

Changes to the 2007-08 and 2008-09 Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR): 9 New Questions, 33 Technical Amendments, 12 Deleted Questions

Question Number	Subject	Type of Amendment	Justification
Part I			
1.1.1	Academic Content Standards	Technical Amendment	Clarification of the question to outline changes of content standards since approval by the Department.
1.1.2	Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/language arts	Technical Amendment	Combines question 1.1.3 regarding changes to academic achievement standards with question 1.1.2 changes to assessments.
1.1.3	Academic Achievement standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts	Deleted Question	Combined with 1.1.2
1.1.4	Assessments in Science	Technical Amendment	Combines question 1.1.3 regarding changes to academic achievement standards with question 1.1.2 changes to assessments.
1.1.5	Academic Achievement standards in Science	Deleted Question	Combined with 1.1.4
1.4.4.1	List of Title I schools identified for improvement	Technical Amendment	Required flag for Title I status (actively affirm Title I status of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring)
1.4.4.3	School Corrective Action Interventions	Technical Amendment	Clarifications to the question based on feedback from the 2006-07 data collection. On the SY 2006-07 CSPR, several States appear to have misinterpreted the year for which data are requested.
1.4.4.4	School Restructuring Interventions	Technical Amendment	Clarifications to the question based on feedback from the 2006-07 data collection. On the SY 2006-07 CSPR, several States appear to have misinterpreted the year for which data are requested.
1.4.5.3	District Corrective Actions	Technical Amendment	Clarifications to the question based on feedback from the 2006-07 data collection. On the SY 2006-07 CSPR, several States appear to have misinterpreted the year for which data are requested.
1.4.5.1	List of Districts Identified for Improvement	Technical Amendment	Required flag for Title I status (actively affirm Title I status of district identified for improvement or corrective action).
1.4.8	Interventions provides as part of School Improvement Grants	Deleted Question	Deleted since the 1003(g) applications submitted by SEAs captured similar information to these items. Question 1-4-8 will new replaced by six new items related to the School Improvement Grants funded under section 1003(g) of ESEA for the first time in FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) and subgrants funded under section 1003(a) of ESEA.

1.4.8.1	Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds in SY 2007-08	New Question	<p>(1) As part of obtaining emergency OMB approval of the School Improvement Grant applications under the Paperwork Reduction Act, ED indicated that it would collect the information on the following topics listed below:</p> <p>A. Number and percentage of students who are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics in schools that received technical assistance through the statewide system of support and whether that number and percentage increased from the prior year as measured by State assessments .</p> <p>B. Number and percentage of students who are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics in schools that received School Improvement Funds as a result of subgrants to LEAs and whether that number and percentage increased from the prior year as measured by State assessments.</p> <p>C. The number of schools that received technical assistance through the statewide system of support that— make adequate yearly progress; ii. exit improvement status.</p> <p>D. The number of schools that received School Improvement Funds that— make adequate yearly progress;exit improvement status.</p>
1.4.8.2	School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance	New Question	E. Evidence that SEAs, LEAs, and schools used data to make decisions about the use of School Improvement Funds
1.4.8.3	Effective School Improvement Strategies	New Question	F. Evidence indicating those school improvement strategies that were effective in contributing to increased student achievement; adequate yearly progress; and exiting improvement status.
1.4.8.4	Sharing of Effective Strategies	New Question	G. The amount of funds allocated under section 1003(g) and 1003(a) to each LEA and school.
1.4.8.5	Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance	New Question	<p>(2) SASA monitoring teams and other ED officials will use these data to ensure that SEAs, LEAs, and schools implement the school improvement activities in accordance with ESEA, the Title I Regulations, and the SEA applications that were approved by ED. §80.40(e) of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations permits ED to make site visits, such as for monitoring, as warranted by program needs.</p>
1.4.5.1	Section 1003(a) State Reservations	New Question	
1.4.5.2	Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools	New Question	
1.4.6	Dates of AYP and Identification	Deleted Question	
1.4.9.1.1	Schools with students eligible for public school choice	Deleted Question	
1.4.9.1.2	Public School Choice - Students	Technical Amendment	Data collected are not useful to program offices, OGC does not believe that the data are required by the statute.
1.4.9.2.1	Schools with students eligible for supplemental educational services	Deleted Question	Clarification to the directions
			Data collected are not useful to program offices, OGC does not believe that the data are required by the statute.

