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).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 07/31/2007

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
__X__Part I, 2005-2006 ___Part II, 2005-2006

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Arizona Department of Education

Address:
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Richard Valdivia
Telephone: 602-542-3270
Fax: 602-542-3050
e-mail: richard.valdivia@azed.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Richard Valdivia

_____ __Thursday, March 01, 2007, 2:03:13 PM__
Signature Date

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 State Board of Education adopted the Grades 3-8 and High School Academic Content Standards for Science, June 2004. Schools and districts had one academic year (2004-2005) as a transition year and were required to implement the standards the following academic year (2005-2006).

The process for development of the Science Standard for Arizona followed the adopted procedure for standards development that was utilized with reading, writing and mathematics standards development. Committees of educators met over a one year period to develop the multiple drafts of the science standard. After the committees completed their draft of the Standard, it was reviewed by experts in the field and evaluated for measurability. Public forums were conducted through the state for review of the Science Standard. A committee then met and reviewed the additional information and produced a final version which was presented to the State Board. Membership on the committees differed to insure greater representation of the diverse Arizona population during this development process.

The State Board of Education adopted the Alternate Academic Standards for Science for students with a significant cognitive disability on May 24, 2006. These standards followed the process used for the development of the Science Standard for Arizona which was adopted June 2004.

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

The Arizona Assessment Program has full approval with recommendations from USDOE. The first operational AIMS (Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards) for high school in reading, writing and mathematics was administered April 26-May 7, 1999. The first operational administration of AIMS to grades 3, 5, and 8 in reading, writing and mathematics was March 27-30, 2000. AIMS assessed the Arizona Standards adopted in 1996.

Currently the Arizona Assessment Program administers the following assessments of the Academic Content Standards for reading, writing and mathematics adopted by the State Board in 2003 and 2004. Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards Dual Purpose Assessment (AIMS DPA) is used in Grades 3-8, Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards High School (AIMS HS) is used in high school, and Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards- Alternate (AIMS-A) is used to assess the competency and growth of students with significant cognitive disabilities in Grades 3-8 and High School. AIMS DPA and AIMS HS are selected response items for reading and mathematics, and extended response for writing. AIMS-A uses a performance evaluation, a parent interview and activity-based evidence. The State provides information to the students, parents, educators and the public about the performance of the student, the school, the district and the state. 2005 was the first year that all grades (3-8 and High School) were administered an assessment of the grade level academic standards. After the administration of the AIMS DPA in 2006, longitudinal reports will be provided to students in Grades 4-8. The results for each administration were provided to districts through a server website.

After the Articulated Academic Standards for reading and mathematics were approved in the spring of 2003, the assessment section started the process of developing assessments for the articulated standards for grades 3-8 and high school. In April 2003, test Blueprints were developed for reading and mathematics. Arizona educators are critical members of the Arizona test development team. Arizona teachers/educators met during the spring/summer of 2003, 2004, and 2005 to write items and to review content/bias of passages/items. Items developed are field tested the following spring during the administration of AIMS. Writing prompts were field tested in October 2003 and April 2004 and next field test of writing prompts is planned for 2006-07. Arizona educators reviewed items after the administration of the field test before the items were placed in the Arizona Item Bank. They also met to develop anchor sets for writing from field tested responses. Arizona educators reviewed items developed to the 1996 standards to determine if the items matched performance objectives of the new standards before the items were included in the Item Bank.

For the first time, Arizona educators met in October 2004 to select items from the Item Bank to be on the operational test for grades 3-8 and high school. For grades 3-8, norm-referenced (TerraNova) items are embedded into the standards-based AIMS to meet state legislation. Again educators met and determined which norm-referenced items aligned to the performance objectives for a particular year and content area. Only items that are aligned will be included as part of student's AIMS scores. Arizona educators met in the summer of 2005, to select replacement items for the 2006 assessments. As always, the items were reviewed for both content and statistical significance prior to final selection.

The State Board approved the Academic Content Standards for Science June 2004. A committee of educators met in April 2005 to begin the process of development of science assessments for Grades 4, 8 and High School Life Science. The Blueprint, Item Specifications, and Scenarios have been developed. Educators will meet March 2006 to write items for the assessments. Field testing will occur April 2007 and operation will follow in April 2008. Alternate Academic Content Standards in Science for students with significant cognitive disabilities were adopted May 2006.

