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 2010-11

OKLAHOMA

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2012

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) 2010-11 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 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 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16, 2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17, 2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, 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 2010-11 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 2010-11 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:
  __X__Part I, 2010-11   ___Part II, 2010-11

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

_____   __Wednesday, April 18, 2012, 4:34:06 PM__
   Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2010-11

**PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011
5PM EST**

1.1 Sᴛᴀɴᴅᴀʀᴅs ᴀɴᴅ Assᴇssᴍᴇɴᴛ Dᴇᴠᴇʟᴏᴘᴍᴇɴᴛ

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

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

OVERVIEW

The state of Oklahoma has had Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts, and Science standards in place for grades PK-12 since 1993. The Oklahoma Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS) document is based on standards recommendations of national organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, the National Council of Teachers of English, The International Reading Association, the National Research Council, and the American Diploma Project.

Revision of PASS occurs pursuant to state statute with committees composed of representatives from state teachers, curriculum specialists, university faculty in content specific areas, and professional organizations. Recommendations for revision are then sent to the State Superintendent and the Oklahoma State Board of Education for public hearings and approval before they become state law. State statute requires review of state standards prior to annual textbook adoption and as appropriate during each content area's six-year cycle.

MATHEMATICS

General mathematics knowledge in patterns and algebraic reasoning, number sense, number operations and computation, geometry, measurement, data analysis, probability, and statistics is targeted in the standards for grades 1-8, while standards for grades 9-12 are written for Algebra 1, Algebra 2, and Geometry. Mathematics process standards and content standards are addressed in separate sections of the PASS document. Process standards address problem solving, connections, representation, communication, and reasoning. Mathematics PASS had minor revisions in 2005 as well as revisions and reorganization of high school standards in 2006 and 2007. Mathematics PASS was comprehensively reviewed and revised in spring 2009. The new mathematics standards were assessed beginning 2010.

READING/LANGUAGE ARTS

Knowledge in the areas of reading, literature, research and information, writing, grammar, usage, mechanics, oral language, listening and speaking, and visual literacy is targeted in the standards for all grades. Reading/Literature standards of Language Arts PASS underwent the six-year review cycle for revisions in 2007. The Grammar/Composition standards of Language Arts PASS were reviewed and revised for adoption in spring 2010. The new standards will be assessed beginning 2011.

COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS and MATHEMATICS

In June 2010, the Oklahoma State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics developed under the direction of the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers. The timeframe 2010-2014 will be used as a transition period from the Priority Academic Student Skills to the Common Core State Standards.

SCIENCE
General science knowledge is targeted in the standards for grades 1-8, while standards for grades 9-12 are written for

Physical Science, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. Science process skills and content standards are addressed in separate sections of the PASS document. Process standards address observation and measurement, classification, experimentation, interpretation and communication, modeling, and inquiry. As students apply the content knowledge through these standards and through extended experimental projects, problem-solving skills and creative thinking processes are enhanced. The six-year review cycle allows for Science PASS reviewed and revised for adoption in spring 2011. The new standards will be assessed beginning 2012.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts and/or science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (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* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests (OCCT) Mathematics and Reading
Oklahoma reset achievement standards for the Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests (OCCT) for grades 3-8 Mathematics and Reading as well as End-of-Instruction English II in June 2009. These standards as well as new Performance Level Descriptors were then adopted by the State Board of Education. All evidence was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education for Peer Review during the November 2009 cycle, and the state is awaiting final written approval.
In June 2011, Oklahoma reset new achievements standards for grades 3-8 in Mathematics on the OCCT after a review and revisions to the Priority Academic Student Skills, (PASS), Oklahoma's curriculum. New performance levels were then adopted by the State Board of Education.

Oklahoma Modified Alternate Assessment Program (OMAAP) Mathematics and Reading
Oklahoma developed the Oklahoma Modified Alternate Assessment Program (OMAAP) assessment and grade-level academic achievement standards for students with disabilities and implemented it for its first administration in Spring 2007. The State submitted evidence during the November 2009 Peer Review for its Modified assessments in Mathematics and Reading for grades 3-8 and End-of-Instruction Algebra I and English II and is awaiting final written approval. In June 2011, new standards were reset for Mathematics in grades 3-8 after a review and revisions to the Priority Academic Student Skills, (PASS) Oklahoma's curriculum. New performance levels were then adopted by the State Board of Education.

