

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 2011-12**

OKLAHOMA



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

**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) 2011-12 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Oklahoma State Department of Education		
Address: 2500 North Lincoln Blvd Oklahoma City, OK 73105		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Kerri White		
Telephone: 405-522-8618		
Fax: 405-522-0496		
e-mail: kerri.white@sde.ok.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Kerri K. White		
		<u>Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 1:36:17 PM</u>
_____ Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**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.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	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 GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	PreK-2013-14; K-8 2014-15	Not Applicable	2013

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

<p>Mathematics: Only prekindergarten standards will be rewritten to align with Common Core Standards (2013-2014). Common Core Standards will be fully adopted in 2014-2015. The 2010-2011 CSPR report indicates that Oklahoma has adopted the Common Core State Standards and will have them fully implemented in 2014-2015. This is unchanged from the details provided in that report.</p> <p>Reading/Language Arts: Common Core Standards will be fully adopted in 2014-2015. The 2010-2011 CSPR report indicates that Oklahoma has adopted the Common Core State Standards and will have them fully implemented in 2014-2015. This is unchanged from the details provided in that report.</p> <p>Science standards for Oklahoma will go under revision 2013 (Spring).</p>

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.

	No revisions or changes to academic content 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 GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

State has revised or changed

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	2011-12
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	2011-12
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	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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: PARCC (Common Core) Assessments will begin in the 2014-2015 school year. No changes have occurred since the 2010-2011 CSPR report was submitted.

Reading/Language Arts: PARCC (Common Core) Assessments will begin in the 2014-2015 school year. No changes have occurred since the 2010-2011 CSPR report was submitted.

Science: The Science assessments in 2012-2013 are modified because they align to the revised PASS Standards adopted in 2011.

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.

<u>State has revised or changed</u>	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 GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.		
Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.			
Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2010-11	2008-09	2012-13
Regular Assessments in High School	2006-07	2008-09	2012-13
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)	2010-11	2007	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12

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

OCCT Science/Biology I
 A standard setting is scheduled for July 2013 because of DOK changes to grade 8 and changes to the content standards in grades 5 and 8. The state will resubmit evidence for Peer Review. A standard setting is scheduled for June 2013 due to changes in content standards and DOK percentages. The state will resubmit evidence for Peer Review.

OMAAP Science
 Due to changes in content standards, a standard setting is scheduled for June 2013 for Biology I and July 2013 for grades 5 and 8 Science. The state will resubmit evidence for Peer Review.

OAAP Math/Reading/Science
 Oklahoma submitted their State Performance Plan for the Oklahoma Alternate Assessment Program (OAAP) assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities for Peer Review in March 2012. Assessments for Science in grades 5 and 8 and End-of-Instruction Biology I had new academic achievement standards reset in June 2012, and new performance levels were adopted by the State Bd. of Educ.

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 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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)	<u>Yes</u>
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)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>Yes</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
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.

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	332,548	325,232	97.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	54,975	53,852	97.96
Asian	6,343	6,254	98.60
Black or African American	32,782	31,611	96.43
Hispanic or Latino	45,274	44,255	97.75
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	863	832	96.41
White	176,008	172,466	97.99
Two or more races	16,303	15,962	97.91
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	55,290	53,379	96.54
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	18,824	18,402	97.76
Economically disadvantaged students	186,199	181,645	97.55
Migratory students	361	352	97.51
Male	170,321	166,223	97.59
Female	162,227	159,009	98.02

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11,582	21.70
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	11,387	21.33
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	26,089	48.88
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,321	8.09
Total	53,379	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	326,210	319,067	97.81
American Indian or Alaska Native	53,737	52,673	98.02
Asian	6,220	6,108	98.20
Black or African American	31,452	30,307	96.36
Hispanic or Latino	44,060	42,933	97.44
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	814	789	96.93
White	173,869	170,542	98.09
Two or more races	16,058	15,715	97.86
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	54,836	52,974	96.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,036	17,585	97.50
Economically disadvantaged students	181,969	177,527	97.56
Migratory students	356	344	96.63
Male	167,990	163,881	97.55
Female	158,220	155,186	98.08