When AIMS-A was first developed, the assessment was aligned to the existing state academic standards, which were not articulated at grade level. The functional level of the standards in reading, writing, listening/speaking, and mathematics was adopted by the State Board of Education. The AIM-SA Level I alternate assessment and alternate achievement standards were adopted by the State Board of Education on August 28, 2000. AIM-SA Level II of the alternate assessment and achievement standards were adopted by the State Board of Education on October 25, 2004. After the adoption of grade-level content standards for reading, mathematics and writing, a subcommittee met

in March 2005 to align the Level I and II alternate assessments with the newly articulated achievement standards. Adjustments were made to the assessment instruments.

Academic Content Standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities were adopted by the State Board May 24, 2006.

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

The State Board of Education (SBE) adopted new academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics for Grades 3-8 and High School on May 12, 2005. The SBE supported the work completed by the Standard Setting Committees which followed the Bookmark Standard Setting procedure for reading and mathematics and the Body of Work Standard Setting procedure for writing.

One hundred forty-four Arizona educators, which represented the diversity of the state, participated in the process.

Alternate Achievement Standards were adopted by the State Board June 2 2006 for the AIM-A, Levels I and II. The State Board adopted the achievement standards recommended by the Standard Setting Committee comprised of Arizona educators, parents and community members.

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	547614	99.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	30205	97.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	13783	99.00
Black, non-Hispanic	29141	99.00
Hispanic	220088	99.00
White, non-Hispanic	243056	98.00
Students with Disabilities	61805	93.00
Limited English Proficient	70046	98.00
Economically Disadvantaged	242435	98.00
Migrant	4622	97.00
Male	277939	98.00
Female	269136	99.00

Comments:

- 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	549627	98.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	30324	97.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	13786	99.00
Black, non-Hispanic	29308	99.00
Hispanic	220653	98.00
White, non-Hispanic	254243	98.00
Students with Disabilities	63103	89.00
Limited English Proficient	70046	98.00
Economically Disadvantaged	243216	97.00
Migrant	4655	96.00
Male	279009	98.00
Female	270071	99.00

Comments:

- 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	67884	91.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	5047	6.80
Comments: Data for students using an alternate assessment based on grade level is not available.		

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	68028	91.70
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	5047	6.80
Comments: Data for students using an alternate assessment based on grade level is not available.		

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	79110	71.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	3933	52.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2052	85.80
Black, non-Hispanic	4124	59.90
Hispanic	34176	61.70
White, non-Hispanic	34825	84.20
Students with Disabilities	9971	44.40
Limited English Proficient	14068	41.00
Economically Disadvantaged	39050	61.30
Migrant	31	19.40
Male	40522	71.30
Female	38588	72.10

Comments: Reviewed

- 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	78545	67.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	3893	49.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2047	82.60
Black, non-Hispanic	4103	58.60
Hispanic	33931	54.30
White, non-Hispanic	34571	81.40
Students with Disabilities	9403	38.80
Limited English Proficient	13852	29.00
Economically Disadvantaged	38706	54.50
Migrant	31	29.00
Male	40116	63.10
Female	38429	71.00

Comments: Reviewed

- 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	79271	72.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	4072	54.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	2086	88.60
Black, non-Hispanic	4170	61.30
Hispanic	33106	62.70
White, non-Hispanic	35837	84.40
Students with Disabilities	10119	41.30
Limited English Proficient	12670	40.00
Economically Disadvantaged	38371	61.80
Migrant	39	46.20
Male	40346	71.90
Female	38925	73.60

Comments: Reviewed

- 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	78812	65.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	4041	45.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2080	81.80
Black, non-Hispanic	4150	57.60
Hispanic	32912	50.80
White, non-Hispanic	35629	81.00
Students with Disabilities	9634	33.90
Limited English Proficient	12453	21.00
Economically Disadvantaged	38095	50.90
Migrant	39	30.80
Male	40007	61.50
Female	38805	69.30

Comments: Reviewed

- 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	78476	67.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	3980	49.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2133	85.80
Black, non-Hispanic	4096	54.00
Hispanic	32322	56.50
White, non-Hispanic	35945	80.70
Students with Disabilities	10056	32.40
Limited English Proficient	10515	27.00
Economically Disadvantaged	37437	55.40
Migrant	50	42.00
Male	39940	67.00
Female	38536	68.80

Comments: Asian: Enrollment for this ethnic group increased approximately 12% statewide going from 2005 to 2006.