Oklahoma Alternate Assessment Program (OAAP) Mathematics and Reading
Oklahoma will be submitting 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 Mathematics and Reading for grades 3-8 and End-of-Instruction Algebra I and English II will have new academic achievement standards reset in June 2012.

Oklahoma's assessments and academic achievement standards in Science are not yet approved.

Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests (OCCT) Science
Oklahoma reset achievement standards for OCCT End-of-Instruction Biology I in June 2009. These standards as well as new Performance Level Descriptors were then adopted by the State Board of Education. All evidence was submitted for Peer Review during the November 2009 cycle, and the state is awaiting final approval.

Oklahoma submitted evidence for OCCT Science grades 5 and 8 for Peer Review during the November 2009 cycle and is awaiting final approval.

Oklahoma Modified Alternate Assessment Program (OMAAP) Science
Oklahoma developed the Oklahoma Modified Alternate Assessment Program (OMAAP) assessment and modified academic achievement standards for students with disabilities and implemented it for its first administration in Spring 2007. The state submitted evidence during the November 2009 Peer Review for its Modified assessments in Science for grades 5 and 8 and End-of-Instruction Biology I and is awaiting final approval.

Oklahoma Alternate Assessment Program (OAAP) Science
Oklahoma will be submitting 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 will have new academic achievement standards reset in June

2012.

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

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 2010-11, 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)	20.0
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	80.0
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 2010-11 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

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

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 Sates for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	331,446	329,842	99.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	57,086	56,872	99.6
Asian	6,974	6,961	99.8
Black or African American	33,206	33,016	99.4
Hispanic or Latino	41,783	41,613	99.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	192,397	191,380	99.5
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	56,411	55,776	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	24,425	24,345	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	191,684	190,669	99.5
Migratory students	367	366	99.7
Male	169,984	169,003	99.4
Female	161,416	160,806	99.6
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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 (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4,389	7.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	19,428	34.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	27,697	49.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,134	7.4
Total	55,648	
Comments: There were 128 Grade 8 IEP students who took the high school Algebra I. They were included in the 1.2.2 counts for the Grade 8 math test, but were not included in the 1.2.2 counts for the high school Algebra I test. Correct numbers for 1.2.2 are as follows: Regular Assessment without Accommodations = 4,417 Regular Assessment with Accommodations = 19,528 That makes the total in 1.2.2 (55,776) match the total in 1.2.1 and 1.3.1.		

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	329,772	327,794	99.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	56,848	56,553	99.5
Asian	6,761	6,733	99.6
Black or African American	33,238	32,988	99.2
Hispanic or Latino	41,031	40,792	99.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	191,875	190,713	99.4
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	55,806	55,093	98.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	24,342	24,222	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	190,040	188,842	99.4
Migratory students	359	354	98.6
Male	168,728	167,523	99.3
Female	160,999	160,240	99.5
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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 (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4,703	8.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	17,198	31.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	29,149	52.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,043	7.3
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	55,093	
Comments: The reason that the Children with Disabilities count in 1.2.4 does not match the sum of the Children with Disabilities counts in 1.3.2 (difference of 83) cannot be determined at this time. Counts used were created by assessment source in one table and grade/proficiency level in another table and do not match exactly. The tables were built by the previous Director of Accountability and Assessment (who is no longer employed with the SDE) and cannot be rebuilt. The correct number of Children with Disabilities participating in assessments is 55,093.		

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	136,579	135,902	99.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	23,764	23,653	99.5
Asian	2,995	2,987	99.7
Black or African American	13,523	13,483	99.7
Hispanic or Latino	15,963	15,905	99.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	80,322	79,866	99.4
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	21,124	20,920	99.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,738	5,709	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	73,586	73,164	99.4
Migratory students	167	167	100.0
Male	69,454	69,119	99.5
Female	67,110	66,778	99.5
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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 <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do <u>not</u> 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	2,020	9.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,116	38.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	10,784	51.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	20,920	
Comments:		

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	48,689	33,554	68.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8,114	5,415	66.7
Asian	1,016	794	78.1
Black or African American	4,917	2,437	49.6
Hispanic or Latino	6,899	4,115	59.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	27,743	20,793	74.9
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,442	4,779	56.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,538	3,206	57.9
Economically disadvantaged students	30,810	19,195	62.3
Migratory students	42	23	54.8
Male	24,778	17,439	70.4
Female	23,906	16,113	67.4

Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.