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

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 and 1.3.2.1 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 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 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	11,717	22.12
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9,370	17.69
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	27,648	52.19
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,239	8.00
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	52,974	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	145,626	140,885	96.74
American Indian or Alaska Native	23,887	23,218	97.20
Asian	2,941	2,869	97.55
Black or African American	15,194	14,269	93.91
Hispanic or Latino	19,106	18,366	96.13
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	367	352	95.91
White	77,290	75,181	97.27
Two or more races	6,841	6,630	96.92
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	24,096	23,008	95.48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,640	6,318	95.15
Economically disadvantaged students	77,337	74,282	96.05
Migratory students	152	149	98.03
Male	74,608	72,099	96.64
Female	71,018	68,786	96.86

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

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4,855	21.10
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,315	23.10
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	11,048	48.02
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,790	7.78
Total	23,008	

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

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.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

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	46,428	32,013	68.95
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,305	5,006	68.53
Asian	856	686	80.14
Black or African American	4,204	2,149	51.12
Hispanic or Latino	6,923	4,026	58.15
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	131	79	60.31
White	24,541	18,332	74.70
Two or more races	2,468	1,735	70.30
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,744	4,038	52.14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,374	2,251	51.46
Economically disadvantaged students	27,634	17,097	61.87
Migratory students	44	25	56.82
Male	23,730	16,496	69.52
Female	22,698	15,517	68.36
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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	46,367	32,016	69.05
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,304	5,028	68.84
Asian	830	631	76.02
Black or African American	4,207	2,254	53.58
Hispanic or Latino	6,879	3,860	56.11
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	130	75	57.69
White	24,552	18,443	75.12
Two or more races	2,465	1,725	69.98
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,825	3,202	40.92
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,318	1,956	45.30
Economically disadvantaged students	27,534	16,997	61.73
Migratory students	41	18	43.90
Male	23,693	15,473	65.31
Female	22,674	16,543	72.96
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
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 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	45,615	32,533	71.32
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,427	5,106	68.75
Asian	846	727	85.93
Black or African American	4,226	2,250	53.24
Hispanic or Latino	6,587	4,114	62.46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	106	73	68.87
White	24,004	18,497	77.06
Two or more races	2,419	1,766	73.01
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,084	4,119	50.95
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,182	1,591	50.00
Economically disadvantaged students	27,134	17,571	64.76
Migratory students	38	18	47.37
Male	23,240	16,622	71.52
Female	22,375	15,911	71.11
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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	45,547	28,177	61.86
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,431	4,354	58.59
Asian	826	624	75.54
Black or African American	4,214	1,868	44.33
Hispanic or Latino	6,556	3,099	47.27
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	105	59	56.19
White	23,993	16,612	69.24
Two or more races	2,422	1,561	64.45
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,103	3,360	41.47
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,130	977	31.21
Economically disadvantaged students	27,079	14,453	53.37
Migratory students	38	15	39.47
Male	23,210	13,919	59.97
Female	22,337	14,258	63.83
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
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 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	45,498	30,841	67.79
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,561	4,786	63.30
Asian	892	752	84.30
Black or African American	4,095	2,055	50.18
Hispanic or Latino	6,289	3,757	59.74
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	111	69	62.16
White	24,106	17,794	73.82
Two or more races	2,444	1,628	66.61
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,002	3,338	41.71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,460	1,066	43.33
Economically disadvantaged students	26,508	15,875	59.89
Migratory students	43	24	55.81
Male	23,364	15,865	67.90
Female	22,134	14,976	67.66
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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	45,463	29,615	65.14
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,568	4,644	61.36
Asian	872	660	75.69
Black or African American	4,101	1,960	47.79
Hispanic or Latino	6,254	3,228	51.61
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	108	69	63.89
White	24,121	17,468	72.42
Two or more races	2,439	1,586	65.03
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,985	3,093	38.74
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,406	676	28.10
Economically disadvantaged students	26,470	14,837	56.05
Migratory students	41	15	36.59
Male	23,360	14,752	63.15
Female	22,103	14,863	67.24
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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	45,422	40,057	88.19
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,561	6,603	87.33
Asian	892	807	90.47
Black or African American	4,059	2,966	73.07
Hispanic or Latino	6,290	5,142	81.75
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	111	86	77.48
White	24,082	22,295	92.58
Two or more races	2,427	2,158	88.92
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,957	6,167	77.50
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,451	1,642	66.99
Economically disadvantaged students	26,407	22,200	84.07
Migratory students	43	32	74.42
Male	23,329	20,537	88.03
Female	22,093	19,520	88.35
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	45,487	31,311	68.84
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,661	5,051	65.93
Asian	848	723	85.26
Black or African American	4,274	2,205	51.59
Hispanic or Latino	6,051	3,611	59.68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	102	70	68.63
White	24,246	18,047	74.43
Two or more races	2,305	1,604	69.59
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,755	3,439	44.35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,098	877	41.80
Economically disadvantaged students	26,074	15,973	61.26
Migratory students	60	35	58.33
Male	23,279	16,095	69.14
Female	22,208	15,216	68.52
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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	45,440	30,079	66.19
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,660	4,840	63.19
Asian	832	653	78.49
Black or African American	4,269	2,160	50.60
Hispanic or Latino	6,024	3,274	54.35
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	102	64	62.75
White	24,251	17,573	72.46
Two or more races	2,302	1,515	65.81
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,746	2,833	36.57
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,060	626	30.39
Economically disadvantaged students	26,045	15,155	58.19
Migratory students	60	32	53.33
Male	23,264	14,653	62.99
Female	22,176	15,426	69.56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
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	45,620	30,554	66.98
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,624	4,809	63.08
Asian	951	844	88.75
Black or African American	4,274	2,146	50.21
Hispanic or Latino	5,763	3,210	55.70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	119	77	64.71
White	24,744	18,001	72.75
Two or more races	2,145	1,467	68.39
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,179	2,271	31.63
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,984	728	36.69
Economically disadvantaged students	24,918	14,408	57.82
Migratory students	67	36	53.73
Male	23,295	15,525	66.65
Female	22,325	15,029	67.32
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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	44,513	31,453	70.66
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,586	5,192	68.44
Asian	819	663	80.95
Black or African American	4,228	2,321	54.90
Hispanic or Latino	5,645	3,246	57.50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	112	63	56.25
White	24,030	18,446	76.76
Two or more races	2,093	1,522	72.72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,164	2,495	34.83
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,932	570	29.50
Economically disadvantaged students	24,652	15,280	61.98
Migratory students	67	38	56.72
Male	22,706	15,064	66.34
Female	21,807	16,389	75.15
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
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 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	51,960	36,854	70.93
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,403	5,613	66.80
Asian	1,165	1,067	91.59
Black or African American	4,829	2,755	57.05
Hispanic or Latino	6,125	3,625	59.18
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	118	74	62.71
White	28,805	21,945	76.18
Two or more races	2,515	1,775	70.58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,849	2,598	37.93
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,864	708	37.98
Economically disadvantaged students	25,868	15,657	60.53
Migratory students	59	27	45.76
Male	26,465	18,407	69.55
Female	25,495	18,447	72.36