1.4.9.2.2	Supplemental Educational Services - Students	Technical Amendment	Clarifications to the table
1.6.1	Language Instruction Educational Programs	Technical Amendment (Deletion of portions of question)	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity; No longer collecting # of programs or % language of instruction in English v. other languages
1.6.2	Number of ALL LEP students	New Question (substantial revision of previous question)	Number of All LEP students in the states
1.6.2.1	Number of LEP students who received Title III language instruction educational programs services	Technical Amendment	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity
1.6.2.2	Most Commonly spoken Languages in the State	Technical Amendment	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity
1.6.3.1.1	ALL LEP student Participation in English Language Proficiency Assessments	New Question (substantial revision of previous question)	Required by section 1111(h)(4)(D) and section 3121(b)(1)
1.6.3.1.2	ALL LEP student English Language Proficiency Performance	New Question (substantial revision of previous question)	Required by section 1111(h)(4)(D) and section 3121(b)(1)
1.6.3.2.1	Title III LEP student Participation in English Language Proficiency Assessments	New Question (substantial revision of previous question)	Required by section 1111(h)(4)(D) and section 3121(b)(1)
1.6.3.2.2	Title III LEP student English Language Proficiency Performance	New Question (substantial revision of previous question)	Removed collection of number and percent of students making no progress
1.6.4.3.1	LEP Subgroup Flexibility	Deleted Question	Duplicate collection; Collected through State Consolidated Accountability Workbooks

1.6.4.3.3	Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP)	Deleted Question	Unnecessary breakdown of monitored former LEP by AYP grades
1.6.3.4.4	LEP students in Non-AYP grades	Deleted Question	Unnecessary breakdown of monitored former LEP by untested grade levels
1.6.3.5.1	LEP Students Assess in Native Language	New Question (substantial revision of previous question)	Divided question to ask separately regarding native language versions of (1) reading/language arts, (2) mathematics, (3) science assessments
1.6.3.5.2	Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given	Technical Amendment	Removed collection of native language assessments by grade level
1.6.3.5.3	Native Language of Reading/Language arts Tests Given	Technical Amendment	Removed collection of native language assessments by grade level
1.6.3.5.4	Native Language of science Tests Given	New Question	Science assessments required for the first time in the 2007-08 school year.
1.6.3.5.4	Native Language Versions of State NCLB Mathematic Assessment Results	Deleted Question	Not required
1.6.3.5.5	Native Language Versions of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results	Deleted Question	Not Required
1.6.3.6.1	Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored	Technical Amendment	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity
1.6.3.6.2	Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics	Technical Amendment	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity
1.6.3.6.2	Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts	Technical Amendment	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity
1.6.4.1	Title III Subgrantee Performance	Technical Amendment (and Deletion)	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity; Deletion of number of subgrantees meeting 1, 2, or 3 AMAOs
1.6.4.2	State Accountability	Technical Amendment	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity

Termination of Title

1.6.4.3	Ill language Instruction Educational Programs	Technical Amendment	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity
1.6.5.1	Education programs and activities for Immigrant Students	Technical Amendment	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity
1.6.5.2	Distribution of Immigrant Funds	Deleted Question	Not required
1.6.6.1	Teacher Information	Technical Amendment; Deleted Question	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity; Deletion of #of certified
1.6.6.2	Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP students	Technical Amendment	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity
1.8.1	Graduation Rates	Technical Amendment	Include comment box on the Word version of the CSPR
Part II			
2.1.1- 2.1.1.4	Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide and Targeted Assistance Schools	Technical Amendment	Slight change to wording to make consistent with section 1.3 (student performance): # Students Who Completed the Assessment & For Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned"
2.2.1	Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants	Technical Amendment	Update to school year
2.2.1.2	Even Start Families Participating During the Year	Technical Amendment	Text changes have been made to improve consistency of data collected. Additional directions on how to calculate the age of children were added. The terms "preschool" and "school-age" were deleted before the age categories as they were unnecessary and caused confusion. Finally, the category "above age-eight" was added to collect data on children above age eight served by Even Start since programs are serving eligible children in this age group.
2.2.1.3	Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment	Technical Amendment	Clarifying text was added at the request of state coordinators to improve data collection

