

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
Parts I and II**

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

For reporting on  
**School Year 2016-17**

**SOUTH DAKOTA**



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

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

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- 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) 2016-17 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### **PART I**

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

- | **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2016-17, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- | **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- | **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

### **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2016-17 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 14, 2017**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 15, 2018**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2016-17, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2016-17 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2016-17 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2016-17 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2016-17		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: South Dakota Department of Education		
Address: 800 Governors Drive Pierre, SD 57501		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Mary Stadick Smith		
Telephone: 605-773-7228		
Fax: 605-773-6139		
e-mail: mary.stadicksmith@state.sd.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Mary Stadick Smith		
		<u>Thursday, March 1, 2018, 11:08:10 AM</u>
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2016-17**



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

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

Response	Options
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	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 "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

South Dakota did not make any changes to its standards for English language arts, math or science during SY 2016-17. As previously reported via the CSPR, science standards were changed in SY 2014-15, which began a multi-year implementation process.

South Dakota has completed a revision process for ELA and mathematics standards. At the present time, the standards are going through a series of public hearings with final approval scheduled at the May 2018 South Dakota Board of Education Standards meeting. The standards implementation process, which is a multi-year process, would begin in SY 2018-19. The timeline can be found at the following URL: <http://doe.sd.gov/ContentStandards/documents/Strd-Timl.pdf>.

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

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

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

At the present time, the South Dakota science standards are in the process of implementation with new assessments that were field tested with all 5th, 8th, and 11th graders during the spring of 2017. The alternate assessment for science is in the process of a similar update with new curriculum connectors being implemented and a new assessment undergoing field testing in 2017-18.

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

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

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

Response	Options
<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 "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Science tests were field tested in the Spring of 2017 and further field testing of items and test formats will continue during the Spring 2018 administration.



**1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities****1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

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

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by Section 1111(b)	90.00
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	10.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no comments	

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

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

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by Section 1111(b)	<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 Response</u>
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no comments	

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT <sup>2</sup>**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	71,140	70,859	99.61
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,112	8,029	98.98
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,306	1,305	99.92
Asian	1,237	1,236	99.92
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	69	69	100.00
Black or African American	2,111	2,099	99.43
Hispanic or Latino	3,861	3,833	99.27
White	53,200	53,052	99.72
Two or more races	2,550	2,541	99.65
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,347	10,285	99.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,460	2,450	99.59
Economically disadvantaged students	28,432	28,292	99.51
Migratory students	235	235	100.00
Male	36,570	36,421	99.59
Female	34,570	34,438	99.62

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

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (*IDEA*) in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,750	85.08
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	586	5.70
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	949	9.23
Total	10,285	////////////////////////////////////

**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	71,142	70,867	99.61
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,113	8,034	99.03
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,306	1,302	99.69
Asian	1,237	1,233	99.68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	69	69	100.00
Black or African American	2,111	2,100	99.48
Hispanic or Latino	3,861	3,836	99.35
White	53,201	53,053	99.72
Two or more races	2,550	2,542	99.69
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,347	10,287	99.42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,460	2,445	99.39
Economically disadvantaged students	28,434	28,298	99.52
Migratory students	235	232	98.72
Male	36,570	36,424	99.60
Female	34,572	34,443	99.63

**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 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	178

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	6,121	59.50
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,214	31.24
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	949	9.23
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	3	0.03
Total	10,287	////////////////////////////////////

**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	28,933	28,609	98.88
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,071	2,939	95.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	560	558	99.64
Asian	530	528	99.62
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	30	30	100.00
Black or African American	827	819	99.03
Hispanic or Latino	1,428	1,401	98.11
White	22,179	22,040	99.37
Two or more races	868	852	98.16
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,653	3,581	98.03
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	708	700	98.87
Economically disadvantaged students	10,661	10,473	98.24
Migratory students	99	98	98.99
Male	14,921	14,752	98.87
Female	14,012	13,857	98.89
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Science Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	140	3.91
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,060	85.45
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	381	10.64
Total	3,581	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT<sup>3</sup>

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

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

#### 1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

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

#### 1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

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

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,794	5,831	54.02
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,299	282	21.71
Asian or Pacific Islander	186	91	48.92
<i>Asian</i>	182	88	48.35
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	4	3	75.00
Black or African American	323	92	28.48
Hispanic or Latino	653	232	35.53
White	7,810	4,899	62.73
Two or more races	523	235	44.93
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,894	607	32.05
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	653	167	25.57
Economically disadvantaged students	4,737	1,774	37.45
Migratory students	44	8	18.18
Male	5,485	3,008	54.84
Female	5,309	2,823	53.17

