

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) 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.*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk.*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform.*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund).*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology.*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- 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.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **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.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

The Alabama State Board of Education formally adopted new science standards in February 2005. These standards are being implemented state-wide during the 2006-2007 school year.

In November/December 2003, the Alabama Department of Education began work to create a committee of stakeholders from throughout the state to determine the science content standards for K-12. Each of the State Board of Education districts was represented including urban/rural and large/small LEAs. Outstanding science educators with general education and special education expertise were nominated by their local superintendents to serve on this committee. In addition to these outstanding classroom educators, representatives from several colleges and universities as well appointees from the Governor were nominated. This committee was formally approved by the Alabama State Board of Education in January 2004.

The committee convened in March 2004 to begin development of the rigorous science content standards. For the next 11 months the committee reviewed content found in such national documents as the National Science Education Standards, Project 2061-Science for All Americans, Benchmarks for Science Literacy, and Pathways for Science Standards and crafted several versions of these content standards. Once the final draft of the science content standards was completed, it was released for public review, comment, and input. The committee reconvened to make the final edits for these rigorous science content standards and made a formal presentation to the Alabama State Board of Education in January 2005 for its consideration.

In July 2006, a committee of Alabama educators was convened to develop science extended standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The committee members were recommended by their local superintendents or special education coordinators. Representatives included special and general education science teachers from elementary, middle and high school settings.

The extended science standards were developed from the state science standards adopted in February, 2005. An alignment study took place in November 17, 2006 to verify alignment between the extended science standards and the general education science standards. Following completion of the alignment study, the extended science standards will be presented to Dr. Joseph B. Morton, State Superintendent of Education, for final approval.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

Alabama now tests all students on reading and mathematics content standards in Grades 3-8 and 11. The implementation of the Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test was a two phase process.

Development of the Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test (ARMT) for Grades 4, 6, and 8 for reading and Grades 4, and 6 for mathematics was completed and the assessments administered in 2003-2004.

The ARMT was administered in April 2004 with a standard setting held in June. Committees of outstanding educators who were nominated by the local superintendents convened to make recommendations for the cut-scores for each of the four established proficiency levels: Level I - Did Not Meet Academic Content Standards, Level II - Partially Meets Academic Content Standards, Level III - Meets Academic Content Standards, and Level IV - Exceeds Academic Content Standards. The standard setting process utilized modified-Angoff as the method for establishing the cut-scores. The State Superintendent of Education formally approved the cut-scores in June 2004.

In the following 2004-2005 school year, development of the Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test (ARMT) for Grades 3, 5, and 7 for reading and Grades 3, 5, 7, and 8 for mathematics was completed and the assessments implemented. (The same standard setting process was used to determine the cut scores for each of the achievement levels.) Additionally, the Alabama High School Graduation Exam for grade 11 reading and math had previously been completed and is being administered.

The Alabama Alternate Assessment (AAA) assessed students with the most severe and profound disabilities by measuring their mastery of the state content extended standards in reading and mathematics. The AAA was administered in Grades 3-8 and 11 during the 2005-2006 school year. A vendor has been selected to revise reading and mathematics and to develop science for the AAA.

The Alabama Science Assessment: Grades 5 and 7 and the science subject-area of the Alabama High School Graduation Exam (Grade 11) began development during the 2005-2006 school year, is piloting items and forms during the 2006-2007 school year, and anticipates full implementation in the 2007-2008 school year.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

Committees of outstanding educators who were nominated by the local superintendents convened to make recommendations for the cut-scores for each of the four established proficiency levels: Level I - Did Not Meet Academic Content Standards, Level II - Partially Meets Academic Content Standards, Level III - Meets Academic Content Standards, and Level IV - Exceeds Academic Content Standards. The standard setting process utilized the modified-Angoff as the method for establishing the cut-scores for the Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test and the Bookmark method was used for the Alabama High School Graduation Exam. The recommendations for the ARMT cut scores were then sent to the State Superintendent of Education for formal approval and the recommendations for the AHSGE cut scores were sent to the State Board of Education for formal approval.

The academic achievement standards for Grades 4, 6, 8, and 11 in reading and for Grades 4, 6, and 11 in mathematics were established and implemented in June 2004. The academic achievement standards for Grades 3, 5, and 7 in reading and for Grades 3, 5, 7, and 8 in mathematics were established and implemented in June 2004.