2.2.1.4	Retention of Families	Technical Amendment	Clarifying text was added above the table to improve directions for completing the data set to improve data collection. Within the data table, the definitions for the categories are now defined in terms of “days of enrollment” rather than “months of participation” which caused confusion (for example, families serving six months could be counted in either item 2 or 3). The new terminology more accurately reflects how states have been collecting data and makes data collection easier for local programs. Also, the language in the current form does not allow for the reporting of families enrolled for 180 or 365 days.
2.2.2	Federal Even Start Performance Indicators	Technical Amendment	Clarifying test was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.
2.2.2.1	Adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	Technical amendment	Clarifying test was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.
2.2.2.2	Limited English proficient adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	Technical Amendment	Clarifying text was added at the request of state coordinators to improve data collection. A second “other” category was added as programs serving English Language Learners often give more than one assessment in addition to and/or instead of the BEST and CASAS and need additional rows on which to report data. The TABE was removed as this assessment does not exist in languages other than English.
2.2.2.3	Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED		Clarifying test was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.
2.2.2.4	Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development	Technical amendment	Clarifying text was added at the request of state coordinators to improve data collection. Rows for reporting the PPVT-IV (the updated version of the PPVT) and the TVIP (the Spanish version of the PPVT) were added at the request of state coordinators with programs using those measures.
2.2.2.5	Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten who demonstrate age-appropriate oral language skills	New Question	While this is not a question that appears on the current CSPP form, it is asking for data already being collected to be reported by programs and state coordinators as required by OMB. The addition of this data field makes Even Start early childhood outcome data more consistent with other programs serving a similar population (for example, Early Reading First) and does not increase the data collection burden on either States or local grantees. A row for reporting data on the PPVT-IV has been added as that measure has been updated and some programs are moving to the new version this year.
2.2.2.6	Average number of letters children can identify as measured by the PALs Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask	Technical Amendment	Clarifying test was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.
2.2.2.7	School-age children reading on grade level	Technical Amendment	Clarifying test was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.

2.2.2.8	Parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities	Technical amendment	Clarifying test was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.
---------	---	---------------------	---

33
12
9

n Number	Subject	Justification
SY2008-09 CSPR Technical Amendments		
Deleted Items		
2.2.2	Federal Even Start Performance Indicators	Removed
Modified Questions: No Substantive Change		
1.1.1	Academic Content Standards	Response limited to 4000 instead of 8000 characters.
1.1.4	Assessment in Science	Response limited to 4000 instead of 8000 characters.
1.2.1	Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment	Clarification to question.
1.2.2	Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment	Clarification to question.
1.2.4	Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment	Clarification to question.
1.2.6	Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment	Clarification to question.
1.3.1	Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics	Clarification to question.
1.3.2	Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts	Clarification to question.
1.4.4.1	List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement	Instructions bulleted to provide clarity to question.

n Number	Subject	Justification
1.4.5.1	List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement	Instructions bulleted to provide clarity to question.
1.4.8.1	Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Sections 10003(a) and 1003(g) Funds	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity.
1.4.8.2	School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity.
1.4.8.3	Effective School Improvement Strategies	Clarification to question and the question in the table.
1.4.9.1.2	Public School Choice - Students	Clarification to Instructions.
1.4.9.1.4	Availability of Public School Choice Options	Clarification to question
1.4.9.2.2	Supplemental Educational Services - Students	Clarification to the definition of students who receive supplemental services.
1.5.1	Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who are Highly Qualified	Chart column and row headings changed to provide greater clarity to the collection. FAQ added to provide clarity about the reporting period.
1.5.2	Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified	1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes and 1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes added as table headings.
1.6.2.1	Number of All LEP Students in the State	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity.