- 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	78170	66.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	3964	48.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2128	82.60
Black, non-Hispanic	4077	57.30
Hispanic	32159	52.70
White, non-Hispanic	35842	81.50
Students with Disabilities	9757	31.90
Limited English Proficient	10128	18.00
Economically Disadvantaged	37234	52.80
Migrant	50	34.00
Male	39705	63.00
Female	38465	70.70

Comments: Asian: Enrollment for this ethnic group increased approximately 12% statewide going from 2005 to 2006.

- 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	78552	62.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	4341	40.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1931	83.10
Black, non-Hispanic	4164	49.50
Hispanic	32003	49.20
White, non-Hispanic	36113	76.60
Students with Disabilities	9120	24.60
Limited English Proficient	9500	19.00
Economically Disadvantaged	37097	48.20
Migrant	26	30.80
Male	39889	60.60
Female	38663	63.70

Comments: Reviewed

- 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	78712	64.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	4350	43.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1929	82.40
Black, non-Hispanic	4195	56.30
Hispanic	32061	49.80
White, non-Hispanic	36177	80.70
Students with Disabilities	9192	27.70
Limited English Proficient	9500	14.00
Economically Disadvantaged	37183	50.10
Migrant	26	23.10
Male	39949	60.60
Female	38763	69.20

Comments: Asian: Enrollment for this ethnic group increased approximately 12% statewide going from 2005 to 2006.

- 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	77524	67.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	4609	47.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1925	86.40
Black, non-Hispanic	4108	56.10
Hispanic	30777	55.20
White, non-Hispanic	36105	80.90
Students with Disabilities	7875	25.60
Limited English Proficient	9463	24.00
Economically Disadvantaged	34694	54.20
Migrant	26	42.30
Male	39277	65.60
Female	38247	69.50

Comments: Asian: Enrollment for this ethnic group increased approximately 12% statewide going from 2005 to 2006.

Students with Disabilities: For our 2006 submission we followed definitions used for AYP / NCLB and excluded test scores of students receiving accomodations and students who are home schooled. These scores were not excluded from the 2005 counts we submitted.

- 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	78006	65.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	4637	46.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1934	81.10
Black, non-Hispanic	4151	57.30
Hispanic	30912	50.70
White, non-Hispanic	36372	80.10
Students with Disabilities	8316	24.80
Limited English Proficient	9240	15.00
Economically Disadvantaged	34922	50.60
Migrant	25	28.00
Male	39544	59.90
Female	38462	70.80

Comments: Asian: Enrollment for this ethnic group increased approximately 12% statewide going from 2005 to 2006.

- 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	77282	60.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	4434	41.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1815	80.10
Black, non-Hispanic	4093	45.70
Hispanic	30299	45.70
White, non-Hispanic	36641	74.90
Students with Disabilities	7531	21.90
Limited English Proficient	8827	19.00
Economically Disadvantaged	33014	45.50
Migrant	26	15.40
Male	39015	59.70
Female	38267	60.60

Comments: Students with Disabilities: For our 2006 submission we followed definitions used for AYP / NCLB and excluded test scores of students receiving accomodations and students who are home schooled. These scores were not excluded from the 2005 counts we submitted.