It is anticipated that academic achievement standards for the new science assessment will be established in May/June 2008. It is also anticipated that the modified-Angoff will be used by the committees when establishing the cut-scores. Additionally, a vendor has been selected to develop science for the AAA that will include alternate achievement standards.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	386751	98.89
American Indian or Alaska Native	3420	99.33
Asian or Pacific Islander	3728	98.68
Black, non-Hispanic	138931	98.44
Hispanic	10490	98.70
White, non-Hispanic	229626	99.16
Students with Disabilities	46877	97.95
Limited English Proficient	7128	98.45
Economically Disadvantaged	201579	98.61
Migrant	1111	98.14
Male	198214	99.10
Female	188537	99.06

Comments: Displaced 2641, 95.41%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	387280	99.02
American Indian or Alaska Native	3426	99.51
Asian or Pacific Islander	3731	98.76
Black, non-Hispanic	139115	98.58
Hispanic	10501	98.81
White, non-Hispanic	229949	99.30
Students with Disabilities	46979	98.16
Limited English Proficient	7155	98.83
Economically Disadvantaged	201902	98.77
Migrant	1118	98.76
Male	198529	98.88
Female	188751	99.17

Comments: Displaced 2649, 95.70%

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	43320	90.52
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3557	7.43

Comments:

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	43445	90.78
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3534	7.38

Comments:

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	55883	77.83
American Indian or Alaska Native	421	83.85
Asian or Pacific Islander	621	90.50
Black, non-Hispanic	19594	67.48
Hispanic	1881	66.67
White, non-Hispanic	33239	84.26
Students with Disabilities	6799	47.55
Limited English Proficient	1516	63.92
Economically Disadvantaged	31083	69.91
Migrant	197	68.53
Male	28788	76.28
Female	27095	79.48

Comments: Asian/Pacific Islander - A review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 16% increase in the number of Asian students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	55905	83.55
American Indian or Alaska Native	420	90.95
Asian or Pacific Islander	616	88.96
Black, non-Hispanic	19599	74.90
Hispanic	1882	67.69
White, non-Hispanic	33261	89.34
Students with Disabilities	6817	49.08
Limited English Proficient	1519	60.63
Economically Disadvantaged	31097	76.80
Migrant	200	66.50
Male	28807	79.56
Female	27098	87.79

Comments: Asian/Pacific Islander - A review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 16% increase in the number of Asian students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	55300	78.09
American Indian or Alaska Native	474	83.97
Asian or Pacific Islander	569	93.85
Black, non-Hispanic	19581	67.63
Hispanic	1703	68.47
White, non-Hispanic	32871	84.46
Students with Disabilities	6790	41.53
Limited English Proficient	1347	65.11
Economically Disadvantaged	30350	70.08
Migrant	194	73.71
Male	28576	76.36
Female	26724	79.95

Comments: Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	55361	84.33
American Indian or Alaska Native	474	87.34
Asian or Pacific Islander	566	90.46
Black, non-Hispanic	19591	75.92
Hispanic	1705	70.50
White, non-Hispanic	32923	89.90
Students with Disabilities	6797	45.01
Limited English Proficient	1349	63.53
Economically Disadvantaged	30393	77.49
Migrant	194	71.65
Male	28613	80.34
Female	26748	88.59

Comments: Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	56403	76.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	550	81.64
Asian or Pacific Islander	534	91.20
Black, non-Hispanic	20347	65.71
Hispanic	1674	65.29
White, non-Hispanic	33206	83.51
Students with Disabilities	7040	36.90
Limited English Proficient	1210	58.26
Economically Disadvantaged	30842	68.05
Migrant	175	61.71
Male	29101	73.48
Female	27302	79.93

Comments: Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	56477	80.61
American Indian or Alaska Native	550	84.18
Asian or Pacific Islander	535	89.16
Black, non-Hispanic	20359	71.19
Hispanic	1675	65.91
White, non-Hispanic	33265	86.89
Students with Disabilities	7043	38.69
Limited English Proficient	1215	54.16
Economically Disadvantaged	30879	72.61
Migrant	177	62.15
Male	29142	76.05
Female	27335	85.47

Comments: Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	57103	74.82
American Indian or Alaska Native	512	85.74
Asian or Pacific Islander	526	92.78
Black, non-Hispanic	20954	60.69
Hispanic	1570	66.82
White, non-Hispanic	33472	83.59
Students with Disabilities	7028	33.48
Limited English Proficient	994	57.65
Economically Disadvantaged	30719	64.77
Migrant	155	60.65
Male	29375	72.78
Female	27728	76.99

Comments: Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

Efforts have been made to close the gap between subgroups. This is being done through increased professional development, reduced class size, mentoring, Alabama Math Science Technology Initiative and the Alabama Reading Initiative.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	57177	82.98
American Indian or Alaska Native	516	87.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	529	87.90
Black, non-Hispanic	20986	74.09
Hispanic	1579	70.49
White, non-Hispanic	33498	88.99
Students with Disabilities	7049	40.52
Limited English Proficient	1000	54.50
Economically Disadvantaged	30768	75.56
Migrant	155	60.00
Male	29417	78.25
Female	27760	87.99