n Number	Subject	Justification
1.6.3	Student Performance	Citation changed in instructions to better align with the statute.
1.6.3.1.1	All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment	Title corrected from "Participation" to "Tested."
1.6.3.2.1	Title III LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment	Instructions/Table change for greater clarity. Title changed to include "state annual" and "assessment."
1.6.3.2.2	Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results	Clarification to instructions and added language to better align the instructions.
1.6.4.1	Title III Subgrantee Performance	Instructions and text box added.
1.9.2.2	Subgroups of Homeless Students Served	Title changed from Subpopulations to subgroups.
2.1.1.4	Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)	Clarification to instructions.
2.2.1.2	Even Start Families Participating During the Year	Clarification to instructions and table.
2.2.1.4	Retention of Families	Clarification to instructions and table.
2.2.2.1	Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading Achievement	Revised instructions to provide greater clarity.
2.2.2.2	Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading	Column headings changed for ease of flow and consistency
2.2.2.4	Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development	Slight change to wording to provide greater clarity to instructions.

n Number	Subject	Justification
2.2.2.4.1	Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age- Appropriate Oral Language Skills	Slight change to wording to provide greater clarity to instructions. Note added to instructions for clarity.
2.2.2.5	The Average Number of Letters Children Can Identify as Measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask	Wording changes to the terms to provide greater clarity to instructions.
2.3.2.3.1	Reading/Language Arts Participation	Removed "ungraded" as a category to provide greater clarity to the table.
2.3.2.3.2	Mathematics Participation	Removed "ungraded" as a category to provide greater clarity to the table.
2.3.3.2	MEP Participation - Summer/Intersession Term	Slight change in wording to provide clarity to instructions.

n Number	Subject
Items	
1.1.3	Academic Achievement standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts
1.1.5	Academic Achievement standards in Science
1.4.4.2	Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement
1.4.6	Dates of AYP and Identification
1.4.9.1.1	Schools with students eligible for public school choice
1.4.9.2.1	Schools with students eligible for supplemental educational services
1.6.3.4.4	LEP students in Non-AYP grades
1.6.3.5.4	Native Language Versions of State NCLB Mathematic Assessment Results
1.6.3.5.5	Native Language Versions of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results
1.6.4.3.1	LEP Subgroup Flexibility
1.6.3.4.3	Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP)
1.6.5.2	Distribution of Immigrant Funds
Subst	
1.1.1	Academic Content Standards
1.1.2	Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/language arts
1.1.4	Assessments in Science

1.3.2	Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts
1.4.4.1	List of Title I schools identified for improvement
1.4.4.3	School Corrective Action Interventions
1.4.4.4	School Restructuring Interventions
1.4.5.3	District Corrective Actions
1.4.5.1	List of Districts Identified for Improvement
1.4.9.1.2	Public School Choice - Students
1.4.9.2.2	Supplemental Educational Services - Students
1.6.1	Language Instruction Educational Programs
1.6.2.2	Number of LEP students who received Title III language instruction educational programs services
1.6.2.3	Most Commonly spoken Languages in the State
1.6.3.5.2	Native Language of Mathematics texts Given
1.6.3.5.3	Native Language of Reading/Language arts texts Given
1.6.3.6.1	Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored
1.6.3.6.2	Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics
1.6.3.6.3	Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts
1.6.4.1	Title III Subgrantee Performance