- 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	78030	62.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	4466	43.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1820	79.00
Black, non-Hispanic	4144	54.70
Hispanic	30547	47.00
White, non-Hispanic	37053	78.40
Students with Disabilities	8225	23.40
Limited English Proficient	9409	12.00
Economically Disadvantaged	33345	47.10
Migrant	24	12.50
Male	39475	58.80
Female	38555	67.00

Comments: Reviewed

- 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	70094	65.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	4181	42.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1783	83.90
Black, non-Hispanic	3783	51.50
Hispanic	24643	50.60
White, non-Hispanic	35704	79.00
Students with Disabilities	5774	21.50
Limited English Proficient	5005	20.00
Economically Disadvantaged	22957	48.90
Migrant	37	43.20
Male	35041	64.30
Female	35053	66.70

Comments: Students with Disabilities: For our 2006 submission we followed definitions used for AYP/NCLB and excluded test scores of students receiving accomodations and students who are home schooled. These scores were not excluded from the 2005 counts we submitted.

- 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	72027	71.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	4309	48.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	1798	82.40
Black, non-Hispanic	3883	63.20
Hispanic	25403	56.20
White, non-Hispanic	36634	85.80
Students with Disabilities	7090	29.80
Limited English Proficient	5467	12.00
Economically Disadvantaged	23912	54.20
Migrant	104	48.10
Male	36233	68.80
Female	35794	74.90

Comments: Black, non-Hispanic: Enrollment for this ethnic group increased approximately 9% statewide going from 2005 to 2006.

- 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	1860	1249	67.00
Comments:			
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	534	327	61.00
Comments:			

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	1169	711	61.00
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	383	208	54.00
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.

ADE provides statewide professional development and technical assistance for superintendents, school leaders, and instructional staff on a variety of topics including but not limited to: instructional leadership, standards based instruction, response to intervention training, differentiation of instruction, effective instruction by paraprofessionals, conducting comprehensive needs assessment, parent involvement, reading and math academies for all grade levels, NCLB programs (grant administration, coordination, reporting, monitoring), data analysis, and instructional technology.

All Title I schools identified in need of improvement have an assigned NCLB Coach. NCLB Coaches are Arizona Department of Education (ADE) employees that are assigned to assist schools in writing/revising and implementing a school improvement plan. Coaches also provide technical assistance for schools in applying for school improvement grants, evaluate school improvement plans, and provide training on the federal consequences and requirements of Title I schools in improvement.

Schools identified in need of improvement are also eligible to participate in a six day (two days each in December, January, and February) What Works in Schools Conference with Dr. Robert Marzano and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Cadre. For 2006-07, seventy-three schools applied of which 50 schools were chosen from throughout the state to participate (schools identified warning - restructuring implementation). Schools were selected based on their status of improvement and the district capacity to assist the school to implement the strategies learned throughout the conference. Schools must commit to attending up to five team members to learn about the student level, teacher level and school level factors that impact student achievement.

Title I schools identified for improvement are given the opportunity to apply for a Title I School Improvement Grant. ADE also provides this opportunity to Title I schools identified as not making AYP for the first time, identified as "Warning" to apply for a Title I School Improvement "Warning" grant. The grant assists eligible schools to write/revise and implement a school improvement plan. Activities include using the grant to pay for the school improvement team to attend the above-mentioned professional development and/or technical assistance.

Schools identified for corrective action were notified and given a Technical Assistance Manual, which explains their responsibilities per federal law. The districts of the Corrective Action schools are required to submit an on-line report to the ADE identifying the corrective action taken and the technical assistance they are providing to the school. Subsequent reports are due monthly.

Schools identified for planning restructuring are given the opportunity to apply for Title I School Improvement Restructuring Planning grants. This grant assists schools in writing a plan to restructure and attend training regarding the Restructuring Planning process.

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.
ADE NCLB Coaches are assigned to review each LEA Final Consolidated Plan Addendum (LEA Improvement Plan) to ensure alignment to the LEA NCLB Consolidated Plan/Update and indicates where the LEA failed to make AYP and includes the required LEA improvement components (including the expenditures for professional development). ADE staff provides technical assistance on writing/revising the LEA Addendum as necessary. A statewide Professional Development Resource Guide is available online to all districts identified for improvement and corrective action in locating appropriate professional development as well as scientifically research based strategies to assist the LEA in making AYP: http://www.schoolsmovingup.net/cs/az/print/htdocs/az/home.htm

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.	15
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.	20
How many of these schools were charter schools?	1
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.	140
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.	65227
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.	144
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:	

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.	58
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	4223
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.	48106
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.	3534
Comments:	

