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

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

<div align="center">

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

</div>

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:
Puerto Rico Department of Education

Address:
PO Box 190759
San Juan, P.R. 00919

<div align="center">Person to contact about this report:</div>

Name: Damaris L. Matos-Carrillo

Telephone: 787-773-4073

Fax: 787-751-2874

e-mail: matos_da@de.pr.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Edward Moreno-Alonso, Ed.D.

_____   _Friday, March 9, 2012, 5:30:12 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 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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 <u>not</u> made or is <u>not</u> 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.

No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned.

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.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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)	No
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	Yes
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	No
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	No
Other	No
Comments:	

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	259,662	257,341	99.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	258,833	256,609	99.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	239	237	99.2
Two or more races	353	345	97.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	60,303	59,666	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,645	1,621	98.5
Economically disadvantaged students	185,688	184,189	99.2
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	132,909	131,594	99.0
Female	126,753	125,747	99.2
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant Program.			

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	8,590	14.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	48,853	81.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,223	3.7
Total	59,666	
Comments:		

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	259,637	257,057	99.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	258,867	256,327	99.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	239	235	98.3
Two or more races	353	346	98.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	60,297	59,616	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,645	1,613	98.1
Economically disadvantaged students	185,677	183,993	99.1
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	132,898	131,454	98.9
Female	126,739	125,603	99.1
Comments: Therefore, the number of students reported as participants in N/X081 will be higher than the number of students reported with results in N/X078 by exactly the number of LEP students who have been in the U.S. less than 12 month and who took the ELP in lieu of the reading/ language arts assessment. Puerto Rico has no Migrant Program.			

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	8,573	14.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	48,710	81.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,222	3.7
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	111	0.2
Total	59,616	
Comments: Therefore, the number of students reported as participants in N/X081 will be higher than the number of students reported with results in N/X078 by exactly the number of LEP students who have been in the U.S. less than 12 month and who took the ELP in lieu of the reading/ language arts assessment.		

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	106,856	104,800	98.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	106,489	104,462	98.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	106	103	97.2
Two or more races	149	145	97.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	22,753	22,222	97.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	589	570	96.8
Economically disadvantaged students	72,882	71,582	98.2
Migratory students	0	0	
Male	53,967	52,885	98.0
Female	52,889	51,915	98.2
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant Program.			

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	3,287	14.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	18,038	81.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	897	4.0
Total	22,222	
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	34,916	22,874	65.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	34,797	22,808	65.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	33	18	54.5
Two or more races	40	23	57.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,988	5,394	60.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	233	159	68.2
Economically disadvantaged students	26,560	17,127	64.5
Migratory students			
Male	18,273	11,884	65.0
Female	16,643	10,990	66.0
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant Program.			

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	34,771	18,625	53.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	34,660	18,573	53.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	25	11	44.0
Two or more races	40	20	50.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,951	3,956	44.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	128	55	43.0
Economically disadvantaged students	26,442	13,793	52.2
Migratory students			
Male	18,187	9,060	49.8
Female	16,584	9,565	57.7
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant Program.			

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: Non testing 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	37,732	19,671	52.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	37,649	19,632	52.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	30	18	60.0
Two or more races	41	18	43.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,673	4,159	43.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	247	141	57.1
Economically disadvantaged students	28,516	14,452	50.7
Migratory students			
Male	19,755	9,926	50.2
Female	17,977	9,745	54.2
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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	37,576	16,660	44.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	37,501	16,634	44.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	23	11	47.8
Two or more races	40	13	32.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,639	3,505	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	147	53	36.1
Economically disadvantaged students	28,407	12,224	43.0
Migratory students			
Male	19,671	7,968	40.5
Female	17,905	8,692	48.5
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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	37,514	25,642	68.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	37,431	25,592	68.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	29	17	58.6
Two or more races	42	26	61.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,598	5,636	58.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	246	147	59.8
Economically disadvantaged students	28,353	19,073	67.3
Migratory students			
Male	19,638	12,858	65.5
Female	17,876	12,784	71.5
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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	37,731	15,083	40.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	37,640	15,051	40.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	35	10	28.6
Two or more races	50	17	34.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,254	2,673	28.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	247	97	39.3
Economically disadvantaged students	28,084	10,822	38.5
Migratory students			
Male	19,376	7,389	38.1
Female	18,355	7,694	41.9
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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	37,588	16,680	44.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	37,511	16,652	44.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	26	8	30.8
Two or more races	46	16	34.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,224	2,887	31.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	129	49	38.0
Economically disadvantaged students	27,981	11,906	42.6
Migratory students			
Male	19,305	7,576	39.2
Female	18,283	9,104	49.8
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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			
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: Non testing grade			