Comments: Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	58996	59.39
American Indian or Alaska Native	549	67.76
Asian or Pacific Islander	461	86.77
Black, non-Hispanic	21861	44.34
Hispanic	1517	48.25
White, non-Hispanic	34530	68.89
Students with Disabilities	7468	19.38
Limited English Proficient	962	38.15
Economically Disadvantaged	31679	46.83
Migrant	165	37.58
Male	30561	54.94
Female	28435	64.18

Comments: A review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 16% increase in the number of Asian students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	59178	74.35
American Indian or Alaska Native	552	81.16
Asian or Pacific Islander	463	84.23
Black, non-Hispanic	21964	62.62
Hispanic	1514	57.60
White, non-Hispanic	34607	82.26
Students with Disabilities	7515	29.22
Limited English Proficient	962	41.16
Economically Disadvantaged	31819	64.31
Migrant	165	50.91
Male	30663	67.57
Female	28515	81.64

Comments: A review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 16% increase in the number of Asian students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	57313	67.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	524	75.38
Asian or Pacific Islander	571	89.49
Black, non-Hispanic	20870	52.57
Hispanic	1380	59.42
White, non-Hispanic	33914	77.02
Students with Disabilities	7236	27.28
Limited English Proficient	797	47.93
Economically Disadvantaged	29538	56.12
Migrant	150	52.67
Male	29351	64.24
Female	27962	71.54

Comments: Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	57400	71.79
American Indian or Alaska Native	527	77.23
Asian or Pacific Islander	570	85.44
Black, non-Hispanic	20913	58.22
Hispanic	1382	59.04
White, non-Hispanic	33954	80.33
Students with Disabilities	7248	27.26
Limited English Proficient	796	37.94
Economically Disadvantaged	29583	60.32
Migrant	152	47.37
Male	29400	65.11
Female	28000	78.80

Comments: Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

In 2005-2006, Alabama collected LEP and Migrant data on student demographics for the first time. Previously, there was a separate manual collection.

A review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 16% increase in the number of Asian students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	45753	83.64
American Indian or Alaska Native	390	85.13
Asian or Pacific Islander	446	93.72
Black, non-Hispanic	15724	74.14
Hispanic	765	81.96
White, non-Hispanic	28394	88.77
Students with Disabilities	4516	37.02
Limited English Proficient	302	74.17
Economically Disadvantaged	17368	74.88
Migrant	75	85.33
Male	22462	81.49
Female	23291	85.72

Comments: Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	45782	85.63
American Indian or Alaska Native	387	87.86
Asian or Pacific Islander	452	84.73
Black, non-Hispanic	15703	75.55
Hispanic	764	70.94
White, non-Hispanic	28441	91.57
Students with Disabilities	4510	38.80
Limited English Proficient	314	40.45
Economically Disadvantaged	17363	76.15
Migrant	75	64.00
Male	22487	83.34
Female	23295	87.84

Comments: Hispanic Reading and Mathematics-review of the Attendance by Ethnicity and Gender Report available on the public SDE Website shows that there is approximately a 15.4% increase in the number of Hispanic students in Alabama Public Schools between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1364	1210	88.71

Comments: A focus on instruction with an emphasis on the Course of Study is a contributing factor to the increase in the number of schools making AYP. Alabama also implements the Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI) and the Alabama Math, Science, and Technology Initiative (AMSTI).

Additionally the SDE established an Accountability Roundtable (ART). The mission of the ART is to provide a seamless system of technical assistance and support to schools in the areas of curriculum, instruction, fiscal responsibility, management, and leadership through a sub-committee known as the State Support Team (SST). The SST is comprised of School Improvement Leaders, Regional Coaches, Peer Mentors, and SDE staff that provide TA and support to all schools with focused assistance to LEAs/schools that do not make AYP. The goal of this effort is to enable LEAs/schools to achieve and maintain annual measurable objectives.

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	132	132	100.00

Comments: A focus on instruction with an emphasis on the Course of Study is a contributing factor to the increase in the number of schools making AYP. Alabama also implements the Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI) and the Alabama Math, Science, and Technology Initiative (AMSTI).

Additionally the SDE established an Accountability Roundtable (ART). The mission of the ART is to provide a seamless system of technical assistance and support to schools in the areas of curriculum, instruction, fiscal responsibility, management, and leadership through a sub-committee known as the State Support Team (SST). The SST is comprised of School Improvement Leaders, Regional Coaches, Peer Mentors, and SDE staff that provide TA and support to all schools with focused assistance to LEAs/schools that do not make AYP. The goal of this effort is to enable LEAs/schools to achieve and maintain annual measurable objectives.