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	23993	20770	86.60
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	8184	6798	83.10
Low-Poverty Schools	1736	1555	89.60
All Elementary Schools	18513	15803	85.40
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	1834	1663	90.70
Low-Poverty Schools	205	177	86.30
All Secondary Schools	5480	4967	90.60
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 though 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	62.90
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	7.80
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	29.30
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
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)	49.50
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	4.90
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	45.60
d) Other (please explain)	0.00

Comments: The FY 2006 HQT data represents a sampling of district and charter schools in Arizona. This sampling includes charter schools and school districts that have one or more schools identified for Title I School Improvement. This sampling represents approximately 50% of the core academic teachers in Arizona. The use of the sampling for FY 2006 was approved by the USDE as a component of Arizona's "Response to Peer Reviewers" submitted on September 29th, 2006.

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	75.80	18.90
Poverty Metric Used	Free or Reduced Priced Lunch	
Secondary Schools	58.20	4.20
Poverty Metric Used	Free or Reduced Priced Lunch	
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	92.00

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

As noted in CSPR, Part II:

ESTABLISHMENT

The English Acquisition Services (EAS) unit of the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) relied heavily on nationally-acclaimed expert, Susan Pimentel; she was key resource in the development of Arizona's K-12, Adult Education, and Early Childhood Education Standards. Her intimate knowledge of Arizona's educational system and standards made her uniquely qualified to produce the initial draft of the ELL standards.

Preliminary draft standards were examined by a small team of national and local experts.

Upon completion of the initial draft of the ELL standards, six regional focus groups were conducted in Chinle, Flagstaff, Mesa, Tucson, Yuma, and West Phoenix from October 6-10, 2003. Approximately 75 educators participated in this first round of regional focus groups. They included ELL coordinators, ELL teachers, principals, directors of federal programs, one superintendent, assistant superintendents, Indian Education coordinators, ELL testers, and members of the Central Arizona Bilingual Consortium (CABC).

EAS also sent a survey and drafts of the ELL standards to 100 participants of the CABC for their review and feedback.

> Substantive feedback was received by both focus group and CABC participants.

> New draft was completed in November 2003.

> From December 10-18, 2003, a second set of regional focus groups was conducted in the same locations with the same participants.

> Approximately 40 participants attended this second round of focus groups.

> Information attained from the six regional focus groups was compiled and final revisions were made to the ELL standards.

The Arizona English Language Proficiency Standards (AELPS) were adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education (SBOE) on January 26, 2004. (SBOE minutes are available at: www.ade.az.gov/stateboard)

The characteristics of the AELPS are as follows:

Each domain defines five stages of proficiency. The proficiency standards indicators in each domain build cognitively from the earliest developmental level to the commencement level through five stages of proficiency -- ELL I through ELL V. The levels are organized in a continuum of developmental progression. The five stages of the ELL Proficiency Standards reflect the five grade level span divisions of Arizona's Content Standards in listening, speaking, reading and writing.

ELL I is correlated to the Readiness level for Kindergarten.

ELL II is correlated to the Foundations level for grades 1-3.

ELL III is correlated to the Essentials level for grades 4-5.

ELL IV is correlated to the Essentials level for grades 6-8.

ELL V is correlated to the Proficient level for grades 9-12.

Students who enter Arizona's schools as Kindergartners will begin their instruction at ELL I and progress through the other stages until they transition into the mainstream academic standards. All other students will be assigned to the proficiency stages that best match their levels of competency in English language literacy. The standards are cumulative. If a student is placed at a higher stage of proficiency, the student has mastered the skills and concepts at the lower stages of proficiency. Accurate placement is essential for appropriate instruction.

Each stage of proficiency provides a summary of performance conditions. Performance conditions are provided for each of the five proficiency stages. These summaries give readers a snapshot of the skills and abilities students at this stage of proficiency demonstrate. They also outline the context in which the performance can be displayed.

Each stage of proficiency also includes the performance standard and five different levels of performance. The five levels of performance within each stage of proficiency are: Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, Early Advanced, and Advanced. Within each performance level are performance indicators. Each performance indicator is a statement of the specific knowledge, skills, and abilities expected to be mastered by the average student who is receiving ELL instruction. The Beginning level introduces new skills and knowledge and proceeds across the performance continuum. Individual concepts advance in complexity in each new level of performance. Advanced level skills, abilities, and knowledge correlate to at-grade level Language Arts content objectives. At-grade level correlations are listed below.