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	38,019	3,978	10.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	37,933	3,969	10.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	31	2	6.5
Two or more races	54	7	13.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,169	730	8.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	263	28	10.6
Economically disadvantaged students	27,780	2,837	10.2
Migratory students			
Male	19,357	1,892	9.8
Female	18,662	2,086	11.2
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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	37,866	18,311	48.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	37,788	18,274	48.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	27	13	48.1
Two or more races	51	24	47.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,147	2,975	32.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	156	57	36.5
Economically disadvantaged students	27,675	12,978	46.9
Migratory students			
Male	19,273	8,081	41.9
Female	18,593	10,230	55.0
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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: Non testing grade			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,124	2,800	6.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	41,030	2,793	6.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	33	0	
Two or more races	56	6	10.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,847	433	4.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	299	26	8.7
Economically disadvantaged students	29,658	1,929	6.5
Migratory students			
Male	21,331	1,315	6.2
Female	19,793	1,485	7.5
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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	40,989	15,343	37.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	40,897	15,308	37.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	33	11	33.3
Two or more races	54	21	38.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,815	1,924	19.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	188	40	21.3
Economically disadvantaged students	29,576	10,390	35.1
Migratory students			
Male	21,262	6,087	28.6
Female	19,727	9,256	46.9
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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: Non testing grade			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	37,650	3,285	8.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	37,548	3,275	8.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	40	3	7.5
Two or more races	59	7	11.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,101	460	5.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	236	15	6.4
Economically disadvantaged students	25,919	2,156	8.3
Migratory students			
Male	18,887	1,521	8.1
Female	18,763	1,764	9.4
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant Program.			

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	37,508	16,959	45.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	37,413	16,916	45.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	36	15	41.7
Two or more races	56	27	48.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,088	1,953	24.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	152	30	19.7
Economically disadvantaged students	25,814	11,146	43.2
Migratory students			
Male	18,833	6,791	36.1
Female	18,675	10,168	54.4
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant Program.			

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	37,349	9,976	26.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	37,248	9,955	26.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	39	9	23.1
Two or more races	59	11	18.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,019	1,196	14.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	230	41	17.8
Economically disadvantaged students	25,699	6,456	25.1
Migratory students			
Male	18,730	4,405	23.5
Female	18,619	5,571	29.9
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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	30,169	2,388	7.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	30,012	2,379	7.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	35	3	8.6
Two or more races	45	4	8.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,634	180	3.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	96	9	9.4
Economically disadvantaged students	17,672	1,274	7.2
Migratory students			
Male	14,615	1,085	7.4
Female	15,554	1,303	8.4
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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	30,116	11,306	37.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	29,963	11,272	37.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	34	9	26.5
Two or more races	42	8	19.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,641	637	13.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	70	10	14.3
Economically disadvantaged students	17,647	6,132	34.7
Migratory students			
Male	14,592	4,271	29.3
Female	15,524	7,035	45.3
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant program.			

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	29,937	13,884	46.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	
Asian	0	0	
Black or African American	0	0	
Hispanic or Latino	29,783	13,821	46.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	
White	35	23	65.7
Two or more races	44	17	38.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,605	997	21.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	94	23	24.5
Economically disadvantaged students	17,530	7,621	43.5
Migratory students			
Male	14,517	6,527	45.0
Female	15,420	7,357	47.7
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant Program.			

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	1,462	156	10.7
Districts	1		
Comments: The blank cells means zero, the district did not make AYP.			

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 not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
All Title I schools	1,456	154	10.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,371	147	10.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	85	7	8.2
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
1		
Comments: The blank cells means zero, the district did not make AYP.		

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	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: During SY 2010-11, PRDE didn't collect data for the corrective actions taken at LEA level due to technical and management issues that required to be fixed. Also, an analysis of PRDE academic policies was needed to ensure the collection of the data during the SY. Steps to ensure the collection for next years, have been taken and PRDE will report the information related to this data group beginning with SY 2011-12. The PRDE recognizes that preparing Puerto Rican students for post-secondary college and career opportunities requires high quality instruction in grades K-12. Therefore, the PRDE is currently developing comprehensive curriculum documents to support improvements in student achievement across the island. In the 2010-11 school year, the PRDE developed curriculum maps in Spanish language arts, mathematics, science, and English as a Second Language for grades 4 through 8. Curriculum maps for grades K-3 and high school for all four content areas are being developed in the 2011-12 school year. The PRDE is implementing these maps in the 2011-12 school year through three coordinated activities. First, teachers and administrators in several pilot schools engaged in multi-day "boot camp" workshops in which they worked intensively with content expert facilitators. These teachers then work with coaches in their own classrooms participate in three community of practice events during the school year. These implementation activities will be scaled to include additional schools beginning in 2012.	