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	878	789	89.86

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	128	128	100.00

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) realizes it does not have the "in-house" expertise to effectively support technical assistance to all schools and districts in improvement. However, this is the second year in which the Accountability Roundtable, a department initiative representing all sections in the ALSDE that work with schools in any capacity, has collaborated with 1) directors of 11 regional in-service centers, 2) the State Support Team, consisting of 11 Regional School Improvement Coaches and 13 Peer Mentors (master teachers placed in multiple year schools), 3) representatives from the Alabama Reading Initiative and the Alabama Math, Science, Technology Initiative, and 4) Special Education and Federal Programs LEA regional specialists. The Accountability Roundtable trains and supports 131 local education agencies and 67 school improvement specialists in developing their own capacity to support themselves with successful instructional practices.

Over seven million dollars, or ninety-five percent of the state's Title I 4% set-aside, has been allocated to LEAs to support school improvement efforts. Grants are offered to eligible LEAs with Title I schools identified for improvement and are calculated using a weighted system of criteria: number of students in poverty; percentage of students in the school system in Title I School Improvement Schools; whether 50% or more of the LEA's students are in school improvement schools; and whether 50% or more of the LEAs' schools have been identified for improvement.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) realizes it does not have the "in-house" expertise or capacity to effectively support technical assistance to all schools and districts in improvement. However, this is the second year in which the Accountability Roundtable, a department initiative representing all sections in the ALSDE that work with schools or systems in any capacity, has collaborated with 1) directors of 11 regional in-service centers, 2) the State Support Team, consisting of 11 Regional School Improvement Coaches and 13 Peer Mentors (master teachers placed in multiple year schools), 3) representatives from the Alabama Reading Initiative and the Alabama Math, Science, Technology Initiative, and 4) Special Education and Federal Programs LEA regional specialists. The Accountability Roundtable trains and supports 131 local education agencies and 67 school improvement specialists in developing their own capacity to support themselves with successful instructional practices.

The State Support Team offers guidance to the 43 identified LEAs as they assess their needs and plan steps to effectively apply the districts' 10% set aside to high quality professional learning opportunities. In addition, while ninety-five percent of the state's Title I 4% set-aside (over \$7m) has been allocated to LEAs for their implementation of school improvement efforts, important guidance from members of the State Support Team enables school districts to more resourcefully research, purchase, or contract for the use of evidence-based materials and strategies focused on improving and sustaining student achievement.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	149
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	157
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	1477
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	163441
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: 5. There were no transfer options for 22,986 of the 163,441 eligible students because of one of the following reasons:	
a. All schools in the school's grade span were in School Improvement.	
b. Schools in small school districts had only one school per grade span.	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services

	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	131
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	6713
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	50795

Optional Information:

If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.

Comments: 3. This number is the sum of the following:

a. Low income students in schools in Title I schools in School Improvement Year 2 and beyond.

b. All students in Title I schools in School Improvement Year 1.

Alabama makes Supplemental Educational Services available to all students in Title I schools in School Improvement Year 1 where there are no transfer options (See comment to response Section 1.4.5.1, Public School Choice, question 4).

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	158496	143912	90.80
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	25681	22861	89.02
Low-Poverty Schools	37174	34926	93.95
All Elementary Schools	97672	92694	94.90
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	17124	13426	78.40
Low-Poverty Schools	27581	24698	89.55
All Secondary Schools	60824	51218	84.21
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or 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.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded 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]

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 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

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.

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 English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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	
b) 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	
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
d) Other (please explain)	
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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)	
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
d) Other (please explain)	
Comments: Data is unavailable at this time, but will be submitted upon receipt.	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	80.00	43.00
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Meal Eligibility	
Secondary Schools	71.60	39.90
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Meal Eligibility	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 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.

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-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	92.80

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

The Consolidated State Performance Report of 2003-2004 describes the development and implementation of the WIDA (World-Class Innovations in Developing Assessments Inc.) ELP (English Language Proficiency) Standards. Alabama has provided WIDA ELP Standards training for implementation of the standards to raise the level of ELP in the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Since the initial regional training in Spring 2005, Local Education Agencies (LEAs) have contracted with the WIDA Consultants to provide follow-up training. Alabama is continuing to provide training state-wide on the WIDA ELP Standards. For Example: An ELL Specialist from the State Department provides WIDA ELP Standards training year round. Plans are being made for a Summer Workshop on the WIDA ELP Standards by a WIDA Consultant. With respect to implementation of the WIDA ELP Standards Alabama monitors each year to ensure compliance of the use of standards by LEAs and school teachers.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The following is a summary of the alignment report. The entire report is available upon request.