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Eighth grade students enrolled in Algebra I take two assessments—the 8th grade Math and Algebra I. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.

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	43,792	33,116	75.62
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,361	5,520	74.99
Asian	809	671	82.94
Black or African American	4,243	2,528	59.58
Hispanic or Latino	5,378	3,351	62.31
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	101	59	58.42
White	23,754	19,341	81.42
Two or more races	2,146	1,646	76.70
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,742	2,753	40.83
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,772	613	34.59
Economically disadvantaged students	23,602	15,956	67.60
Migratory students	54	28	51.85
Male	22,559	16,319	72.34
Female	21,233	16,797	79.11

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Eighth grade students enrolled in Algebra I take two assessments—the 8th grade Math and Algebra I. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.

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	44,121	38,730	87.78
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,395	6,542	88.47
Asian	847	781	92.21
Black or African American	4,281	3,145	73.46
Hispanic or Latino	5,420	4,300	79.34
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	103	66	64.08
White	23,908	21,973	91.91
Two or more races	2,167	1,923	88.74
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,650	5,133	77.19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,789	1,091	60.98
Economically disadvantaged students	23,641	19,614	82.97
Migratory students	58	47	81.03
Male	22,704	19,869	87.51
Female	21,417	18,861	88.07

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Eighth grade students enrolled in Algebra I take two assessments- the 8th grade Math and Algebra I.

