CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on School Year 2016-17

NEW HAMPSHIRE



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION WASHINGTON, DC 20202

PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION

SOME DATA IN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED OR BLURRED TO PROTECT STUDENT PRIVACY.

OMB NO. 1810-0724 Page 2 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:

- o Title I, Part A Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- o Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- o Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- o Title I, Part D Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- o Title II, Part A Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- o Title III, Part A English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- o Title V, Part A Innovative Programs
- o Title VI, Section 6111 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- o Title VI, Part B Rural Education Achievement Program
- o Title X, Part C Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2016-17 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PARTI

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 2014-15, 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.
- The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
- 3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0724
	Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
	Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001
Check the one that indicates the report you are submX_Part I, 2016-17	itting: Part II, 2016-17
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting New Hampshire Department of Education	This Report:
Address: 101 Pleasant Street Concord, NH 03301	
	Person to contact about this report:
Name: Joe Pipinias	
Telephone: 603-271-4862	
Fax: 603-271-3830	
e-mail: Joe.Pipinias@doe.nh.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Heather Gage	
Signature	Thursday, March 1, 2018, 12:49:20 PM Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT PART I

For reporting on School Year 2016-17



PART I DUE DECEMBER 14, 2017 5PM EST

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

Response	Options
	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject
State has revised or changed	area.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

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

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by Section 1111(b)	0.00
To administer assessments required by Section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other	
activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	100.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by Section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by Section 1111(b)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	No_
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No_
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	_Yes_
Other	No Response
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	I.

1.2 Participation in State Assessment ²

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

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do <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*.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	92,810	96.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	244	>=95
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	3,225	97.8
Asian	S	3,142	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	83	>=95
Black or African American	S	1,801	92
Hispanic or Latino	S	5,399	93.6
White	S	79,848	96.4
Two or more races	S	2,293	96
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	13,831	91.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	2,966	94.0
Economically disadvantaged students	S	24,598	94.4
Migratory students	S	22	76
Male	S	47,650	96.1
Female	S	45,160	96.3
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000	characters. This is data is co	rrect.	

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

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

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do <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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment		
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	10,982	79.40		
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,093	15.13		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards				
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards				
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	756	5.47		
Total	13,831			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This data is correct.				

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	S	92,813	96.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	244	>=95
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	3,222	97.8
Asian	S	3,139	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	83	>=95
Black or African American	S	1,810	93
Hispanic or Latino	S	5,376	93.3
White	S	79,877	96.4
Two or more races	S	2,284	96
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	13,821	91.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	2,989	94.9
Economically disadvantaged students	S	24,585	94.3
Migratory students	S	23	79
Male	S	47,637	96.0
Female	S	45,176	96.3
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 c	haracters. This data is correct	t.	

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu	
	324

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do <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*

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	10,727	77.61
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,337	16.91
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	757	5.48
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	0	0.00
Total	13,821	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 cha	racters. This data is corre	ct.

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	S	38,596	96.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	103	>=95
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	1,318	98
Asian	S	1,285	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	33	>=90
Black or African American	S	762	92
Hispanic or Latino	S	2,123	92
White	S	33,475	96.9
Two or more races	S	815	97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	6,049	94.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	1,100	93
Economically disadvantaged students	S	9,536	94.8
Migratory students	S	7	>=50
Male	S	20,006	96.5
Female	S	18,590	96.6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 c	haracters. This data is correct	t.	

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

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

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do <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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,665	44.06
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,082	50.95
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	302	4.99
Total	6,049	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 cha	racters.	

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT 3

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

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

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	13,097	S	55.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	26	S	58
Asian or Pacific Islander	445	S	75
Asian	432	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	13	S	>=50
Black or African American	259	S	29
Hispanic or Latino	861	S	34
White	11,077	S	57.1
Two or more races	429	S	53
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,810	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	588	S	33
Economically disadvantaged students	4,074	S	36.6
Migratory students	8	S	<50
Male	6,715	S	56.9
Female	6,382	S	54.0

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Low migrant student count can cause a sharp increase/decrease in achievement percentages. First-year LEP Students do not take the RLA Assessment.

