI. There are no additional English or science opportunities for these students. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.

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	46,635	34,798	74.62
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,717	5,606	72.64
Asian or Pacific Islander	946	774	81.82
Asian	830	698	84.10
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	116	76	65.52
Black or African American	4,414	2,572	58.27
Hispanic or Latino	5,857	3,700	63.17
White	24,806	19,951	80.43
Two or more races	2,895	2,195	75.82
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,481	3,354	44.83
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,020	719	35.59
Economically disadvantaged students	25,601	16,893	65.99
Migratory students	31	16	51.61
Male	23,793	16,899	71.03
Female	22,824	17,890	78.38

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.

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	47,522	26,112	54.95
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,830	4,061	51.86
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,004	684	68.13
<i>Asian</i>	873	625	71.59
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	131	59	45.04
Black or African American	4,528	1,574	34.76
Hispanic or Latino	6,070	2,437	40.15
White	25,331	15,834	62.51
Two or more races	2,759	1,522	55.16
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,647	3,619	47.33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,248	505	22.46
Economically disadvantaged students	26,112	11,701	44.81
Migratory students	36	9	25.00
Male	24,232	13,780	56.87
Female	23,245	12,310	52.96

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data. Standards for Science increased in rigor for the current year data causing scores to decrease.

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	35,598	26,953	75.71
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,191	4,598	74.27
Asian or Pacific Islander	648	554	85.49
<i>Asian</i>	454	414	91.19
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	194	140	72.16
Black or African American	3,703	2,342	63.25
Hispanic or Latino	4,561	3,313	72.64
White	18,501	14,642	79.14
Two or more races	1,994	1,504	75.43
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,981	3,724	53.34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,615	1,009	62.48
Economically disadvantaged students	19,658	13,969	71.06
Migratory students	37	19	51.35
Male	18,417	13,532	73.48
Female	17,157	13,411	78.17

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to the opportunities in 7th and 8th grade, there are fewer students at the high school level that attempt Algebra I. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.

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	42,133	35,484	84.22
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,801	5,544	81.52
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,152	1,007	87.41
<i>Asian</i>	947	828	87.43
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	205	179	87.32
Black or African American	3,889	2,868	73.75
Hispanic or Latino	4,849	3,726	76.84
White	22,888	20,129	87.95
Two or more races	2,554	2,210	86.53
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,355	3,331	52.42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	990	422	42.63
Economically disadvantaged students	20,069	15,592	77.69
Migratory students	37	27	72.97
Male	21,157	17,030	80.49
Female	20,966	18,451	88.00

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to the opportunities in 7th and 8th grade, there are fewer students at the high school level that attempt Algebra I. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data.

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	41,191	22,181	53.85
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,740	3,387	50.25
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,103	762	69.08
Asian	893	626	70.10
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	210	136	64.76
Black or African American	3,864	1,312	33.95
Hispanic or Latino	4,886	1,872	38.31
White	22,460	13,699	60.99
Two or more races	2,138	1,149	53.74
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,354	3,017	47.48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,312	245	18.67
Economically disadvantaged students	20,155	8,673	43.03
Migratory students	29	14	48.28
Male	20,871	11,902	57.03
Female	20,307	10,274	50.59

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were a total of 842 students who did not submit their gender along with their assessment data. Standards for Biology I increased in rigor for the current year data causing scores to decrease.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
Schools			
Districts			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma has a waiver and no longer calculates AYP.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator³ based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
Schools	1,696	160	9.43
Districts	525	19	3.62

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

³ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2012-13. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma has a waiver and no longer calculates AYP.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator⁴ based on data for SY 2012-13. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools	1,181	92	7.79
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,055	78	7.39
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	126	14	11.11

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

⁴ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma has a waiver and no longer calculates AYP.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator⁵ based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator
519	19	3.66

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

⁵ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2012-13
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma's approved Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility request does not identify Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. Instead, it identifies Priority, Targeted Intervention, and Focus Schools.	

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma's approved Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility request does not identify Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. Instead, it identifies Priority, Targeted Intervention, and Focus Schools.	

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.

The measures being taken to address the achievement problems of sites identified as Priority Schools includes all of the following.

Priority Schools are required to submit the following reports:

- a. A site plan for improvement aligned to Oklahoma Nine Essential Elements Performance Indicators and Rubrics
- b. Baseline School Improvement Status Report (SISR)
- c. Quarterly SISR
- d. English Language Learner Plan to the Title III Office
- e. Annual SMART Goals for student performance on state assessments.

The technical assistance provided by the state for Priority Schools includes:

- a. Monthly site visits by School Support Team Leaders or School Support Specialists
- b. Quarterly reviews of SISRs with feedback and updates
- c. Quarterly reviews of benchmark data, progress made toward SMART goals, and development of Action Plans
- d. Technical assistance from the Title III and Special Education Offices to support efforts to improve student learning and achievement.