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	44,624	28,662	64.23
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,871	4,921	62.52
Asian	696	541	77.73
Black or African American	5,709	2,785	48.78
Hispanic or Latino	6,517	3,632	55.73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	145	58	40.00
White	22,020	15,589	70.79
Two or more races	1,666	1,136	68.19
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,766	3,409	43.90
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,440	1,055	43.24
Economically disadvantaged students	23,509	13,791	58.66
Migratory students	41	20	48.78
Male	22,850	14,218	62.22
Female	21,774	14,444	66.34
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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	47,945	36,189	75.48
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,763	5,724	73.73
Asian	1,120	818	73.04
Black or African American	5,045	3,044	60.34
Hispanic or Latino	6,197	3,793	61.21
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	131	79	60.31
White	25,841	21,291	82.39
Two or more races	1,848	1,440	77.92
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,409	3,418	46.13
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,967	559	28.42
Economically disadvantaged students	22,145	14,810	66.88
Migratory students	43	20	46.51
Male	25,089	18,194	72.52
Female	22,856	17,995	78.73
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SY 2011-12 CSPR will not reflect accurately the eligible Migrant population's participation and achievement in OK statewide assessments. The Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a plan to address the discrepancies between migrant students identified and migrant students assessed on statewide assessments. Data submitted by the MEP will be correct for the 2013 CSPR.			

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	51,342	35,471	69.09
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,262	5,579	67.53
Asian	1,130	825	73.01
Black or African American	5,929	2,860	48.24
Hispanic or Latino	6,656	3,367	50.59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	138	70	50.72
White	27,191	21,280	78.26
Two or more races	2,036	1,490	73.18
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,401	5,548	66.04
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,078	627	30.17
Economically disadvantaged students	24,234	14,489	59.79
Migratory students	48	18	37.50
Male	26,066	18,625	71.45
Female	25,276	16,846	66.65
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. More students took Biology I in 2011-2012 than those who took Algebra I in 2011-2012. Biology I and Algebra I are not grade-level dependent.			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,774		
Districts	575		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of districts listed above (575) is incorrect. SEA staff contacted ED Facts and the following was the response from ED Facts, Lindsay Wise (Contractor): Thank you for bringing this to our attention. ED is examining the agency types included in the calculation of 1.4.1.2.1 for states with approved ESEA Flexibility requests. A change will be made in the calculation logic (and any necessary documentation) between the Part I close (12/20) and the Part I re-open (in late February). ED recommends that OK include information in the 1.4.1.2.1 Comment box related to the 49 districts it coded as "Other education agency (8)" and "State agency providing elementary and/or secondary level instruction (5)" in its directory for the Part I certification. Please let us know if you have any further questions. Oklahoma has a waiver.			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	1,203		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,069		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	134		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma has a waiver.			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
521		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma has a waiver.		

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	3
Extension of the school year or school day	2
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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	6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There were no Districts in Corrective Action or Restructuring in FY2011-2012.

Technical Assistance Available to Districts in School Improvement:
What Works in Oklahoma Schools Conference held annually, since 2005, for Oklahoma schools needing improvement. Presentations are developed to support the areas of need for Oklahoma districts and schools in improvement and to ensure strategies. Presentations are developed to support the areas of need for Oklahoma districts and schools in improvement and to ensure scientifically based research and best practices are being presented to the schools.

Oklahoma Nine Essential Elements Performance Indicators and Rubrics:
The Oklahoma Nine Essential Elements guides districts and schools in making strategic decisions in the areas of

1. Academic learning and performance,
2. Professional Learning Environment,
3. Collaborative Leadership.

The Oklahoma Nine Essential Elements are subdivided into ninety indicators of effective practice that represent all aspects of school operations.

For districts with schools utilizing the Ways to Improve School Effectiveness online planning tool (WISE), the Elements are embedded in and aligned with the school improvement plan.

What Works in Oklahoma Schools Study:
Oklahoma contracted with the Marzano Research Laboratory (MLR) in the spring of 2010 to conduct a research based on the Oklahoma Nine Essential Elements Performance Indicators. The study included 33 schools in improvement and 28 schools that were not in improvement, but had similar demographics. The study was designated to : 1) validate the Oklahoma Nine Essential Elements Performance Indicators that are integral to the success of Oklahoma schools, 2) provide feedback on strengths and areas of need for a sample of Oklahoma schools, and 3) use the results to create a replicable system for all Oklahoma schools to better identify areas of strength and need. MRL surveyed administrators, teachers, parents, and students and later interviewed these groups as well as conducted classroom observations which in some cases were videoed.