PART I: SUMMARY**1. Objective**

The purpose of the alignment study was to find evidence of agreement between the Alabama Course of Study (Alabama Standards) and WIDA's English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners. This study was conducted by doing an evaluation of matches between the WIDA and the Alabama Standards. The results from the study could provide evidence that the WIDA Standards are aligned with NCLB, and so this study also determines alignment of the Alabama Standards with NCLB.

2. Methods**2.1 Documents****WIDA Standards**

The WIDA English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards are organized into five standards: Social and Instructional Language, Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies; four grade level clusters: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12; 4 domains: Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing; and five proficiency levels: Entering, Beginning, Developing, Expanding, and Bridging. There is a model performance indicator (PI) for each language proficiency level in each domain. The PIs in each domain represent a stem or topic. The WIDA Standards are linked at the main WIDA website: <http://www.wida.us/>

Alabama Standards

The Alabama Standards were organized by content areas: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. Each content area has several documents showing the standards for different grade level clusters. Although the documents were organized by grade levels, each document included course content at each grade level cluster (K-12). We used the latest versions which are available on the following URL: <http://www.alsde.edu/html/CoursesOfStudy.asp>

There were four documents for English Language Arts. They were organized according to six strands: Reading, Listening, Viewing, Writing, Speaking, and Presenting. There were ten documents for Math. For grade levels K-8, the course contents were organized according to five strands: Numbers and Operations, Algebra, Geometry, Measurement, and Data Analysis and Probability. For grade levels 9-12, there were seven different strands, each one in a separate document: Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry, Algebraic Connections, Algebra II with Trigonometry, Algebra II with Statistics, Pre-calculus. For Science, there were four documents. They were organized according to three domains or cores: Physical Science, Life Science, and Earth and Space Science. For Social Studies, there were five documents. They were organized according to four strands: Economics, Geography, History and Political Science.

2.2 Procedures

We conducted a systematic review of the WIDA standards, followed by a systematic review of the Alabama Course of Study. We judged alignment against specific sets of alignment criteria and decision rules. For a more complete description of the alignment process, please see Part II of this document. We should note that our team is very familiar with the WIDA Standards by virtue of its ongoing involvement in the development of the WIDA test specifications.

3. Results

In this study, we found that all the WIDA PIs were represented in the Alabama Standards; therefore, we are able to claim complete alignment between the respective Alabama and WIDA Standards. This representation varies somewhat, as described next and as further elaborated in the italicized comments in the third part of this report.

We found that there was a strong match between most of the PIs in the WIDA Standards and the content of the Alabama Standards. We defined a strong match when there was both a clear agreement between the stem(s) in the WIDA Standards and strand(s) in the Alabama Standards and agreement between the WIDA PI(s) and the Alabama course content(s). We also found that there were weak associations between some of the WIDA and the Alabama Standards. We defined a weak match when there was only a match between the stem in the WIDA Standards and the strands in the Alabama Standards, but there was no exact match between the WIDA PIs and any of the Alabama course contents. Whenever this occurred, we determined that there was sufficient agreement so that the Alabama course contents could be adapted or extended to match the WIDA PIs. For all the weak matches found in the study, we added comments justifying alignments and suggested ways to extend the course content.

We did not conduct an alignment study for WIDA's social and instructional language standards with Alabama, because Alabama has adopted those WIDA Standards as their ESL standards, in total. Therefore may claim complete alignment of Alabama and WIDA social and instructional language standards.

4. Trends

The following characteristics of the Alabama Standards facilitated the alignment study:

1. Each grade level in Alabama has its own set of course contents. This facilitated the alignment process because we were able to systematically compare the grade level clusters in the WIDA Standards with each grade level course content in Alabama. That is, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the two standards. By this, we mean that we needed only to look at one document to complete the alignment.
2. The Alabama Standards were organized according to strands or categories. This facilitated the alignment process because we could find agreements between the strands in the Alabama Standards and the WIDA stems.
3. Many of the Alabama course contents provided examples. This helped us have a better understanding of what the content was, thus, we were able to match the Alabama academic content against the WIDA Standards.
4. The Alabama course content defines minimum skills that students have to demonstrate. These skills are fundamental and specific, but not exhaustive. This allowed us to extend the Alabama course contents to match the WIDA PIs.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:

- An independent alignment study No Response
- Other evidence of alignment No Response