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	48,612	32,733	67.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8,116	5,295	65.2
Asian	987	738	74.8
Black or African American	4,922	2,531	51.4
Hispanic or Latino	6,856	3,723	54.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	27,731	20,446	73.7
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,443	3,882	46.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,313	1,878	43.5
Economically disadvantaged students	30,754	18,439	60.0
Migratory students	40	21	52.5
Male	24,736	15,968	64.6
Female	23,871	16,762	70.2

Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.

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 Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Oklahoma does not give a science test in the 3rd grade.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,322	33,910	70.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8,200	5,521	67.3
Asian	1,044	848	81.2
Black or African American	4,728	2,430	51.4
Hispanic or Latino	6,542	4,101	62.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	27,808	21,010	75.6
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,747	4,863	55.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,974	3,012	60.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29,894	18,936	63.3
Migratory students	43	25	58.1
Male	24,877	17,670	71.0
Female	23,432	16,232	69.3
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,253	29,844	61.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8,200	4,816	58.7
Asian	1,015	709	69.9
Black or African American	4,733	2,139	45.2
Hispanic or Latino	6,492	3,246	50.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	27,813	18,934	68.1
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,770	4,048	46.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,143	1,025	32.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29,848	15,946	53.4
Migratory students	42	19	45.2
Male	24,845	15,020	60.5
Female	23,397	14,818	63.3
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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 Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Oklahoma does not give a science test in grade 4.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,280	32,465	67.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8,346	5,278	63.2
Asian	990	811	81.9
Black or African American	4,883	2,587	53.0
Hispanic or Latino	6,357	3,922	61.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	27,704	19,867	71.7
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,792	4,275	48.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,126	2,337	56.6
Economically disadvantaged students	28,930	17,626	60.9
Migratory students	85	55	64.7
Male	24,774	16,679	67.3
Female	23,504	15,784	67.2
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,224	31,363	65.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8,349	5,158	61.8
Asian	964	689	71.5
Black or African American	4,884	2,415	49.4
Hispanic or Latino	6,319	3,348	53.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	27,708	19,753	71.3
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,809	3,930	44.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,513	765	30.4
Economically disadvantaged students	28,869	16,632	57.6
Migratory students	83	38	45.8
Male	24,749	15,443	62.4
Female	23,473	15,919	67.8
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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	47,581	41,924	88.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8,226	7,249	88.1
Asian	976	885	90.7
Black or African American	4,796	3,604	75.1
Hispanic or Latino	6,180	5,064	81.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	27,403	25,122	91.7
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,144	6,189	76.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,573	1,769	68.8
Economically disadvantaged students	28,478	24,167	84.9
Migratory students	81	61	75.3
Male	24,325	21,406	88.0
Female	23,254	20,517	88.2
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	47,446	30,910	65.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8,271	4,999	60.4
Asian	989	770	77.9
Black or African American	4,790	2,380	49.7
Hispanic or Latino	5,907	3,372	57.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	27,489	19,389	70.5
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,049	3,861	48.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,942	1,385	47.1
Economically disadvantaged students	27,757	15,847	57.1
Migratory students	60	36	60.0
Male	24,310	15,897	65.4
Female	23,126	15,009	64.9

Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	47,390	29,547	62.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8,263	4,800	58.1
Asian	970	695	71.6
Black or African American	4,794	2,263	47.2
Hispanic or Latino	5,875	2,895	49.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	27,488	18,894	68.7
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,064	3,305	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,032	540	26.6
Economically disadvantaged students	27,712	14,745	53.2
Migratory students	59	33	55.9
Male	24,288	14,401	59.3
Female	23,094	15,142	65.6

Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.

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 Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Oklahoma does not give a science test in grade 6.			