Based on the results of the research, the following recommendations were made to support districts and schools alike:

- Administrators and teachers should seek agreement on the school's strengths and weaknesses regarding school performance.
- All teachers should set personal goals regarding instructional strategies.
- Students' perceptions of acceptance and order should be examined.
- Schools should find ways for staff to work together (e.g., professional learning communities).
- The What Works in Oklahoma Schools Toolkit can be used by Oklahoma district administrators, principals, and teachers to determine the best courses of action for their schools and classrooms. Included in the toolkit are the following:
 - Administrator Survey
 - Teacher Survey
 - Student Survey Grades 3-5
 - Student Survey Grades 6-8
 - Student Survey Grades 9-12
 - Principal Interview Questions
 - Planning Questions

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. AYP is not applicable in the state of Oklahoma. Oklahoma Has a waiver.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	N/A
---	-----

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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

For SY 2011-12 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2011-12.

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 leader 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.

SIG Principals' Academy: During the summer of 2012, a SIG Principals' Academy was conducted by the Leadership and Learning Center. Presentations were focused on best practices. During the spring of 2013, another SIG Principals' Academy will be offered and will allow principals to share challenges and successes and determine appropriate action steps.

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 2011-12 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 School Support Teams through the Curriculum Department.
- 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
- Adolescent Literacy Conference
- 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 school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	67,312
Applied to transfer	557
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	386
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 731,311

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.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	38

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.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	17,845
Applied for supplemental educational services	5,576
Received supplemental educational services	3,098
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 4,656,383
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

	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 NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	146,203	145,761	99.70	147	0.10
All elementary classes	59,476	59,329	99.75	147	0.25
All secondary classes	86,727	86,432	99.66	295	0.34

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.

Not Applicable.

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.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	48.00
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	43.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
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. Testing requirements pending approval.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	66.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	11.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	23.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Out of state certified teachers. Testing requirements pending approval.

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	17,558	17,461	99.45
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	14,676	14,659	99.88
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	13,707	13,631	99.45
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	35,143	35,064	99.78

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	79.80	51.40
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Percent	
Secondary schools	77.30	51.50
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
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Cherokee, Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Cherokee, Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>No</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>No</u>	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	41,405
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 who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	36,904
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	34,795
Cherokee	1,160
Vietnamese	1,016
Hmong	584
Chinese	393

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).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	40,091
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	256
Total	40,347
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In spring 2012, Oklahoma field tested the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs (English Language Learners) Test. The field test involved 21 school districts. Of the 21 school districts that administered the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs to their students in grades 1-12 who are classified as ELLs and have significant cognitive disabilities, 16 receive Title III-A funding and five do not. The total number of all LEP students taking the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Test in spring 2012 is 226.</p>	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	6,235
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	15.55
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.</p>	

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.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	36,515
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	199
Total	36,714

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In spring 2012, Oklahoma field tested the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Test. The field test involved 21 school districts. Of the 21 school districts that administered the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs to their students in grades 1-12 who are classified as ELLs and have significant cognitive disabilities, 16 receive Title III-A funding, and five do not. The total number of Title III LEP students taking the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs Test in spring 2012 is 27. If this number is subtracted from the total of all LEP students (226), the answer (199) will be the number of Title III LEP students not tested.

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).

	#
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.	2,181

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%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	16,973	49.43	21,410	62.00
Attained proficiency	5,699	15.61	6,976	19.00

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
3,701	3,445	7,146

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
6,246	4,567	73.12	1,679

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
7,098	4,914	69.23	2,184
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
2,187	1,723	78.78	464
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.)

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	93
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	29
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	28
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	56
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	33
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	33
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	20

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. If only the LEA were counted, the total number of subgrantees would be 56. 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. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
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.	0
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
3,897	1,314	12

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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,019
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	290

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.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	71	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	58	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	53	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	44	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	52	
Other (Explain in comment box)	18	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	80	15,585
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	59	2,334
PD provided to principals	71	734
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	59	352
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	59	2,265
PD provided to community based organization personnel	13	89
Total	341	21,359

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

District-level professional development concentrated on Professional Learning Communities, Differentiated Instruction, and assessment-based instructional strategies. School districts also focused on the needs of their staff by providing foreign language classes, needs assessments, monthly newsletters, and webinars. All district-level professional development was inclusive of topics and techniques applicable to teachers and administrators working with English language learners.

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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	10/11/11	73
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.

Beginning 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 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 will provide 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 will then inform 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.