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Both the number of 3rd graders identified as LEP and their academic achievement gains are correct based on the state data. There will be more students identified as migratory taking math assessments since all students are required to participate.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,766	5,170	48.02
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,299	230	17.71
Asian or Pacific Islander	179	74	41.34
<i>Asian</i>	175	72	41.14
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	4	2	50.00
Black or African American	313	100	31.95
Hispanic or Latino	643	194	30.17
White	7,809	4,332	55.47
Two or more races	523	240	45.89
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,892	454	24.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	625	134	21.44
Economically disadvantaged students	4,713	1,539	32.65
Migratory students	38	6	15.79
Male	5,474	2,448	44.72
Female	5,292	2,722	51.44

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Some of the migratory students who took the math assessment did not take the RLA because they were first year in country.

## 1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Students are not assessed in science at grade 3. Therefore all fields will be blank.			

## 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	10,775	5,413	50.24
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,279	229	17.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	191	85	44.50
<i>Asian</i>	178	81	45.51
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	13	4	30.77
Black or African American	339	87	25.66
Hispanic or Latino	663	220	33.18
White	7,840	4,603	58.71
Two or more races	463	189	40.82
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,791	405	22.61
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	580	125	21.55
Economically disadvantaged students	4,737	1,590	33.57
Migratory students	40	5	12.50
Male	5,519	2,893	52.42
Female	5,256	2,520	47.95

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There has been an increase in the state in the number of Hispanic or Latino students and the number is accurate for grade 4 students who tested in mathematics. The increase in the number of LEP students can be attributed to the fact that there is an increase of newcomers and the fact that the exit criteria for LEP has increased due to updates in the assessment used to determine English proficiency. Thus, there are more LEP students tested who have had a chance to improve their understanding of mathematics. Many of the migratory students are also first year in country students who take the math assessment but not the ELA assessment per federal law.

## 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	10,748	5,340	49.68
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,280	241	18.83
Asian or Pacific Islander	183	86	46.99
<i>Asian</i>	171	80	46.78
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	12	6	50.00
Black or African American	324	100	30.86
Hispanic or Latino	657	241	36.68
White	7,842	4,478	57.10
Two or more races	462	194	41.99
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,791	374	20.88
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	550	128	23.27
Economically disadvantaged students	4,710	1,597	33.91
Migratory students	32	4	12.50
Male	5,511	2,543	46.14
Female	5,237	2,797	53.41

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There has been an increase in the state in the number of Hispanic or Latino students and the number is accurate for grade 4 students who tested in RLA and the percent scoring proficient is accurate. The increase in the number of LEP students can be attributed to the fact that there is an increase of newcomers and the fact that the exit criteria for LEP has increased due to updates in the assessment used to determine English proficiency. Thus, there are more LEP students tested who have had a chance to improve their understanding of RLA. Many of the migratory students are also first year in country students who take the math assessment but not the ELA assessment per federal law.

Concerning Children with disabilities, the change in proficiency from last year may be attributed to the focus area of the State Systemic Improvement Plan.



## 1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Students are not assessed in science at grade 4. Therefore all fields will be blank.			

## 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	10,486	4,382	41.79
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,232	144	11.69
Asian or Pacific Islander	182	75	41.21
<i>Asian</i>	174	71	40.80
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	8	4	50.00
Black or African American	323	70	21.67
Hispanic or Latino	566	134	23.67
White	7,759	3,803	49.01
Two or more races	424	156	36.79
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,607	249	15.49
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	265	16	6.04
Economically disadvantaged students	4,484	1,122	25.02
Migratory students	40	1	2.50
Male	5,395	2,339	43.35
Female	5,091	2,043	40.13

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Many of the migratory students are also first year in country students who take the math assessment but not the ELA assessment per federal law. Many of the LEP students are also first year in country so take math but not ELA assessments per federal law.

## 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	10,457	5,366	51.31
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,234	234	18.96
Asian or Pacific Islander	174	82	47.13
<i>Asian</i>	166	77	46.39
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	8	5	62.50
Black or African American	315	111	35.24
Hispanic or Latino	549	185	33.70
White	7,760	4,559	58.75
Two or more races	425	195	45.88
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,610	288	17.89
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	232	27	11.64
Economically disadvantaged students	4,457	1,518	34.06
Migratory students	33	6	18.18
Male	5,377	2,487	46.25
Female	5,080	2,879	56.67

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Many of the migratory students are also first year in country students who take the math assessment but not the ELA assessment per federal law. Many of the LEP students are also first year in country so take math but not ELA assessments per federal law.