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	46,952	30,079	64.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8,176	4,837	59.2
Asian	946	786	83.1
Black or African American	4,829	2,434	50.4
Hispanic or Latino	5,606	3,078	54.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	27,395	18,944	69.2
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,563	2,753	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,509	1,056	42.1
Economically disadvantaged students	26,925	15,008	55.7
Migratory students	51	20	39.2
Male	24,164	15,397	63.7
Female	22,785	14,680	64.4
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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	46,944	31,911	68.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8,192	5,340	65.2
Asian	926	715	77.2
Black or African American	4,837	2,572	53.2
Hispanic or Latino	5,576	3,094	55.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	27,413	20,190	73.7
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,584	3,132	41.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,898	554	29.2
Economically disadvantaged students	26,915	16,009	59.5
Migratory students	50	27	54.0
Male	24,167	15,511	64.2
Female	22,773	16,397	72.0
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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 Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Oklahoma does not give a science test in grade 7			

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	45,174	28,879	63.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7,827	4,652	59.4
Asian	970	820	84.5
Black or African American	4,462	2,122	47.6
Hispanic or Latino	5,241	2,793	53.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	26,674	18,492	69.3
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,040	2,877	40.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,368	962	40.6
Economically disadvantaged students	24,204	13,427	55.5
Migratory students	55	27	49.1
Male	22,859	14,432	63.1
Female	22,315	14,447	64.7

Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.

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	45,152	33,452	74.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7,840	5,654	72.1
Asian	938	754	80.4
Black or African American	4,498	2,663	59.2
Hispanic or Latino	5,202	3,162	60.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	26,674	21,219	79.5
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,072	3,541	50.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,773	546	30.8
Economically disadvantaged students	24,210	16,057	66.3
Migratory students	51	30	58.8
Male	22,872	16,039	70.1
Female	22,280	17,413	78.2

Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.

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	44,738	40,246	90.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7,749	6,932	89.5
Asian	969	892	92.1
Black or African American	4,447	3,564	80.1
Hispanic or Latino	5,136	4,266	83.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	26,437	24,592	93.0
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,642	5,457	82.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,894	1,287	68.0
Economically disadvantaged students	23,939	20,553	85.9
Migratory students	54	44	81.5
Male	22,581	20,253	89.7
Female	22,155	19,991	90.2
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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	44,979	34,493	76.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7,938	5,690	71.7
Asian	1,006	874	86.9
Black or African American	4,407	2,859	64.9
Hispanic or Latino	5,061	3,405	67.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	26,567	21,665	81.5
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,143	4,330	60.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,888	1,032	54.7
Economically disadvantaged students	22,149	15,215	68.7
Migratory students	30	23	76.7
Male	23,241	17,571	75.6
Female	21,738	16,922	77.8
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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	43,420	35,978	82.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7,617	6,145	80.7
Asian	936	779	83.2
Black or African American	4,362	3,130	71.8
Hispanic or Latino	4,489	3,171	70.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	26,001	22,748	87.5
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,434	3,714	57.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,185	440	37.1
Economically disadvantaged students	20,670	15,558	75.3
Migratory students	29	20	69.0
Male	22,020	17,586	79.9
Female	21,399	18,392	85.9
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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	43,583	33,989	78.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7,678	5,784	75.3
Asian	1,042	867	83.2
Black or African American	4,240	2,482	58.5
Hispanic or Latino	4,589	2,943	64.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	26,026	21,911	84.2
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,134	4,059	66.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,242	438	35.3
Economically disadvantaged students	20,747	14,388	69.3
Migratory students	32	19	59.4
Male	22,213	17,488	78.7
Female	21,369	16,500	77.2
Comments: Oklahoma does not record Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or Two or more races in the demographics portion of Oklahoma tests.			

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 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Schools	1,777	1,251	70.4
Districts	529	356	67.3
Comments:			

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 2010-11 . Include only public Title I schools. Do <u>not</u> 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 2010-11	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
All Title I schools	1,190	803	67.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,048	689	65.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	142	114	80.3
Comments:			

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 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11
525	353	67.2
Comments: The discrepancy is due to the annexations of seven districts from 2009-2011 and two invalid entries.		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[1]
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer).

---

[1] The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc.