1.6.4.2	State Accountability
1.6.4.3	Termination of Title III language Instruction Educational Programs
1.6.5.1	Education programs and activities for Immigrant Students
1.6.6.1	Teacher Information
1.6.6.2	Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP students
1.8.1	Graduation Rates
2.1.1-2.1.1.4	Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide and Targeted Assistance Schools
2.2.1	Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants
2.2.1.2	Even Start Families Participating During the Year
2.2.1.3	Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment
2.2.1.4	Retention of Families
2.2.2	Federal Even Start Performance Indicators
2.2.2.1	Adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading
2.2.2.2	Limited English proficient adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading

2.2.2.3	Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED
2.2.2.4	Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development
2.2.2.6	Average number of letters children can identify as measured by the PALs Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask
2.2.2.7	School-age children reading on grade level
2.2.2.8	Parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities

**antial
ly**

1.2.5	Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment
1.2.6	Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assesment
1.3.3	Student Academic Achievement in Science
1.4.8.1	Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds in SY 2007-08

1.4.8.2	School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance
1.4.8.3	Effective School Improvement Strategies
1.4.8.4	Sharing of Effective Strategies
1.4.8.5	Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance
1.4.8.5.1	Section 1003(a) State Reservations
1.4.8.5.2	Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools
1.4.8.5.3	Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance
1.4.8.7	Improvement* Supported by Funds Other than Those of Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g)
1.6.2.1	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State
1.6.3.1.1	ALL LEP student Participation in English Language Proficiency Assessments
1.6.3.1.2	ALL LEP student English Language Proficiency Performance
1.6.3.2.1	Title III LEP student Participation in English Language Proficiency Assessments
1.6.3.2.2	Title III LEP student English Language Proficiency Performance
1.6.3.5.1	LEP Students Assess in Native Language
1.6.3.5.4	Native Language of Science Tests Given
1.6.3.6.4	LEP Performance on Science Assesmentments
Part II	
2.2.2.5	Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten who demonstrate age-appropriate oral language skills

Part II

Justification

Combined with 1.1.2

Combined with 1.1.4

duplicate collection

while this information is important to ED, ED both needs, and collects most of this information earlier through means other than the CSPR. CSPR data are submitted in December for the previous school year and generally not available to staff until the following February. ED staff generally collects and uses this data in Aug. - Oct. for the previous school year, therefore these data collected through the CSPR are less useful.

Data collected are not useful to program offices, OGC does not believe that the data are required by the statute.

Data collected are not useful to program offices, OGC does not believe that the data are required by the statute.

Unnecessary breakdown of monitored former LEP by untexted grade levels

Not required

Not Required

Duplicate collection; Collected through State Consolidated Accountability Workbooks

Unnecessary breakdown of monitored former LEP by AYP grades

Not required

Clarification of the question to outline changes of content standards since approval by the Department.

Combines question 1.1.3 regarding changes to academic achievement standards with question 1.1.2 changes to assessments.

Combines question 1.1.3 regarding changes to academic achievement standards with question 1.1.2 changes to assessments.

Required flag for Title I status (actively affirm Title I status of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring)

Clarifications to the question based on feedback from the 2006-07 data collection. On the SY 2006-07 CSPR, several States appear to have misinterpreted the year for which data are requested.

Clarifications to the question based on feedback from the 2006-07 data collection. On the SY 2006-07 CSPR, several States appear to have misinterpreted the year for which data are requested.

Clarifications to the question based on feedback from the 2006-07 data collection. On the SY 2006-07 CSPR, several States appear to have misinterpreted the year for which data are requested.

Required flag for Title I status (actively affirm Title I status of district identified for improvement or corrective action).

Clarification to the directions

Clarifications to the table

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity; deleted of portions of question (No longer collecting # of programs or % language of instruction in English v. other languages).

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity. Previously number 1.6.2.1

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity. Previously number 1.6.2.2

Removed collection of native language assessments by grade level

Removed collection of native language assessments by grade level

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity; Deletion of number of subgrantees meeting 1, 2, or 3 AMAOs

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity; Deletion of #of certified

Revised instructions to provide greater clarity

Include comment box on the Word version of the CSPR

Slight change to wording to make consistent with section 1.3 (student performance): # Students Who Completed the Assessment & For Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned”

Update to school year

Text changes have been made to improve consistency of data collected. Additional directions on how to calculate the age of children were added. The terms “preschool” and “school-age” were deleted before the age categories as they were unnecessary and caused confusion. Finally, the category “above age-eight” was added to collect data on children above age eight served by Even Start since programs are serving eligible children in this age group.