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	13,051	S	53.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	26	S	50
Asian or Pacific Islander	429	S	70
Asian	416	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	13	S	>=50
Black or African American	246	S	30
Hispanic or Latino	840	S	34
White	11,084	S	55.2
Two or more races	426	S	52
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,815	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	534	S	30
Economically disadvantaged students	4,052	S	33.8
Migratory students	7	S	<50
Male	6,686	S	49.9
Female	6,365	S	57.8

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Low migrant student count can cause a sharp increase/decrease in achievement percentages. First-year LEP Students do not take the RLA Assessment.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 character	ers. NH does not test science in grade 3.		

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	13,385	S	51.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	47	S	40
Asian or Pacific Islander	473	S	70
Asian	463	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	S	<50
Black or African American	245	S	33
Hispanic or Latino	949	S	31
White	11,308	S	52.7
Two or more races	363	S	51
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,038	S	17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	612	S	33
Economically disadvantaged students	4,058	S	31.0
Migratory students	2	S	S
Male	6,862	S	53.6
Female	6,523	S	49.1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 cha	racters.	•	•

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	13,298	S	55.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	47	S	47
Asian or Pacific Islander	458	S	70
Asian	448	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	S	>=50
Black or African American	227	S	36
Hispanic or Latino	921	S	38
Vhite	11,286	S	57.1
Two or more races	359	S	54
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,038	S	18
imited English proficient (LEP) students	558	S	33
Economically disadvantaged students	4,021	S	35.1
Migratory students	2	S	S
Male	6,813	S	52.0
- emale	6,485	S	59.6

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This data only represents a difference (decrease) of 3.34 percent proficient, not more than 15 percent as the error implies.

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	13,481	S	49.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	47	S	49
Asian or Pacific Islander	473	S	54
Asian	463	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	S	<50
Black or African American	250	S	27
Hispanic or Latino	955	S	31
White	11,391	S	51.1
Two or more races	365	S	48
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,309	S	21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	610	S	25
Economically disadvantaged students	4,082	S	31.5
Migratory students	1	S	S
Male	6,926	S	48.6
Female	6,555	S	50.0

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	13,457	S	46.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	31	S	26
Asian or Pacific Islander	471	S	67
Asian	460	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	11	S	<50
Black or African American	277	S	24
Hispanic or Latino	849	S	25
White	11,435	S	47.9
Two or more races	394	S	47
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,169	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	637	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	3,915	S	27.7
Migratory students	6	S	<50
Male	6,844	S	48.3
Female	6.613	S	44.9

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	13,425	S	60.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	31	S	42
Asian or Pacific Islander	462	S	78
Asian	451	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	11	S	>=50
Black or African American	268	S	35
Hispanic or Latino	833	S	39
Vhite	11,438	S	62.4
Two or more races	393	S	59
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,168	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	593	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	3,898	S	40.4
Migratory students	5	S	S
Male	6,828	S	55.0
- emale	6,597	S	66.9
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 cha	aracters. This data is correct.		

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 Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 character	ers. NH does not test science in grade 5.		

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	13,300	S	46.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	43	S	30
Asian or Pacific Islander	461	S	67
Asian	452	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	9	S	<50
Black or African American	260	S	25
Hispanic or Latino	813	S	26
White	11,356	S	47.7
Two or more races	367	S	43
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,150	S	11
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	359	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	3,632	S	24.7
Migratory students	2	S	S
Male	6,848	S	45.6
Female	6,452	S	47.3

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There was an unfortunate incident at the Monroe School this past year (2016-2017) when the only 6th grade teacher left the school in the middle of the year. Therefore, while the 11 students fully participated in the local competency assessments, the Teacher Judgement Survey, which is necessary to produce "annual determinations" was not completed. Therefore these students were not included in the Math and RLA Achievement counts.