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)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: During SY 2010-11, PRDE didn't collect data for the restructuring actions taken at LEA level due to technical and management issues that required to be fixed. Also, an analysis of PRDE academic policies was needed to ensure the collection of the data during the SY. Steps to ensure the collection for next years, have been taken and PRDE will report the information related to this data group beginning with SY 2011-12.	

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.

The Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) is a unitary system, which acts as both the state educational agency (SEA) and the local educational system (LEA). The PRDE is made up of four administrative levels: the central level, 7 educational regions, 28 districts and 1500 elementary and secondary schools. During Summer 2010 and August 2010 School Improvement Office offered services to all districts regarding the role of a school support team based on the law requirements. Assistance was continued for content knowledge through various trainings.

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	1
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: The Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) is a unitary system, which acts as both the state educational agency (SEA) and the local educational system (LEA). The PRDE is made up of four administrative levels: the central level, 7 educational regions, 28 districts and 1500 elementary and secondary schools. The district restructuration ended with staffing and function assignment during summer/school year 2010-2011. The districts were strengthen to include subject matter facilitators that will assist schools in their specific needs. These facilitators will work as liaison with SEA Program Directors.	

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	0	0
Schools	42	1
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete	09/29/11

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 <u>percent</u> 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) <u>evaluation</u> and <u>technical assistance</u> activities that your State conducted during SY 2010-11.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) is a unitary system, which acts as both the state educational agency (SEA) and the local educational system (LEA). The PRDE is made up of four administrative levels: the central level, 7 educational regions, 28 districts and 1500 elementary and secondary schools. The school Improvement Office offered training to the district on their role as support team to the schools. The Technical Assistance Unit offered technical assistance to schools regarding the requirements based on the applications in improvement. The Monitoring Unit and School Improvement Office offered technical assistance to prepare the 1003(g) schools on the monitoring instrument. The schools were monitored based on the monitoring instrument. Support on the findings were provided by Technical Assistance Unit. A evaluation was done to assess the services provided to schools under 1003(g).

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.

Additional support through Title I was given to school to include professional development based on its particular needs as established in their PCE (10% of school funds). Title II-A, ll-D, III, and IV funds were also available to schools to provide additional trainings as determined by Program Directors.

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	436,453
Applied to transfer	0
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	0
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	$ 0

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	0

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: Puerto Rico was able to provide the service, but it was not requested.

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	346,243
Applied for supplemental educational services	125,136
Received supplemental educational services	71,487
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	$ 93,161,858
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	89,354	75,205	84.2	14,149	15.8
All elementary classes	41,360	33,415	80.8	7,945	19.2
All secondary classes	47,994	41,790	87.1	6,204	12.9

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.

In the K-3 level classes in full day self contained classroom,PRDE counted its classes by one for Spanish, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. In the English class, in K-3 it was counted by attendance group (equivalent to class). In 4-6 level classes, PRDE used a departmentalized counted in multiple times for all core subject areas.

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	73.0
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	1.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.8
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)	52.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	1.5
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	46.1
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	9,456	7,448	78.8
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	10,998	8,855	80.5
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	8,800	7,881	89.6
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	13,247	11,147	84.1

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	85.0	71.5
Poverty metric used	Free lunch program	
Secondary schools	77.2	58.8
Poverty metric used	Free 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
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual programs	
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
No	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
No	Content-based ESL	
No	Pull-out ESL	
No	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	2,994
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.	2,994
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
Haitian; Haitian Creole	74
Chinese	43
Arabic	25
Irish	11
Hawaiian	9

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Puerto Rico's language of instruction is Spanish. Therefore, instead of LEP, students are identified as limited Spanish proficiency (LSP). The number of English speakers who are LSP is 1886.

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	1,470
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,524
Total	2,994
Comments: The number of students not tested continues to be high probably due to the high mobility of the group to the United States and difficulties in the follow up of the absent students. Personnel have been contracted in order to give structure to the program and address this and other situations.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	66
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	4.5
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	1,470
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,524
Total	2,994
Comments: The number of students not tested continues to be high probably due to the high mobility of the group to the United States and difficulties in the follow up of the absent students. Personnel have been contracted in order to give structure to the program and address this and other situations.	
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.	1,057

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	309	74.8	82	21.00
Attained proficiency	66	4.5	35	9.00
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)
Comments: No native language assessments were given.