Clarifying text was added at the request of state coordinators to improve data collection

Clarifying text was added above the table to improve directions for completing the data set to improve data collection. Within the data table, the definitions for the categories are now defined in terms of “days of enrollment” rather than “months of participation” which caused confusion (for example, families serving six months could be counted in either item 2 or 3). The new terminology more accurately reflects how states have been collecting data and makes data collection easier for local programs. Also, the language in the current form does not allow for the reporting of families enrolled for 180 or 365 days.

Clarifying text was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.

Clarifying text was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.

Clarifying text was added at the request of state coordinators to improve data collection. A second “other” category was added as programs serving English Language Learners often give more than one assessment in addition to and/or instead of the BEST and CASAS and need additional rows on which to report data. The TABLE was removed as this assessment does not exist in languages other than English.

Clarifying text was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.

Clarifying text was added at the request of state coordinators to improve data collection. Rows for reporting the PPVT-IV (the updated version of the PPVT) and the TVIP (the Spanish version of the PPVT) were added at the request of state coordinators with programs using those measures.

Clarifying text was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.

Clarifying text was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.

Clarifying text was added at the request of state data coordinators to improve data collection.

Science assessments required for the first time in the 2007-08 school year. Math and reading are collected in December, whereas science is collected in February.

Science assessments required for the first time in the 2007-08 school year. Math and reading are collected in December, whereas science is collected in February.

Science assessments required for the first time in the 2007-08 school year. Math and reading are collected in December, whereas science is collected in February.

(1) As part of obtaining emergency OMB approval of the School Improvement Grant applications under the Paperwork Reduction Act, ED indicated that it would collect the information on the following topics listed below:

- A. Number and percentage of students who are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics in schools that received technical assistance through the statewide system of support and whether that number and percentage increased from the prior year as measured by State assessments .
 - B. Number and percentage of students who are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics in schools that received School Improvement Funds as a result of subgrants to LEAs and whether that number and percentage increased from the prior year as measured by State assessments.
 - C. The number of schools that received technical assistance through the statewide system of support that— make adequate yearly progress; ii. exit improvement status.
 - D. The number of schools that received School Improvement Funds that— make adequate yearly progress;exit improvement status.
-

E. Evidence that SEAs, LEAs, and schools used data to make decisions about the use of School Improvement Funds
F. Evidence indicating those school improvement strategies that were effective in contributing to increased student achievement: adequate yearly progress: and exiting improvement status.

Substantial revision of previous question. Required by section 1111(b)(7)

Substantial revision of previous question. Required by section 1111(h)(4)(D) and section 3121(b)(1)

Substantial revision of previous question. Required by section 1111(h)(4)(D) and section 3121(b)(1)

Substantial revision of previous question) Required by section 1111(h)(4)(D) and section 3121(b)(1)

Substantial revision of previous question. Removed collection of number and percent of students making no progress

Substantial revision of previous question. Divided question (into 1.6.3.5.1 & 1.6.3.5.2.) to ask separately regarding native language versions of (1) reading/language arts, (2) mathematics

Adds question on native language versions of science assessments to meet science reporting requirements effective for the SY 2007-08.

Adds question on LEP performance on Science assessments to meet science reporting requirements effective for the SY 2007-08.

While this is not a question that appears on the current CSPP form, it is asking for data already being collected to be reported by programs and state coordinators as required by OMB. The addition of this data field makes Even Start early childhood outcome data more consistent with other programs serving a similar population (for example, Early Reading First) and does not increase the data collection burden on either States or local grantees. A row for reporting data on the PPVT-IV has been added as that measure has been updated and some programs are moving to the new version this year.