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 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 2012-13
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2011-12 and beginning of SY 2012-13 as a corrective action)	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma's approved Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility request does not identify Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. Instead, it identifies Priority, Targeted Intervention, and Focus Schools.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2012-13 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. AYP is not applicable in the state of Oklahoma. Oklahoma has an approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete	

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 2012 (SY 2012-13) 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 C SPR Crosswalk. The C SPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the C SPR, 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 C SPR 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) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2012-13.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

School Support Team (SST) Leaders, retired, highly qualified successful educators, were added to serve the School Improvement Grant (SIG) schools. The SST leaders visited the schools multiple times during the school year but at least quarterly in addition to the three yearly team visits.

SST leaders were directly involved in facilitating school improvement processes in identified schools. In collaborations with State, school and district staff, parents and community members, SST leaders facilitated an educational needs assessment of each school based on Oklahoma's Nine Essential Elements Performance Indicators and provided guidance for the development and implementation of a comprehensive school improvement plan to build on the school's strengths and address the identified needs.

Educational Leadership Coaching: School Support Team Leaders who work directly with SIG schools currently serve as Educational Leadership Coaches. The leaders are trained in leadership strategies and coaching by Dr. Karla Reiss, author of *Leadership Coaching for Educators*. The Educational Leadership Coaches read SIG applications and SIG School Improvement Plans via the WISE Online Planning Tool. Therefore, they know what the action plans are and what implementation steps should be evident. During site visits the coaches monitor implementation of the plan and provide timely feedback. As an additional support, leaders provide coaching comments through the WISE Tool.

The Educational Leadership Coaches meet with individual principals more frequently than the scheduled team visits, and follow up after each School Support Team report. In addition, Educational Leadership Coaches visit the schools at least once a month to work specifically with the principal to develop his or her leadership capacity. The coaches provide additional support, attend and facilitate Professional Learning Community meetings, and complete classroom observations.

Mid-year and end-of-the-year surveys are completed by the Educational Leadership Coaches as another tool to gather feedback to make necessary changes as The Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) continues to improve its support and service to schools.

Oklahoma Data Review (ODR) Model: OSDE is currently using a portion of SIG reserve funds to provide on-site data analysis to SIG schools. Data Facilitators formally monitor progress at least three times a year at each SIG school. The purpose of the Data Review is to analyze school benchmark assessment data at the student level in reading, mathematics, and other content areas as requested and determine how performance relates to the state standards. Other data to be reviewed may include student behavior and professional activities. The purpose of the ODR is to develop timely action steps to be implemented at the district, school, and classroom level to improve teaching and learning. The goal is for the school leadership team to ensure that individual teachers have a focused summary of the Data Review in order to monitor progress of students, subgroups, and class groups.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2012-13 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Activities in the state that were supported with funds other than 1003(a) and 1003(g) are listed as follows:

- Non-Title I schools in improvement were supported by a School Support Specialist, School Support Team Leaders, and other SEA personnel as needed.
- Title I and Non-Title I schools in improvement were supported through regional curriculum conferences.
- Special Education training on co-teaching and other special education initiatives.
- REACH Network
- STEM (Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics)
- Math/Science Partnerships
- Reading Sufficiency Act

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Number applied to transfer and Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions is information that is not collected in School Improvement or Title I. Priority Schools are required to set aside up to 20% of their Title I, Part A allocation for the implementation of interventions and school choice. Oklahoma does not collect information on the percent or the amount of the set aside spent explicitly on transportation for public school choice.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma does not collect data on how many LEAs are unable to provide Public School Choice.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma does not offer Supplemental Educational Services.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma does not offer Supplemental Educational Services.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	140,967	140,896	99.95	71	0.05
All elementary classes	56,601	56,585	99.97	16	0.03
All secondary classes	84,366	84,311	99.93	55	0.07

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Both. Some districts are self-contained and some use a departmentalized approach.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes	
Elementary School Classes	Percentage
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	40.00
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	23.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	28.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	9.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Out-of-State certified teachers. No equivalent test data received.

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes	
Secondary School Classes	Percentage
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	0.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	71.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	29.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	15,033	15,023	99.93
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	14,751	14,751	100.00
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	13,295	13,289	99.95
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	34,104	34,074	99.91

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	82.50	54.40
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Percent	
Secondary schools	72.80	46.00
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Percent	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Dual language	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Cherokee
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish, Cherokee
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Heritage language	Spanish, Cherokee
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	43,657
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 unduplicated number 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.	39,435
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	37,018
Cherokee	1,005
Vietnamese	962
Hmong	554
Chinese	467

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	42,830
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	238
Total	43,068
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	8,082
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	18.87
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing		#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		39,036
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		224
Total		39,260
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 and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ 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 and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.		2,565