The counts not reported:

11 Total

0 Am Ind

0 Asian

0 Hawaiian

1 Black

0 Hispanic 10 White

0 Multi-Race

2 IDEA

0 LEP

4 Economic

0 Migrant

6 Female

5 Male

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	13,249	S	56.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	42	S	50
Asian or Pacific Islander	454	S	72
Asian	445	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	9	S	<50
Black or African American	250	S	33
Hispanic or Latino	796	S	38
White	11,339	S	58.1
Two or more races	368	S	58
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,143	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	322	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	3,613	S	34.8
Migratory students	2	S	S
Male	6,824	S	50.6
Female	6,425	S	63.5

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There was an unfortunate incident at the Monroe School this past year (2016-2017) when the only 6th grade teacher left the school in the middle of the year. Therefore, while the 11 students fully participated in the local competency assessments, the Teacher Judgement Survey, which is necessary to produce "annual determinations" was not completed. Therefore these students were not included in the Math and RLA Achievement counts.

The counts not reported:

11 Total

0 Am Ind

0 Asian

0 Hawaiian

1 Black

0 Hispanic

10 White 0 Multi-Race 2 IDEA 0 LEP 4 Economic 0 Migrant 6 Female 5 Male

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 character	ers. NH does not test science in grade 6.		

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	13,501	S	50.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	36	S	50
Asian or Pacific Islander	489	S	66
Asian	474	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	15	S	<50
Black or African American	232	S	23
Hispanic or Latino	736	S	29
White	11,711	S	51.7
Two or more races	297	S	42
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,073	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	262	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	3,368	S	27.9
Migratory students	2	S	S
Male	6,873	S	49.9
Female	6,628	S	50.6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 cha	racters. This data is correct.	•	•

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	13,444	S	61.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	37	S	57
Asian or Pacific Islander	476	S	73
Asian	461	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	15	S	>=50
Black or African American	224	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	706	S	40
White	11,705	S	62.8
Two or more races	296	S	60
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,061	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	217	S	19
Economically disadvantaged students	3,344	S	39.3
Migratory students	1	S	S
Male	6,830	S	54.7
Female	6,614	S	68.4

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 character	ers. NH does not test science in grade 7.		

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	13,357	S	45.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	29	S	34
Asian or Pacific Islander	473	S	61
Asian	460	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	13	S	<50
Black or African American	269	S	24
Hispanic or Latino	675	S	25
White	11,655	S	46.5
Two or more races	256	S	40
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,910	S	10
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	255	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	3,167	S	23.6
Migratory students	1	S	S
Male	6,951	S	43.0
Female	6,406	S	47.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 ch	aracters. First-year LEP Students do not take the RLA Ass	sessment.	

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	13,334	S	58.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	29	S	59
Asian or Pacific Islander	464	S	67
Asian	451	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	13	S	>=50
Black or African American	259	S	36
Hispanic or Latino	651	S	38
White	11,677	S	59.8
Two or more races	254	S	54
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,915	S	17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	215	S	11
Economically disadvantaged students	3,143	S	35.5
Migratory students	1	S	S
Male	6,937	S	50.0
Female	6,397	S	67.5
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 cha	aracters. First-year LEP Students do not take the RLA Ass	sessment.	

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	13,907	S	27.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	30	S	<=20
Asian or Pacific Islander	489	S	36
Asian	476	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	13	S	<50
Black or African American	298	S	13
Hispanic or Latino	739	S	13
White	12,078	S	28.4
Two or more races	273	S	24
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,134	S	6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	282	S	9
Economically disadvantaged students	3,367	S	13.1
Migratory students	4	S	S
Male	7,216	S	25.2
Female	6,691	S	29.9

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	12,702	S	43.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	S	25
Asian or Pacific Islander	413	S	63
Asian	401	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	12	S	<50
Black or African American	258	S	17
Hispanic or Latino	516	S	22
White	11,296	S	44.8
Two or more races	187	S	35
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,679	S	8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	253	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	2,380	S	22
Migratory students	1	S	S
Male	6,552	S	45.5
Female	6,150	S	41.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 ch	aracters. First-year LEP Students do not take the RLA Ass	sessment.	