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	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 youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	517	517
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	527	527
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	959	400
K	1,380	783
1	1,318	722
2	1,156	675
3	1,061	624
4	1,029	604
5	953	576
6	982	575
7	861	498
8	784	465
9	858	552
10	742	416
11	778	363
12	774	429
Ungraded	0	8
Total	13,635	7,690

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The student count in Section 1.9.1.1 is 7,690 and 7,695 in Section 1.9.1.2 which results in a difference of five children. The five children are in the birth through two category. The two totals do not match because the USDE's data collection system does not include a place to count the five children in birth through two category in Section 1.9.1.1.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	1,396	1,519
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	11,071	5,488
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	825	436
Hotels/Motels	343	252
Total	13,635	7,695

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The student count in Section 1.9.1.1 is 7,690 and 7,695 in Section 1.9.1.2 which results in a difference of five children. The five children are in the birth through two category. The two totals do not match because the USDE's data collection system does not include a place to count the five children in birth through two category in Section 1.9.1.1.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	400
K	783
1	722
2	675
3	624
4	604
5	576
6	575
7	498
8	465
9	552
10	416
11	363
12	429
Ungraded	8
Total	7,690

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.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	470
Migratory children/youth	58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,387
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	810

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 youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	869	539
4	799	417
5	763	409
6	776	374
7	664	372
8	569	336
High School	701	497

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	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	874	540
4	811	516
5	762	448
6	787	428
7	683	365
8	626	333
High School	682	422

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	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	764	616
6		
7		
8	569	425
High School	814	489

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oklahoma does not give a science test in grades 3, 4, 6, and 7.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	53
K	52
1	47
2	50
3	38
4	45
5	36
6	44
7	52
8	36
9	43
10	36
11	33
12	41
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	21
Total	627
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. pending	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 Child Count of Oklahoma decreased for the 2011-2012 school year. The decrease was the result of two migrant programs discontinuing due to students' eligibility ending and settling out. The numbers reported are accurate for the requested period and are generated via the MIS2000 system. A limited number of districts incorrectly identified mobile students as migrant students in the data system, causing it to appear that more migrant students took the tests than the number of eligible migrant students.

In the Statewide Student Information System (SSIS), school districts have the ability to flag students as "migrant." This demographic data then becomes a part of the students PreID label on his or her state content testing. Some districts have inadvertently flagged students who happen to be migratory as migrant. Oklahoma's Migrant Education Program has worked with the Office of Accountability and Assessments to clarify the definition of migrant via the Test Administrators' Manual. However, the actual number of eligible students are generated from MIS2000.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	8
1	10
2	11
3	12
4	12
5	7
6	8
7	7
8	7
9	4
10	4
11	4
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	98
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 Child Count of Oklahoma decreased for the 2011-2012 school year. The decrease was the result of two migrant programs discontinuing because of eligibility ending and settling out. These reported numbers are accurate for the requested period. A limited number of districts incorrectly identified mobile students as migrant students in the school system, causing it to appear that more migrant students took the tests than the number of eligible migrant students.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oklahoma used the MIS2000 system to compile and generate Category 1 and 2 child counts for this reporting period. The same system was used for the last reporting period.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Oklahoma Migrant Education Program uses the National Certificate of Eligibility. Student information (name, birthdate, gender, race, place of birth, parents' or guardians' names, migrant student ID number), eligibility information (QAD), residency date, termination date, withdrawal date, qualifying activity), school information enrollment date, withdrawal date, enrollment type (school year/summer) and attendance are required data from migrant districts. MEP/LEA staff (recruiters, teachers, aides, and record clerks) recruit migrant children through interviews with parents or legal guardians either face-to-face or home visits. MEP/LEA staff update existing National COEs through a validation process such as one-on-one interviews or home visits. Results of interviews are recorded on the National COEs. National COEs are completed upon identification of migrant families or children. Summer school project enrollment information is collected at the end of each project and during student record update procedures. All National COEs are entered into MIS2000 at the State level by a migrant specialist. National COEs are completed upon identification of migrant families or children. Summer school project enrollment information is collected at the end of each project and during student record update procedures. All National COEs are entered into MIS2000 at the State level by a migrant specialist.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oklahoma has maintained a database system through MIS2000. All migrant sites submit hard copies of National COEs and COE validation forms via United States Postal Service to the Oklahoma State Department of Education where data is verified to be accurate. Based on conversations during home visits, the National COEs are updated with eligibility information. Oklahoma has maintained a database system through MIS2000. All migrant sites submit hard copies of National COEs and COE validation forms via United States Postal Service to the Oklahoma State Department of Education where data is verified to be accurate. The MIS2000 system can generate a query that filters out any child who did not meet the following criteria during the child count period; between the ages of 3-21 and has not graduated from high school, was within 36 months of Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) and has had a 3rd birthday before the end date. A report is generated that gives a 12-month unduplicated count or list of students between the ages of 3-21, who are within 3 years of the QAD and who had a Residency QAD, Withdrawal Date, Enroll Date or Term Date during the date range of 9-1-10 to 8-31-11. In an attempt to avoid duplication of student records, a search of the local database is performed for each student identified. A search is performed by the last name spelling as reported and if no match is found, then any other possible last name spelling is used such as Rodriguez might be Rodriguez or Rodrigues etc. A search is also conducted with birthdate, legal father, and/or legal mother. If no match is made, then a search is made by birthdate and/or first name. If no matches are found, a new student ID number is created for the child. A query of the database is performed to identify any possibilities of duplicated numbers. The query pulls out students with similar names and birthdates to check possible duplication. If there are duplications, they are corrected by merging the data into one student record. Another query is run to identify and verify that any children identified as having residency before the funding begin date are still in the state after the begin date. Any child who was not in residency is eliminated from the Category 1 child count. Summer school enrollment is conducted the same way.