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:

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

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

Title III Results	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	17,043	46.73	23,341	64.00
Attained proficiency	7,220	18.50	8,588	22.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	_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)
Not Applicable
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)
Not Applicable
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)
Not Applicable
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 unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (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
10,405	8,547	18,952

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

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,020	5,145	73.29	1,875

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.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. 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
9,432	6,394	67.79	3,038
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.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. 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
2,500	1,022	40.88	1,478
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.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

Title III Subgrantees	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	94
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	4
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	43
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	35
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	8
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	45
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2011-12 and 2012-13)	18
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2012-13 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	18
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13)	5

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Each member of the consortia is counted as one in the total number of subgrantees. Data for consortia are aggregated at the consortium level and reported at the consortium level. Each consortium member must implement Title III improvement at the district level and will be monitored at the district level as well.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: 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 unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
3,883	2,663	9

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.	532
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	384

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee 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.)
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	62
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	48
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	50
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	40
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	51
Other (Explain in comment box)	15

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	70	15,802
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	48	1,717
PD provided to principals	65	670
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	53	290
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	52	1,719
PD provided to community based organization personnel	10	208
Total	//////	20,406

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

District-level professional development concentrated on the following topics: parent outreach, refugee students, modifications, interventions, technology for English language learners, and the Common Core. School districts also focused on differentiated instruction, the cultural and social needs of English language learners, and understanding WIDA scores and descriptors.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2012-13 funds July 1, 2012, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2012, for SY 2012-13 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/12/12	10/01/12	82
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.

In August 2011, the OSDE formed a partnership with MTW solutions to design a Grants Management System (GMS) to more efficiently serve LEAs in the allocations upload, grants application, and claims approval process. This two-year partnership has involved designing new applications and allocations upload process for Title III, Part A - LEP and Title III, Part A - Immigrant Children and Youth. The GMS provides assistance in both the allocation and reallocation process. The process for allocation and reallocating funds will involve sending a spreadsheet of allocation and reallocation amounts for each LEA to the programmer who will then enter those amounts into the system. The system then informs the district contact or contacts that monies have been awarded. We anticipate that the process of application review and approval will be completed in half the time. The Office of Titles I, II, III, VI, and X is working to shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to its subgrantees by centralizing all allocations through one employee, who works as a liaison between the OSDE and the GMS. This employee assists in reviewing Grant Award Notifications (GANs), performing allocations, uploading allocation notices, and distributing reallocations for all federal grants listed above. This employee works to streamline federal fiscal processes for the purpose of providing more effective services to subgrantees.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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 will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	514	514
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	524	524
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not all districts have reported or participated in the Homeless Census Report.		

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)	1,006	415
K	1,533	874
1	1,424	791
2	1,204	747
3	1,099	670
4	1,099	660
5	1,007	608
6	997	588
7	940	597
8	920	550
9	960	530
10	771	377
11	766	371
12	794	377
Ungraded	2	129
Total	14,522	8,284

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. LEAs Without Subgrants-The student count in Section 1.9.1.1 is 14,522 and 14,595 in Section 1.9.1.2 which results in a difference of 73 children. 46 of those 73 children are in the birth through two category, the remaining 27 children are in the out of school category. The two totals do not match because the USDE's data collection system does not include a place to count the 46 children in birth through two category and 27 children in the out of school category. LEA's with Subgrants-The student count in Section 1.9.1.1 is 8,284 and 8,339 in Section 1.9.1.2 which results in a different of 55 children. 43 of those 55 children are in the birth through two category, and the remaining 13 children are in the out of school category. The two totals do not match because the USDE's data collection system does not include a place to count the 43 children from birth to two category and 13 children from out of school category. Also, there is one district with a discrepancy in the unaccompanied youth count of 1 student.

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, awaiting foster care	1,203	1,645
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	11,913	5,952
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	1,052	485
Hotels/Motels	427	257
Total	14,595	8,339

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

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	722	1,095
Migratory children/youth	291	22
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,180	1,753
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	935	748

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 Homeless Children and Youth 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	43
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	415
K	874
1	791
2	747
3	670
4	660
5	608
6	588
7	597
8	550
9	530
10	377
11	371
12	377
Ungraded	129
Total	8,327

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,095
Migratory children/youth	22
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,680
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	714

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 of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for ESEA.

Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,059	623	473	255
4	1,010	559	452	228
5	948	533	387	195
6	667	349	360	158
7	613	301	378	180
8	642	358	328	176
High School	310	245	140	103

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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,056	665	480	262
4	1,014	679	450	245
5	960	593	390	212
6	654	386	364	191
7	614	284	366	155
8	671	345	356	179
High School	301	210	151	94

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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3				
4				
5	952	401	388	130
6				
7				
8	867	350	379	137
High School	361	146	152	52

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Oklahoma, science is not tested in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.