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	12,677	S	66.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	S	53
Asian or Pacific Islander	407	S	73
Asian	395	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	12	S	>=50
Black or African American	253	S	40
Hispanic or Latino	505	S	42
White	11,293	S	67.7
Two or more races	187	S	63
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,679	S	22
imited English proficient (LEP) students	228	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	2,369	S	44
Migratory students	1	S	S
Male	6,539	S	63.3
- emale	6,138	S	69.3
comments: The response is limited to 4,000 ch	aracters. First-year LEP Students do not take the RLA Ass	sessment.	

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	11,208	S	32.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	26	S	<=20
Asian or Pacific Islander	356	S	42
Asian	346	S	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	S	<50
Black or African American	214	S	10
Hispanic or Latino	429	S	14
White	10,006	S	33.4
Two or more races	177	S	29
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,606	S	7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	208	S	6
Economically disadvantaged students	2,087	S	16
Migratory students	2	S	S
Male	5,864	S	30.6
Female	5,344	S	34.3

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on accountability.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2016-17
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This is all language	age from NCLB and was not implemented in 2016-17 due to our approved ESFA

1.4.4.4 Restructuring - Year 2

Flexibility Waiver.

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

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This is all language from NCLB and was not implemented in 2016-17 due to our approved ESEA	

| Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This is all language from NCLB and was not implemented in 2016-17 due to our approved ESEA | Flexibility Waiver.

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.

This is all language from NCLB and was not implemented in 2016-17 due to our approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

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.

Priority and Focus Schools were required to provide an innovation/improvement plan based on their academic achievement data and explain how they would use their funds to improve areas of concern. In addition, these schools were required to participate in quarterly technical assistance and professional learning meetings, a summer summit (professional learning), and tri-annual reviews of their data with DOE staff and peers.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

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

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

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All schools that receive 1003(g) funds in New Hampshire are considered Priority Schools, and as such, receive the same technical assistance opportunities available to all Priority Schools. This includes Quarterly Meetings, a Summer Summit, tri-annual reviews, etc.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This is all language from NCLB and was not implemented in 2016-17 due to our approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational program

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs =** Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.us/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.

2. Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>No</u>	Dual language	
<u>No</u>	Two-way immersion	
<u>No</u>	Transitional bilingual	
<u>No</u>	Developmental bilingual	
<u>No</u>	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Yes	Structured English immersion	11/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	///////////////////////////////////////
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
No Response	Other (explain in comment box below)	///////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.	

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

n 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.

n Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	4,263
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	3,786
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students	
Spanish; Castilian	1,805	
Arabic	294	
Nepali	249	
Portuguese	188	
Chinese	158	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,165
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	4,165
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	S
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	6.0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,627
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	3,627
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined.	902

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. **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.
- 2. 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.
- 3. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

	Results	Results
Title III Results	#	%
Making progress	S	23.1
Attained proficiency	S	5.5

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. It is currently understood that the SEA has continued to use previous methodology for determining improvement criteria for ELs making progress toward English Proficiency, until the new Consolidated State Application is approved by the USED. ARH 12.11.17

Criteria for attaining proficiency through the state's annual ELP (ACCESS 2.0) have been changed to reflect the submitted Consolidated State Application. Changes took affect for 2016-17 ACCESS 2.0 testing.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)).

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

Native Language Testing	Yes/No
State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No_
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for ESEA accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
33.(4)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. At this time, no statewide assessment is provided fully in another language other than English.

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. At this time, no statewide assessment is provided fully in a language other than English.
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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. At this time, no statewide assessment is provided fully in a language other than English.