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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	5
Extension of the school year or school day	2
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	5
Comments:	

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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 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)	1
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	5
Comments:	

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 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State'ts Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action[2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer).

---

[2] The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc.

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.

Technical Assistance Provided to Districts and Schools in Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring are as Follows; What Works in Oklahoma Schools Conference are held annually, since 2005, for Oklahoma schools needing improvement. Dr. Robert Marzano has aligned the Oklahoma Nine Essential Elements to the What Works in Schools 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 those 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 (MRL) in the spring of 2010 to conduct a research study 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 designed 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.

Phase I consisted of MRL surveying administrators, teachers, parents, and students. During Phase II, interviews were conducted with administrators and classroom observations were conducted, including confidential video observations.

Based on surveys, principal interviews, on-site observations, and videotape analyses conducted during Phases I and II, MRL provides the following five recommendations to help schools move from Improvement status to Non-Improvement status:

•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.
•Student engagement should receive a schoolwide focus.
•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

Ways to Improve School Effectiveness (WISE online planning tool):
Oklahoma's WISE Tool, developed by the Center on Innovation and Improvement, is an online planning tool for schools and is based on the Oklahoma Nine Essential Elements. WISE allows districts/schools to meet federal Title I requirements and LEA requirements. The WISE tool is designed to help district and school staff identify which of the Nine Essential Elements performance indicators to assess, plan, and monitor.

Steps in the WISE Tool include registering district/school; providing district/school information; forming district/school teams; assessing district/school indicators; utilizing the 29 rapid improvement indicators; utilizing the 90 performance indicators; creating a school plan that meets federal Title I regulations; and monitoring the plan.

The WISE Tool also has district indicators.

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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 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 2010-11
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 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: There are no districts in corrective action.	

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 2010-11 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	23	0
Schools	57	0
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete	11/10/11

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 2010-11.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) 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*:   4.0 %

Comments:

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

For SY 2010-11 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 EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g)Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts 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 2010-11.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

SST leaders were directly involved in facilitating school improvement processes in identified schools. In collaboration 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 provide 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 the SIG applications and the SIG school improvement plans via the WISE 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 the individual principals more frequently than the scheduled team visits, and follow up after each School Support Team report and each 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 (PLC) 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 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 Reviews is to analyze school benchmark assessment data at the student level in reading, mathematics, and other content areas as requested and 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 2011, a SIG Principals' Academy was conducted by the Leadership and Learning Center. Presentations were focused on best practices. During the summer of 2012, another SIG Principals' Academy 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 2010-11 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 1003a and 1003g 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 the regional curriculum conferences.
•Pocket PASS printed for the state standards: Priority Academic Student Skills
•Parent's Guide to PASS
•Special Education training on co-teaching and other special education initiatives.
•Building Academic Vocabulary training.
•Master Teacher's
•Math Academies
•Math/Science Partnerships
•Adolescent Literacy Conference

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	28,071
Applied to transfer	735
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	640
Comments:	

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	$ 1,392,395

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	23

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:

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	11,848
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,780
Received supplemental educational services	2,945
Comments:	

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	$ 3,087,719
Comments:	

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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	149,938	149,313	99.6	625	0.4
All elementary classes	61,117	60,949	99.7	168	0.3
All secondary classes	88,821	88,364	99.5	457	0.5

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.	Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary self contained classes are generally reported as one class except in instances where students go to another classroom for instruction such as music or art.

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	64.5
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	35.6
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	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)	76.9
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	23.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	17,874	17,809	99.6
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	15,894	15,856	99.8
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	13,637	13,535	99.3
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	35,377	35,227	99.6

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	82.9	56.8
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	73.8	45.9
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	

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/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the underlined 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	39,648
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the underlined 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.	35,275
Comments:	

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	33,090
Cherokee	1,117
Vietnamese	942
Hmong	526
Chinese	390

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	38,058
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	431
Total	38,489
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	4,528
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	11.9
Comments:	

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	34,608
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	375
Total	34,983
Comments:	
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 AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ 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.	2,861

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) =** State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **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.
3. **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.
4. **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	15,079	47.5	19,238	60.00
Attained proficiency	4,447	12.8	5,588	16.00
Comments:				

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:	

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)
None
Comments:

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)
None
Comments:

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)
None
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP 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.