2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

Independent Alignment Study:

The WIDA Consortium has contracted with Dr. Gary Cook from the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER) to conduct an independent alignment study of the alignment between the WIDA ELP Standards (adopted by Alabama) and the ACCESS for ELLs® ELP assessment, Alabama's measure of English proficiency growth. The alignment will be conducted by teachers from Alabama and the 14 other WIDA Consortium states in Madison, Wisconsin, December 4-5, 2006. Dr. Norman Webb's alignment procedures will be used and the teachers will enter their findings in the Web Alignment Tool, a federally funded on-line alignment framework that identifies match, depth of knowledge, and balance between the standards and the assessment. Webb's system is one of four federally recognized methodologies for conducting alignments. Dr. Cook has adapted the Webb system for use with English proficiency standards and ELP tests. Dr. Cook is one of the leading authorities in this area. Dr. Cook will analyze and synthesize the teachers' finding and write the summary report on the degree of alignment including any recommendations for changes to the standards or the assessment. The report should be available by March 1, 2007 and will be shared with all WIDA member states and the US Department of Education.

Other Evidence:

Alabama's teachers were involved in the process of developing the WIDA ELP Standards and model performance indicators. A content match procedure was used at the time the ELP Standards were developed (see WIDA ELP Standards Overview, Gottlieb, 2004).

New NCLB Compliant ELP Assessment

1. Alabama uses the ACCESS for ELLs® ELP assessment. The test provides annual, secure forms for Kindergarten through grades 12 (grade clustered tested are K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12.) 33% of the test items are changed annually based on the ELP standards and test blue print guidelines. Test item development is conducted at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL).
2. ACCESS for ELLs® tests four separate domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and provides score reports in those four plus comprehension (based on the listening and reading domains).
3. ACCESS for ELLs® is aligned to the WIDA ELP Standards adopted by Alabama.
4. ACCESS for ELLs® has undergone rigorous pilot, field testing and annual assessments of technical quality. The WIDA Consortium has an active technical advisory council with national experts to assist with ensuring the highest standards of validity and reliability. (see Development and Field Report, 2005; and the Annual Technical Report Series 100, 2006).

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	12500	75.38
2. Vietnamese	521	3.14
3. Korean	440	2.65
4. Arabic	285	1.72
5. Chinese	210	1.27
6. Japanese	148	0.89
7. Russian	144	0.87
8. Gujarati	120	0.72
9. German	120	0.72
10. Laotian/Cambodian	104	0.63
Comments:		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = 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
- **# of immigrants subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
4595	4360	47

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

The increase in the number of immigrant students could be contributed to professional development on the identification and reporting of immigrant children and youth.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

- 1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;**
- 2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;**
- 3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.**

STATE RESPONSE

Alabama in collaboration with WIDA has established Level 4.8 or above as Fluent English Proficient, provided that the student tests proficient on the statewide reading assessment at grade level. For example, if a student scores anywhere from a 4.8 to a 6.0 on the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs and scores at Meet Standards on the reading portion of the state assessment, that student would be considered Former Limited English Proficient (FLEP) Monitoring Year 1. Once students are FLEP they no longer take ACCESS for ELLs English proficiency test. The Accessing Comprehension and Communication in English for English Language Learners (ACCESS) assessment developed by WIDA uses frameworks for large-scale assessments in the form of rubrics. This matrix format is intentionally used in order for educators to visualize the developmental nature of language acquisition across language proficiency levels and emphasize the scaffolding of language demands at each grade level cluster. It is built upon the assumption that the effects of acquiring language at each subsequent grade level cluster and language proficiency level are cumulative. The English language proficiency standards are the centerpiece for the large-scale assessment frameworks. Each framework, however, generates a separate set of model performance indicators for the language domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. The classroom framework, along with its model performance indicators, informs and enhances the large-scale state framework. The five English language proficiency standards reflect the social and academic dimensions of acquiring a second language that are expected of English language learners in grade levels K-12 attending schools in the United States. Each Language proficiency standard addresses a specific context for language acquisition (social and instructional settings as well as language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) and is divided into four grade-level clusters: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Overall, the language proficiency standards center on the language needed and used by English language learners

to succeed in school:

English Language Proficiency Standard 1:

English language learners communicate in English for SOCIAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL purposes within the school setting.

English Language Proficiency Standard 2:

English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of LANGUAGE ARTS.

English Language Proficiency Standard 3:

English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of MATHEMATICS.

English Language Proficiency Standard 4:

English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of SCIENCE.

English Language Proficiency Standard 5:

English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of SOCIAL STUDIES.