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 all grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
477	503	980
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

- 1. # Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics.
- # 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
748	S	34	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
749	S	43	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
269	S	33	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Termination of Title III Programs	Yes/No
Were any Title III language instruction educational programs 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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <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 <u>not</u> include immigrant students who only receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
- 3. 3114(d)(1)Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do <u>not</u> include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
1,985	423	2

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.

Minor adjustment Nashua 381 and Dover 48 total = 429

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

Ferritarian de comercia de contrata de con	
Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	151
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5	
years*.	17

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 <u>additional</u> teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do <u>not</u> include the number of teachers <u>currently</u> working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

- 1. Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
- 2. #Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.1).

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

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	12
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	9
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP	
students	8
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	6
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	7
Other (Explain in comment box)	9

PD Participant Information	# Subgrante	ees # Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	11	512
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	13	137
PD provided to principals	7	68
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	5	23
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	5	52
PD provided to community based organization personnel	2	5
Total	///////////////////////////////////////	///////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other professional development topic: Culturally and linguistically appropriate practices

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/16	08/17/16	47
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The DOE is in the process of reorganizing its bureaus and offices. With this transition, we will be reviewing procedures to ensure subgrantees receive their funds as soon as possible after the state receives its allocation.

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.doc.

Persistently Dangerous Schools		
Persistently Dangerous Schools		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were no persistently dangerous schools in NH.		

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data	
LEAs without subgrants	199	199	
LEAs with subgrants	5	5	
Total	204	204	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not		
Kindergarten)	45	34
K	201	82
1	284	116
2	235	129
3	270	98
4	262	110
5	234	107
6	203	69
7	175	75
8	180	54
9	167	113
10	148	82
11	112	76
12	163	94
Ungraded		
Total	2,679	1,239
omments: The response	e is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

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

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing	386	167
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,869	945
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary		
trailer, or abandoned buildings)	124	31
Hotels/Motels	300	96
Total	2,679	1,239
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

FAQ on reporting homeless students:

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

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

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

	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With				
Special Population	Subgrants	Subgrants				
Unaccompanied homeless youth	198	175				
Migratory children/youth	1	11				
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	789	305				
Limited English Proficient (LEP)						
students	81	94				
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.						

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Young Homeless Children Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	37
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	63
Total	100
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

	LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a	LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring	LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants - % of Homeless Students	LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a	LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring	LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring
	Proficiency Level Was	at or above	Scoring at or	Proficiency Level Was	at or above	at or above
Grade	Assigned	Proficient	above Proficient	Assigned	Proficient	Proficient
3	248	S	31	83	S	25
4	242	S	29	100	S	20
5	216	S	40	92	S	33
6	187	S	33	52	S	27
7	158	S	28	50	S	16
8	156	S	26	35	S	20
High School	74	S	34	35	S	23
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.						

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

	LEAs Without Subgrants -	LEAs Without		LEAs With Subgrants - #	LEAs With	LEAs With
	# of Homeless Students	Subgrants - # of	LEAs Without	of Homeless Students	Subgrants - # of	Subgrants - % of
	Who Received a Valid	Homeless	Subgrants - % of	Who Received a Valid	Homeless	Homeless
	Score and for Whom a	Students Scoring	Homeless Students	Score and for Whom a	Students Scoring	Students Scoring
	Proficiency Level Was	at or above	Scoring at or	Proficiency Level Was	at or above	at or above
Grade	Assigned	Proficient	above Proficient	Assigned	Proficient	Proficient
3	251	S	32	84	S	32
4	243	S	27	102	S	12
5	216	S	26	97	S	22
6	189	S	24	51	S	18
7	158	S	15	55	S	<=10
8	160	S	12	38	S	<=10
High School	75	S	17	37	S	<=10
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.						

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	Subgrants - # of Homeless	LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4	178	S	26	101	S	9
5						
6						
7						
8	138	S	7	45	S	<=10
High School	58	S	14	31	S	<=10
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.						