<u>**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**</u>

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
4,125	4,081	8,206
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 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.

<u>**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**</u>

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
6,669	4,886	73.3	1,783
Comments:			

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,216	4,781	66.3	2,435
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP(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 monitored former LEP 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.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,476	2,149	86.8	327
Comments:			

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	27
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	42
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	42
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	92
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2009-10 and 2010-11)	5
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	5
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)	14

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: 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 55. 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 all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments:	

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 or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled =** Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program =** Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who 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
4,713	2,255	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 education 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 µLanguage 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.	676
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	313

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 1.6.1.1 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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	69	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	63	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	43	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	44	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	52	
Other (Explain in comment box)	17	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	77	15,125
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	53	1,420
PD provided to principals	71	699
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	62	456
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	60	1,750
PD provided to community based organization personnel	13	89
Total		19,539

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A total for the # Subgrantees column would provide a duplicated total of subgrantees; therefore, an accurate number cannot be entered. District-level professional development focused on the targeted needs of staff, students, and parents. School districts began to realize the benefits of data analysis using their English language proficiency assessment after attending a statewide ELL Data Digging Workshop and replicated this practice within their school sites and districts. School districts have also extended professional learning communities to their staff working with ELL students and to the study of professional development literature geared toward instruction, compliance, accommodations, and techniques. In addition, school districts often attend workshops or webinars about software or online learning resources for ELLs.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

<u>Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:</u>

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 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/15/10	10/26/10	104
Comments:		

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 Bilingual Education/Title III Office sends a preliminary estimate of funds to all districts in Oklahoma before the Federal Grant Application process begins. School districts start applying for their federal grants through the consolidated application process before the school year ends in May. Applications are then due at the end of June. In order to comply with this deadline, districts may complete a
budget and justification with an estimate of funds. Because a final notice of funds is not received until July 1 or after, the state does not know what the per student allocation will be but may estimate based on the district's previous year's allocation. There is never a true delay in funding to the districts. Funding is available to the districts as soon as it is made available to the state.
The state of Oklahoma has also initiated the adoption of an online grants management system, which will promote a speedy distribution of Title III funds, approval of Title III budgets, and review of Title III plans. The state's new online grant's management system will be in use for FY2013 Title III funds.

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:	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	80.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	75.0
Hispanic	73.0
White, non-Hispanic	84.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	83.6
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	81.4
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
Comments: Blank values should be zero. Oklahoma does not collect graduation rate data for LEP, Migrant, Male, and Female students. Oklahoma is preparing to calculate graduation rates for LEP, Migrant, males and females. The state is working to obtain the necessary data in the longitudinal data system. Oklahoma applied for a USDE waiver. The target date to obtain data is 2012-13.	

FAQs on graduation rates:

a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
   - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
   - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
   - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	2.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3.3
Hispanic	3.5
White, non-Hispanic	2.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2.9
Limited English proficient	5.4
Economically disadvantaged	3.0
Migratory students	0.0
Male	2.6
Female	2.2
Comments: No district reported migrant dropouts.	

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

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	512	354
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	522	364
Comments: All districts that received a grant reported data. However, all districts in the state did not report data. The districts were given a window of four weeks to complete the state report. Districts were contacted by telephone and email at a minimum of three times. The Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) required the data to be submitted in a timely manner in order to meet our state's deadline. The OSDE does not have specific consequences for districts that do not submit the information.		

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 <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	694	398
K	1,002	688
1	1,003	664
2	864	589
3	859	612
4	740	547
5	700	493
6	703	536
7	687	487
8	589	453
9	693	429
10	662	341
11	636	310
12	645	381
Ungraded	2	43
Total	10,479	6,971

Comments: 1.9.1.2 includes children counted as "Under 3" (12 Homeless Children/Youth . . . without subgrants) and "Out of School" (8 Homeless . . . with subgrants). Since these are not included in 1.9.1.1, these totals will not match.