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)
Comments: No native language assessments were given.

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)
Comments: No native language assessments were given.

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.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
66		66
Comments: Puerto Rico received Title III SY 2009-10 funds in SY 2010-11 and the program was implemented in SY 2010-11. So the first year of full monitoring will be reported in SY 2011-12 (one year after the student left the program).		

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.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
Comments: Puerto Rico received Title III SY 2009-10 funds in SY 2010-11 and the program was implemented in SY 2010-11. So the first year of full monitoring will be reported in SY 2011-12 (one year after the student left the program).			

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
Comments: Puerto Rico received Title III SY 2009-10 funds in SY 2010-11 and the program was implemented in SY 2010-11. So the first year of full monitoring will be reported in SY 2011-12 (one year after the student left the program).			

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
Comments: Puerto Rico received Title III SY 2009-10 funds in SY 2010-11 and the program was implemented in SY 2010-11. So the first year of full monitoring will be reported in SY 2011-12 (one year after the student left the program).			

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	1
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	1
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2009-10 and 2010-11)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)	0

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:

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
923	138	1

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction 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.	52
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	200

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	1	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	1	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	1	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	1	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	1	
Other (Explain in comment box)	1	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	1	340
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	1	58
PD provided to principals	1	612
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	1	160
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	1	245
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	1	1,415

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

```
OTHER TOPICS DISCUSSED IN WORK SHOPS
-PROFILE OF A STUDENT WHOSE FIRST LANGUAGE IS NOT SPANISH
-SUPPORT PERSONAL'S ROLE: SPECIAL NEEDS MANUAL
-LSP IDENTIFICATION PROCESS
-SCREENER TEST
-ANNUAL ASSESSMENT TEST DISCUSION
-PR SCREENER TEST
-LSP STUDENT IDENTIFICATION ON THE SIS
-TITLE III SERVICES FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS
-HOW TO DETERMINE THE PROGRESS OF THE LSP IN THE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT TEST
-TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR TEACHERS
-TEST INSTRUCTORS
-TITLE III - LSP AND INMIGRANT PROGRAM
```

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 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
12/09/10	03/13/11	94
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.

Puerto Rico has an established procedure to ensure that the process will be the shortest.

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	7
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	97.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	100.0
Hispanic	97.6
White, non-Hispanic	90.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	98.6
Limited English proficient	100.0
Economically disadvantaged	97.2
Migratory students	0.0
Male	96.9
Female	98.2
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migratory Program.	

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	1.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0.0
Hispanic	1.3
White, non-Hispanic	0.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	0.5
Limited English proficient	0.2
Economically disadvantaged	1.2
Migratory students	
Male	0.7
Female	0.6
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant Program. The White, non-Hispanic dropout rate is 0.2	

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	0	0
LEAs with subgrants	1	1
Total	1	1
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	6
K	0	378
1	0	586
2	0	571
3	0	561
4	0	530
5	0	454
6	0	371
7	0	286
8	0	227
9	0	190
10	0	163
11	0	82
12	0	81
Ungraded	0	241
Total	0	4,727
Comments:		

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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	0	1,662
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	0	2,725
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	0	340
Hotels/Motels	0	0
Total	0	4,727
Comments:		

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)	65
K	378
1	582
2	570
3	558
4	530
5	453
6	370
7	282
8	226
9	190
10	155
11	81
12	77
Ungraded	239
Total	4,756
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	0
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	466
Limited English proficient students	1
Comments: Puerto Rico has no Migrant Program.	

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	615	269
4	815	305
5	777	267
6	707	259
7	783	189
8	768	258
High School	641	178
Comments: Due to self-reporting, homeless students count is higher in the assessment. Steps were taken to ensure a more reliable count. It included more specific orientation and guidance at school level. Another step that is expected to be taken during SY 2011-2012 is the use of SIS to identify the students participating in the assessments.		

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	619	354
4	823	380
5	780	217
6	713	92
7	780	32
8	779	47
High School	637	29
Comments: Due to self-reporting, homeless students count is higher in the assessment. Steps were taken to ensure a more reliable count. It included more specific orientation and guidance at school level. Another step that is expected to be taken during SY 2011-2012 is the use of SIS to identify the students participating in the assessments.		

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)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: PRDE has no Migrant Program.	

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the underlined unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were underlined served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the underlined summer term or during intersession periods 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 underlined not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: PRDE has no Migrant Program.	

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

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? <u>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.</u>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

<u>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.</u>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.

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.

PRDE has no Migrant Program.