## 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	10,469	4,741	45.29
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,219	151	12.39
Asian or Pacific Islander	182	66	36.26
<i>Asian</i>	174	62	35.63
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	8	4	50.00
Black or African American	323	66	20.43
Hispanic or Latino	564	146	25.89
White	7,757	4,140	53.37
Two or more races	424	172	40.57
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,606	405	25.22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	263	17	6.46
Economically disadvantaged students	4,469	1,277	28.57
Migratory students	40	4	10.00
Male	5,388	2,623	48.68
Female	5,081	2,118	41.68

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The test is new and the standard for proficient is higher than in the past based on higher content expectations. Less students are now proficient. Any discrepancy in subgroups is due to the changing demographics in the student population.

## 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	10,474	4,445	42.44
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,264	174	13.77
Asian or Pacific Islander	174	87	50.00
<i>Asian</i>	164	84	51.22
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	10	3	30.00
Black or African American	309	53	17.15
Hispanic or Latino	620	156	25.16
White	7,748	3,840	49.56
Two or more races	359	135	37.60
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,571	189	12.03
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	269	21	7.81
Economically disadvantaged students	4,317	1,102	25.53
Migratory students	34	3	8.82
Male	5,403	2,214	40.98
Female	5,071	2,231	44.00

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of Hispanic students has increased in the past year, so the number of students assessed is correct. Many of the migratory students are also first year in country students who take the math assessment but not the ELA assessment per federal law. Many of the LEP students are first year in country so take math but not ELA assessments per federal law.

## 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	10,442	5,139	49.21
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,265	244	19.29
Asian or Pacific Islander	169	90	53.25
<i>Asian</i>	159	87	54.72
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	10	3	30.00
Black or African American	297	88	29.63
Hispanic or Latino	605	211	34.88
White	7,746	4,341	56.04
Two or more races	360	165	45.83
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,572	214	13.61
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	236	18	7.63
Economically disadvantaged students	4,286	1,415	33.01
Migratory students	26	4	15.38
Male	5,385	2,348	43.60
Female	5,057	2,791	55.19

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The reported numbers for Hispanic, IDEA, and LEP are correct based on the state data base. The increases for Hispanic and LEP are accurate based on the shifting demographics in the state. Many of the LEP students are students who took the RLA test for the first time in 2016-17. The children with disabilities data are correct according the state data base.

Many of the migratory students are also first year in country students who take the math assessment but not the ELA assessment per federal law. Many of the LEP students are first year in country so take math but not ELA assessments per federal law.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The science assessment is not administered in 6th grade. Therefore, the fields will all be blank.			

## 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	10,102	4,599	45.53
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,210	187	15.45
Asian or Pacific Islander	194	103	53.09
<i>Asian</i>	182	99	54.40
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	12	4	33.33
Black or African American	309	75	24.27
Hispanic or Latino	486	123	25.31
White	7,565	3,978	52.58
Two or more races	338	133	39.35
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,430	205	14.34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	244	26	10.66
Economically disadvantaged students	3,965	1,130	28.50
Migratory students	19	1	5.26
Male	5,212	2,393	45.91
Female	4,890	2,206	45.11

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of American Indian or Alaska Native students taking the mathematics assessment is correct according to the state data base. The percent proficient is also accurate according to the state data base. Many of the migratory students are also first year in country students who take the math assessment but not the ELA assessment per federal law. Many of the LEP students are first year in country so take math but not ELA assessments per federal law.

## 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	10,081	5,429	53.85
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,207	291	24.11
Asian or Pacific Islander	193	116	60.10
<i>Asian</i>	181	111	61.33
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	12	5	41.67
Black or African American	297	93	31.31
Hispanic or Latino	480	189	39.38
White	7,565	4,581	60.56
Two or more races	339	159	46.90
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,430	248	17.34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	221	32	14.48
Economically disadvantaged students	3,942	1,449	36.76
Migratory students	17	3	17.65
Male	5,205	2,496	47.95
Female	4,876	2,933	60.15

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Many of the migratory students are also first year in country students who take the math assessment but not the ELA assessment per federal law. Many of the LEP students are first year in country so take math but not ELA assessments per federal law.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The science assessment is not administered at 7th grade. Therefore, all of the fields will be blank.