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	1,103	1,342
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	305	5,179
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	8,159	243
Hotels/Motels	924	215
Total	10,491	6,979

Comments: 1.9.1.2 includes children counted as "Under 3" (12 Homeless Children/Youth . . . without subgrants) and "Out of School" (8 Homeless . . . with subgrants). Since these are not included in 1.9.1.1, these totals will not match.

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 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	398
K	688
1	664
2	589
3	612
4	547
5	493
6	536
7	487
8	453
9	429
10	341
11	310
12	381
Ungraded	43
Total	6,971
Comments:	

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 youth	829
Migratory children/youth	57
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	902
Limited English proficient students	584
Comments:	

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	652	326
4	676	338
5	840	420
6	708	354
7	680	340
8	580	290
High School	60	30
Comments: Data pulled from the assessment office differs from data gathered through the Homeless Education portion of the CSPR because not all districts reported in for the CSPR. The data given here is a more accurate picture.		

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	412	206
4	432	216
5	652	326
6	780	390
7	760	380
8	552	276
High School	180	90
Comments: Data pulled from the assessment office differs from data gathered through the Homeless Education portion of the CSPR because not all districts reported in for the CSPR. The data given here is a more accurate picture.		

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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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 <u>not</u> 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)	69
K	53
1	58
2	54
3	49
4	55
5	60
6	77
7	64
8	43
9	53
10	41
11	34
12	46
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	21
Total	777
Comments:	

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 has stabilized for the 2010-2011 school year. The increase was only thirteen students. These reported numbers are accurate for the requested period.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u> that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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 <u>not</u> 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	7
1	7
2	6
3	12
4	8
5	8
6	11
7	7
8	3
9	0
10	1
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	70
Comments:	

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.

There was an increase in the Category 2 Child Count for the 2010-2011 reporting period attributable to more migrant districts offering migrant-funded summer programs. The reported numbers are accurate for the requested period.

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 Category 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.

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 guardian either face-to-face or home visits. MEP/LEA staff update existing COEs through a verification process such as one-on-one interviews and home visits. Results of interviews are recorded on COEs.

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 COEs are entered into MIS2000 at the State level by the migrant education coordinator.

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 COEs and COE update 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 COEs are updated with eligibility information. All changes and updates are sent to the Oklahoma State Department of Education. Oklahoma has maintained a database system through MIS2000. All migrant sites submit hard copies of COEs and COE update forms via United States Postal Service to the Oklahoma State Department of Education were data is verified to be accurate. Based on conversations during home visits, the COEs are updated with eligibility information. All changes and updates are sent to the Oklahoma State Department of Education.

The MIS 2000 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 3-31-11.

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 Rodriquez might be Redriguez 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 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 9-1-10 to 8-31-11.

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 MIS2000 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) requires 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 COEs and COE updates are signed by the school district migrant recruiter, certifying all of the information provided on the COE is true and correct to the best of his or her knowledge. The recruiter's supervisor then reviews the COEs and signs them before submitting them, in paper form, to the SEA. If a recruiter has an eligibility question or issue, he or she is instructed to contact the Migrant Education Office for resolving the problem or question.

At the State level:
The OSDE trains all new 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 two 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. Each site was notified about the revised manual.

All COEs and COE updates submitted to the OSDE are reviewed for accuracy and eligibility by the state migrant education coordinator and migrant education program specialist (a position vacant since October) 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 a question, the question is referred to the 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.

Incomplete or questionable 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 Rodriquez 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 the migrant education coordinator at the state office, reviewed by the migrant education specialist (a position vacant since October), 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 COEs through re-interviews, on-site school monitoring visits, and provision of enrollment procedures to summer school personnel. Random checks of 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. 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. The OSDE encourages school districts to provide specialized in-service trainings to paraprofessionals and teachers at LEAs. School districts are also required to notify the OSDE when a change in migrant recruiters 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 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 Coordinator 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 COE is completed and it is noted on the form whether or not the household retains eligibility. Upon receipt of the 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. The migrant education coordinator 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. COEs are compared to the student lists for accuracy of all information. 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 COEs are reviewed by staff for accuracy and eligibility determination. This consists of checking the following information: QAD date, 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 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 coordinator and the migrant education director review all of the COEs and all of the data has been entered into the database. The coordinator and the director also review all of the counts. 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 videoconferences, 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.