If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MIS2000 system can generate a query that filters out any child who did not meet the following criteria during the child count period: between the ages of 3 and 21 and has not graduated from high school, was within 36 months of Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD), and has had a third birthday before the end date.

A report is generated that gives a 12-month unduplicated count or list of students between the ages of 3 and 21, who are within 3 years of the QAD and who had a Residency QAD, Withdrawal Date, Enroll Date or Term Date during the date range of 9-1-11 to 8-31-12.

The same procedure is used as in the first paragraph of 1.10.3.3 with the exception of the School History; Type-Summer School is identified by Enrollment Type.

In an attempt to avoid duplication of student records, a search of the state database is performed for each student identified. A search is performed by the last name spelling as reported and if no match is found, then any other possible last name spelling is used such as Rodriquez might be Rodriguez or Rodriques etc. A search is also conducted with birthdate, legal father, and/or legal mother. If no match is made then a search is made by birth date and/or first name. If no matches are found a new student ID number is created for the child. A query of the database is performed to identify any possibilities of duplicated names. The query pulls out students with similar names and birth dates to check possible duplication. If there are duplications, they are corrected by merging the data into one student record. Another query is run to identify and verify that any child identified as having residency before the funding begin date are still in the state after the begin date. Any child who was not in residency is eliminated from the Category 1 count.

If your State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MIS200 database is used to collect and maintain both Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At the LEA level:

The Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) required all LEAs to use the national Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Student eligibility begins with a one-on-one interview with a parent, guardian, an adult responsible for the child, or a youth as the migrant worker. Both National COEs and COE validations are signed by the school district recruiter, certifying all of the information provided on the National COE is true and correct to the best of his or her knowledge. The recruiter's supervisor then reviews the National COEs and signs them before submitting them, to the SEA. If a recruiter has an eligibility question or issue, he or she is instructed to contact the State Migrant Education Office for resolving the problem or question. All incomplete or questionable National COEs are returned for additional information, completeness and corrections.

At the State level:

The OSDE trains all new migrant recruiters. The recruiters must have at least two training sessions before they can begin recruiting. Each training session lasts at least four hours. The training includes identification and recruitment, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, when comments are warranted on the COE, and all eligibility requirements. All recruiters must attend all videoconferences related to migrant training. This is done three times a year minimum. Point-to-Point trainings are conducted with any recruiter or school district providing migrant education services that the SEA determines needs additional training. This process is described to LEAs and is included in the state ID&R manual located on the state's Web site. The ID&R manual was revised in 2011 and is currently being revised again. Each site will be notified about the revised manual.

All National COEs and COE validations submitted to the OSDE are reviewed for accuracy and eligibility by two state migrant education specialists before being signed by the migrant education director and entered into the database. If eligibility questions or issues arise, the SEA reviews the federal guidance and federal regulations. If the state migrant staff still has questions, the question is referred to a Migrant Program Specialist at the Office of Migrant Education. This process is provided to LEAs and is included in the state's ID&R manual, which is located on the state's Web site. Audits of COEs are conducted using random samples from each migrant district. Other audits of childcount records are conducted using random samples.

Incomplete or questionable National COEs are reviewed and returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification within a five-day window. Repeated errors by the same recruiter/LEA result in further training and/or an on-site technical visit by SEA migrant education program staff. In addition, the SEA has conducted "common COE errors" workshops through webinars, videoconferences, and face-to-face meetings.