B. The Language Domains

Each of the five English language proficiency standards encompasses four language domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The language domains reflect the modality of the communication that is further delineated by the language proficiency levels and their model performance indicators. The definitions of the language domains are as follows:

Listeningâ€™process, understand, interpret, and evaluate spoken language in a variety of situations

Speakingâ€™engage in oral communication in a variety of situations for an array of purposes and audiences

Readingâ€™process, interpret and evaluate written language, symbols and text with understanding and fluency

Writingâ€™engage in written communication in a variety of forms for an array of purposes and audiences

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

STATE RESPONSE

ESTABLISHING AMAOs for ALABAMA:

The chart below represents WIDA's suggested estimates for reporting progress of English language learners (Technical Report # 3)

To determine if ELL students make Adequate Progress with Language Acquisition (APLA), students would be expected to score in the range of performance of the next cohort to have made APLA. The table below explains this process.

Cohort English Language Proficiency Level (Range)

Determined by ACCESS score) Range of Performance

(Composite score on ACCESS)

I 1.0- 2.0 1.0

II 2.1- 2.8 .7

III 2.9- 3.5 .6

IV 3.6- 4.1 .5

V 4.2- 4.7 .5

VI 4.8- 5.3 .5

AL will consider 4.8-5.3 or above proficient

VII 5.4- 6.0 .6

-4.8 is the point at which a student reaches proficiency. Students entering at cohort I (1.0 to 2.0) should reach proficiency in 5+years.

-If a student does not make the expected progress (APLA) in a year they will remain in that cohort. If a student moves two levels in one year they will move to that cohort.

Imagine a hypothetical group of 20 ELL students in grade level cluster 3-5

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Name 2005 Cohort APLA 2006 Cohort APLA 2007

ACCESS 2005 for 05? ACCESS 2006 for 06? ACCESS

Lisa 2.1 II ? 2.8 II no

Yuan 1.8 I ? 2.9 III yes

Chi 1.3 I ? 2.3 II yes

Roberto 4.3 V ? 4.7 V no

Thomas 4.2 V ? 4.2 V no

Gunter 4.1 IV ? 3.8 IV no

Ivan 2.9 III ? 3.6 IV yes

Emily 2.2 II ? 3.0 III yes

Julia 1.7 I ? 2.3 II yes

Jose 5.4 VII Proficient Monitor Monitor Monitor Monitor

Jorge 3.3 III ? 4.2 V yes

Rosa 2.5 II ? 2.9 III yes

Anna 4.9 VI Proficient Monitor Monitor Monitor Monitor

Laurence 2.1 II ? 3.0 III yes

Mario 3.8 IV ? 3.8 IV no

Kim 3.6 IV ? 4.5 V yes

Pak 5.6 VII Proficient Monitor Monitor Monitor Monitor

Cam 3.6 IV ? 3.5 III no

Maria 5.3 VI Proficient Monitor Monitor Monitor Monitor

Marie-Claire 2.9 III ? 3.6 IV yes

In year 2006 10 of 16 or 62.5% made APLA (4 of the original group were in monitoring).

Obviously the model is idealized. There would be new students in 2006 and others would also have left.

To determine if a school or LEA has met their AMAO we will rank order all schools by grade level cluster and then by % who made APLA. (Following the model established for Title I)

Using their population of ELL students, establish a cut at the 20th percentile for all students tested. Everyone above that line would have made their AMAO.

Sample of establishing the baseline by finding the school at the 20th percentile. (HYPOTHETICAL DATA!)

SCHOOL ranked from highest% %making APLA in Population in making APLA to lowest% Language Acquisition Cluster 3-5

making APLA

Jones School 65% 250

Elm St School 65% 55

Davis School 64% 100

MLK School 61% 90

Lincoln School 61% 50

Johnson School 60% 70

River Road School 58% 90

Austin School 58% 80

Monroe School 57% 50

Jefferson School 56% 60

Tyler School 55% 45

Adams School 55% 240

McKinnley School 54% 70

Franklin School 53% 40

Grant School 48% 120

Nixon School 47% 100

Clinton Ave School 47% 45

Eisenhower School 45% 45

80% of the ELL students are above this line, 20% of the ELL students are below

Maple School 42% 80

Polk School 38% 45

Carver School 37% 50

John Glen School 36% 70

Lee School 21% 75

Kennedy School 16% 80 TOTAL ELL in grade level cluster 3-5 = 2000

Once the base line is established, a growth trajectory will be created to establish annual goals at equal intervals with the intention of reaching 80% of all students achieving APLA each year by 2014.