## 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	9,690	4,139	42.71
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,113	127	11.41
Asian or Pacific Islander	187	71	37.97
<i>Asian</i>	180	67	37.22
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	7	4	57.14
Black or African American	290	66	22.76
Hispanic or Latino	476	132	27.73
White	7,369	3,649	49.52
Two or more races	255	94	36.86
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,202	146	12.15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	272	15	5.51
Economically disadvantaged students	3,722	969	26.03
Migratory students	37	5	13.51
Male	4,972	1,995	40.12
Female	4,718	2,144	45.44

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of Black or African American students in the 8th grade taking the mathematics test is accurate based on changing student demographics. The increase in the percent of students is correct according to the state data base. Many of the migratory students are also first year in country students who take the math assessment but not the ELA assessment per federal law. Many of the LEP students are also first year in country so take math but not ELA assessments per federal law.

## 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	9,658	4,781	49.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,118	232	20.75
Asian or Pacific Islander	181	89	49.17
<i>Asian</i>	174	84	48.28
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	7	5	71.43
Black or African American	276	84	30.43
Hispanic or Latino	462	172	37.23
White	7,367	4,102	55.68
Two or more races	254	102	40.16
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,201	159	13.24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	238	15	6.30
Economically disadvantaged students	3,693	1,252	33.90
Migratory students	27	7	25.93
Male	4,952	2,071	41.82
Female	4,706	2,710	57.59

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Many of the migratory students are also first year in country students who take the math assessment but not the ELA assessment per federal law. Many of the LEP students are also first year in country so take math but not ELA assessments per federal law.



## 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	9,664	4,689	48.52
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,102	200	18.15
Asian or Pacific Islander	186	79	42.47
<i>Asian</i>	179	76	42.46
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	7	3	42.86
Black or African American	290	76	26.21
Hispanic or Latino	472	167	35.38
White	7,360	4,061	55.18
Two or more races	254	106	41.73
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,201	268	22.31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	271	21	7.75
Economically disadvantaged students	3,706	1,214	32.76
Migratory students	37	6	16.22
Male	4,962	2,440	49.17
Female	4,702	2,249	47.83

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The test is new and the standard for proficient is higher than in the past based on higher content expectations. Less students are now proficient. Any discrepancy in subgroups is due to the changing demographics in the student population.

## 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	8,538	3,592	42.07
American Indian or Alaska Native	632	87	13.77
Asian or Pacific Islander	191	66	34.55
<i>Asian</i>	176	60	34.09
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	15	6	40.00
Black or African American	206	37	17.96
Hispanic or Latino	369	91	24.66
White	6,961	3,256	46.77
Two or more races	179	55	30.73
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	790	87	11.01
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	167	15	8.98
Economically disadvantaged students	2,330	583	25.02
Migratory students	21	2	9.52
Male	4,435	1,803	40.65
Female	4,103	1,789	43.60

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data for both American Indian and Children with disabilities are correct according to the state data base. Shifting enrollment patterns between public and BIE/tribal schools likely accounts for the change in American Indian students tested.

## 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	8,537	5,685	66.59
American Indian or Alaska Native	631	255	40.41
Asian or Pacific Islander	189	93	49.21
<i>Asian</i>	174	82	47.13
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	15	11	73.33
Black or African American	207	68	32.85
Hispanic or Latino	369	198	53.66
White	6,962	4,953	71.14
Two or more races	179	118	65.92
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	788	180	22.84
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	165	15	9.09
Economically disadvantaged students	2,329	1,129	48.48
Migratory students	21	2	9.52
Male	4,434	2,677	60.37
Female	4,103	3,008	73.31

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data for both American Indian and Children with disabilities are correct according to the state data base. Shifting enrollment patterns between public and BIE/tribal schools accounts for a change in the American Indian students tested.

## 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	8,476	3,490	41.18
American Indian or Alaska Native	618	98	15.86
Asian or Pacific Islander	190	48	25.26
<i>Asian</i>	175	41	23.43
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	15	7	46.67
Black or African American	206	31	15.05
Hispanic or Latino	365	87	23.84
White	6,923	3,156	45.59
Two or more races	174	70	40.23
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	774	129	16.67
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	166	10	6.02
Economically disadvantaged students	2,298	589	25.63
Migratory students	21	2	9.52
Male	4,402	1,974	44.84
Female	4,074	1,516	37.21

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The test is new and the standard for proficient is higher than in the past based on higher content expectations. Less students are now proficient. Any discrepancy in subgroups is due to the changing demographics in the student population.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

This section collects data on accountability.