In an attempt to avoid duplication of student records, a search of the local database is performed for each student identified. A search is performed by the last name spelling as reported and if no match is found, then other possible last name spellings are used such as Rodriguez might be Rodriguez or Rodriquez etc. The search is also performed using birth date given, male parent/guardian and female parent/guardian. A query of the database is performed to identify any possibilities of duplicated names. The query pulls out students with similar names and birth dates to check possible duplication. If there are duplications, they are corrected by merging the data into one student record. Another query is run to verify that any children identified before the funding begin date are still in the state after the begin date.

All data entry is conducted at the state office. All reports are compiled by a migrant program specialist at the state office, reviewed by another migrant program specialist, and signed off on by the migrant education director. To ensure the timely receipt of reports and data, this information is first reviewed by all staff at the SEA level and then emailed to the migrant education director at each school district.

Other quality control measures include sampling of National COEs through re-interviews, on-site school monitoring visits, and provision of enrollment procedures to summer school personnel. Random checks of National COEs are completed by re-interviewing a random sample of migrant parents by the migrant education director. During a school monitoring visit, a list of migrant students is reviewed for attendance data. All eligibility documents are reviewed during the monitoring visit.

Procedures are provided to summer session personnel in collecting and reporting pupil enrollment and attendance data. The OSDE provides recruiters and administrative staff with training via videoconferences, statewide meetings and a written recruitment guide which was revised in 2011 and in the process of revisions again. The OSDE encourages school districts to provide specialized in-service trainings to paraprofessionals and teachers at LEAs. School districts are required to notify the OSDE when a change in migrant recruiters and/or staff occurs. In this way, the district never suffers a break in services to its migrant students.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the

SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All MEP sites within the state are monitored each year. One piece of this monitoring is the re-interview process. The OMEP randomly selects National COEs from each migrant education program in the state to be included in the re-interview process. The Migrant Education Director at the SEA level conducts re-interviews in the native language of the family. If the family is found to be ineligible for services, they are immediately removed from the district's MEP. At the SEA level, the Migrant Education Specialist changes the status of the students within the family from migrant to non-migrant. Eligible households are re-interviewed on a yearly basis to determine ongoing eligibility. School district recruiters and staff meet with families prior to school enrollment and discuss ongoing eligibility, a second or third year evaluation National COE is completed and it is noted on the form whether or not the household retains eligibility. Upon receipt of the National COE, the SEA reviews the document and takes appropriate action, either removing the student from the program or continuing service.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The OSDE has procedures at the state level to ensure child count data is entered and updated on a regular basis. A migrant education specialist provides all migrant sites with their student lists twice each semester and once during summer school for those sites offering migrant summer school. Each site must proof the student lists, make any necessary changes, and return its list to the OSDE. National COEs are compared to the student lists for accuracy of all information. Lists of migrant students are provided to each local migrant education program for accuracy. Any changes to the lists are returned to the state office for changes to be made. All data is entered at the state level. No migrant sites are responsible for entering their own migrant student level data. Throughout the year, all National COEs are reviewed by the two migrant specialists and the migrant director for accuracy and eligibility determination. This consists of checking the following information: QAD, residency date, moved from , moved to, children moved with, moving on own, qualifying activity code, and temporary or seasonal. Districts are required to conduct their own re-interviews of currently enrolled families. Reports are run on a monthly basis for each migrant district comparing the data with the original National COE. Reports for duplicate students are run also on a monthly basis.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Prior to submission of the Category 1 and Category 2 counts to the USDE, a preliminary report is run after the migrant specialists and the director review all of the National COEs and all of the data has been entered into the database. The specialists and director review all of the counts. A list of migrant students is emailed to each migrant district for the migrant director to check for accuracy. Any changes are made on the list and returned to the State Office for changes. The State Migrant office runs student list for each district every time the district adds a student or withdrawals a student. The list is also run each quarter. The counts are compared to the previous year's count and other data tables in the report to assess accuracy of each.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Overall, Oklahoma has seen an increase in accuracy; however, further training of school district personnel has been pursued via on-site visits, point-to-point videoconference, monitoring, leveled (novice versus expert) professional development, and new migrant staff training.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Oklahoma MEP has confidence in the accuracy of the reported child counts and eligibility based on the MIS2000 system, training of recruiters in identification and recruiting procedures, and the re-interview process. All the data reported is accurate.