For example: from the fictional sample above: if 45% became the baseline (the lowest % of students making APLA), there would be a difference of 35% between 2006 performance of the school at the 20th percentile and the goal of 80% by 2006. Divided into 8 equal intervals would move the "MADE AMAOs level" by 4.375% each year. To make their AMAOs in 2007 would require 49.375% of the students making APLA, in 2008, 53.75%, in 2009, 58.25% and so on.

Other Factors

1. Full academic year: Because the first administration of ACCESS establishes a base line, even if the student comes one day before testing their score would not factor into the AMOS until 12 months later. The full academic year (OCT 1) will apply only for transfer students).
 2. Rules for transfer students will apply only if a student transfers with an ACCESS score.
 3. Minimum N of 40.
 4. AMAOs will apply to all schools accepting Title I or Title III funds
 5. Number of students achieving proficiency each year will be shown in a table.
 6. AMAOs will apply first at the schools level and then be rolled up to the LEA level.
-

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

Students are identified to a cohort by taking the ACCESS for ELL's. The student's composite score places them into their cohort. After the second administration of this assessment a student's progress in English proficiency is determined. If the student moves into a different cohort then Adequate Progress with Language Acquisition (APLA) has been met.

The chart below represents WIDA's suggested estimates for reporting progress of English language learners (Technical Report # 3)

Determining if ELL students make Adequate Progress with Language Acquisition (APLA)

Students would be expected to score in the range of performance of the next cohort to have made APLA

Cohort (Determined by ACCESS score) English Language Proficiency Level (Range)

Range of Performance

(Composite score on ACCESS)

I 1.0- 2.0 1.0

II 2.1- 2.8 .7

III 2.9- 3.5 .6

IV 3.6- 4.1 .5

V 4.2- 4.7 .5

VI 4.8- 5.3 .5

AL will consider 4.8-5.3 or above proficient

VII 5.4- 6.0 .6

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? No Response

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

The AMAO data is not currently available.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS			
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS			
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY			
TOTAL			

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? No Response

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information	
	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No Response</u>

Comments: The AMAO data is not currently available.

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	76	85.39
4	44	80.00
5	55	90.16
6	53	94.64
7	34	89.47
8	24	77.42
H.S.	15	83.33

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	80	89.89
4	45	81.82
5	50	80.65
6	48	85.71
7	32	84.21
8	23	76.67
H.S.	16	88.89

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. 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.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	
Comments: This is a transition year for Alabama, graduation/dropout rates will be reported starting with the 2005-2006 school year.	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," 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.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	1.38
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.37
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.37
Black, non-Hispanic	40.75
Hispanic	0.02
White, non-Hispanic	58.50
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	60.82
Female	39.18
Comments: 2004-2005 dropout data is not available for Students with Disabilities, Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged, and Migrant student group populations.	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

A total of 175 instructional days for students; 182 days for teachers.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	98	63
LEAs with Subgrants	34	25

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	185	1376
1	177	1043
2	153	1042
3	174	949
4	138	866
5	146	813
6	185	1088
7	133	1132
8	147	1001
9	104	620
10	79	513
11	86	410
12	40	291

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth		
Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.		
Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	242	996
Doubled-up	973	7356
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	161	1187
Hotels/Motels	99	632
Unknown	272	973
Comments:		
* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.		

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	1250
1	927
2	896
3	801
4	747
5	723
6	995
7	1017
8	886
9	542
10	406
11	336
12	255
Comments: Other 132	

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006
124
Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

108

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

425

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	582
English Language Learners (ELL)	259
Gifted and Talented	141
Vocational Education	199

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	19
Expedited evaluations	9
Staff professional development and awareness	19
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	16
Transportation	13
Early childhood programs	10
Assistance with participation in school programs	19
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	20
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	15
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	19
Coordination between schools and agencies	18
Counseling	16
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	14
Clothing to meet a school requirement	22
School supplies	23
Referral to other programs and services	17
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	14
Other (optional)	4

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School selection	1
Transportation	5
School records	3
Immunizations or other medical records	3
Other enrollment issues	2

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	656	305
Grade 4	Yes	604	275
Grade 5	Yes	552	243
Grade 6	Yes	555	262
Grade 7	Yes	591	218
Grade 8	Yes	479	144
Grade 9	Yes	36	<n
Grade 10	Yes	95	32
Grade 11	Yes	145	46
Grade 12	Yes	30	8

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	643	266
Grade 4	Yes	588	253
Grade 5	Yes	537	224
Grade 6	Yes	544	254
Grade 7	Yes	560	167
Grade 8	Yes	432	141
Grade 9	Yes	34	<n
Grade 10	Yes	94	22
Grade 11	Yes	143	40
Grade 12	Yes	29	10

Comments:

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.