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

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

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
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	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not Applicable - Flexibility state	

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.

Not Applicable - Flexibility state
------------------------------------

**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.

Not Applicable - Flexibility state

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2016-17
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2015-16 and beginning of SY 2016-17 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not Applicable - Flexibility state	

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

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

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

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2016 (SY 2016-17) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

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

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

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

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



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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2016-17.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State reservation is 5%, which is used to monitor, provide technical assistance and evaluate the use of funds.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not Applicable - Flexibility state

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational program**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.us/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.us/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>No</u>	Dual language	
<u>No</u>	Two-way immersion	
<u>No</u>	Transitional bilingual	
<u>No</u>	Developmental bilingual	
<u>No</u>	Heritage language	
<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 October 1 count of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- o 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.
- o 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	4,638
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	4,447
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In school year 16-17 we had more LEAs join Title III.	

**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	1,605
German	781
Karen languages	472
Nepali	254
Somali	161

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).

<b>All LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,705
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	263
Total	4,968
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

<b>All LEP Results</b>	<b>#</b>
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	131
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	2.84
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>		<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		4,527
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		224
Total		4,751
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include them in the calculations for making progress (# and % making progress).

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>		<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined.		1,406

**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:**

- 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 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.

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>
Making progress	782	25.06
Attained proficiency	133	2.94
<b>Comments:</b> 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)).

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

<b>Native Language Testing</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
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
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

<b>Language(s)</b>
English
<b>Comments:</b> 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)
English
<b>Comments:</b> 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)
English
<b>Comments:</b> 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 all grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
397	657	1,054
<b>Comments:</b> 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.
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
1,041	252	24.21	789
<b>Comments:</b> 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.
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
1,041	327	31.41	714
<b>Comments:</b> 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
490	88	17.96	402
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

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

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

Termination of Title III Programs	Yes/No
Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b> 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
1,082	15	1

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

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

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

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

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

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

<b>Title III Teachers</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	88
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	250

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 1.6.4.1).
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	4
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	4
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	2
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	2
Other (Explain in comment box)	2

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	3	1,190
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	4	124
PD provided to principals	4	83
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	3	60
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	2	31
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	7
Total	//////////	1,495

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other professional development included: Separating Difference vs. Disability, writing Language Acquisition Plans, writing for ELs, and English as a second language endorsement course work.

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

Example: State received SY 2016-17 funds July 1, 2016, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2016, for SY 2016-17 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/17	7/30/17	30
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

The SEA will work with Title III coordinators prior to submission to indicate focus areas of each LEA and ways LEAs can utilize Title III funding to the fullest.

**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/unsafechoice.doc>.

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



**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

This section collects data on homeless children and youth and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	148	148
LEAs with subgrants	2	2
Total	150	150

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

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth**

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	19	48
K	77	166
1	59	143
2	68	131
3	54	129
4	47	107
5	64	116
6	42	106
7	38	108
8	42	81
9	45	154
10	54	47
11	36	39
12	45	40
Ungraded		
Total	690	1,415

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. We do not have ungraded students in our state.

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth**

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

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing	106	314
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	488	781
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	30	27
Hotels/Motels	66	293
Total	690	1,415

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

FAQ on reporting homeless students:

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

**1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled**

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	34	81
Migratory children/youth	4	12
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	142	330
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	19	74

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

**1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

**1.9.2.1 Young Homeless Children Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Served by Subgrants</b>
Age Birth Through 2	89
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	101
Total	190
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students**

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

**1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment**

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	42	13	30.95	99	24	24.24
4	39	6	15.38	83	14	16.87
5	49	14	28.57	81	23	28.40
6	33	15	45.45	82	21	25.61
7	27	7	25.93	72	16	22.22
8	32	4	12.50	60	10	16.67
High School	19	9	47.37	25	12	48.00

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

**1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment**

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	42	14	33.33	101	25	24.75
4	39	6	15.38	85	17	20.00
5	49	8	16.33	83	16	19.28
6	33	8	24.24	84	11	13.10
7	27	4	14.81	72	14	19.44
8	31	3	9.68	60	11	18.33
High School	19	1	5.26	25	5	20.00

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

**1.9.3.3 Science Assessment**

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	48	12	25.00	82	11	13.41
6						
7						
8	30	4	13.33	59	13	22.03
High School	18	2	11.11	24	5	20.83

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