The advanced level for ELL1 correlates to the Readiness level for Kindergarten.

The advanced level for ELL 2 correlates to the Foundations level for 3rd grade.

The advanced level for ELL 3 correlates to the Essentials level for 5th grade.

The advanced level for ELL 4 correlates to the Essentials level for 8th grade.

The advanced level for ELL 5 correlates to the Proficient level for 12th grade.

IMPLEMENTATION/OPERATIONALIZATION

1. The AELPS are being used by district and school teachers across Arizona.

2. The AELPS are one of the mandatory rubric items in training required to obtain the Structured English Immersion (SEI) Endorsement (ARS 15-756: Programs for English learners; requirements; federal funding). In addition, the SEI Endorsement (and its necessary component, the AELPS) are now part of the Teacher Preparatory Programs at all Arizona Institutes of Higher Learning.

As you can see, EAS and the SBOE have made the AELPS an integral part of ELL education. (See Checklists I & II below)

NOTE:The State of Arizona is requesting technical assistance from the USDOE.

CHECKLIST I - Curricular Framework for PROVISIONAL SEI Endorsement Training (15 CLOCK HOURS) SBOE approved 1/24/2005

1. Examine the format and alignment of ELL Proficiency Standards to the Arizona Language Arts (Listening & Speaking, Reading, and Writing) Academic Standards

2. Use ELL Proficiency Standards to plan, deliver and evaluate instruction.

3. Demonstrate the integration of ELL Proficiency Standards in all content areas.

CHECKLIST II - Curricular Framework for FULL SEI Endorsement Training (45 CLOCK HOURS) SBOE approved 1/24/2005

1. Examine the format and the alignment of ELL Proficiency Standards to the Arizona Language Arts (Listening & Speaking, Reading, and Writing) Academic Standards.

2. Use ELL Proficiency Standards to plan, deliver and evaluate instruction.

3. Demonstrate the integration of ELL Proficiency Standards in all content areas.

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

Arizona's AZELLA Form AZ-1 - ELL Standards Alignment Review Process

A Modified Achieve, Inc. Model

STEP ONE: Test Blueprint Development (February - March 2006)

Senior reviewers align AZELLA Form AZ- 1 test items from the Pre-literacy, Primary, Elementary, Middle School, and High School tests with Arizona's ELL proficiency standards and content objectives.

STEP TWO: Item-by-Item, Source of Challenge, Balance, and Range Analyses (March - April 2006)

(a). Confirm test blueprints;

(b). Rank content centrality;

(c). Rank performance centrality;

(d). Rank the source of challenge;

(e). Determine balance (how well a set of test items correlates to a standard and its content objectives); and

(f). Determine range (the measurement of coverage between test items and content objectives).

STEP THREE: Alignment Results Reporting (April - June 2006)

Senior reviewers prepare and submit AZELLA Form AZ-1 Alignment Review to the Arizona Department of Education. The report includes the findings from the five Achieve measurements listed in Step Two. Data from the AZELLA Form AZ-1 Alignment Review.

Arizona chose a benchmarking model that would produce the range and depth of analysis required to thoroughly assess the alignment between AZELLA Form AZ-1 and the English Language Learner proficiency standards. This process employed an intensive examination of both AZELLA Form AZ-1 tests and the Arizona ELL proficiency standards. Two experienced senior reviewers studied and analyzed every test question. Susan Pimentel, J.D., a national standards and assessment expert, reviewed the draft report and provided additional guidance. The results of their efforts and expertise have been presented in this report.

In summary, the alignment of Form AZ-1 to the AZ ELL proficiency standards was .85, or 85%. This is the range measurement that shows there was at least one test item for 85% of the AZ ELL proficiency standards' content objectives. This is a very high correlation.

The other measures of alignment are:

Content Centrality: 77%

Performance Centrality: 92.5%

Appropriate Source of Challenge: 93%

Balance: 27% of the content objectives are unassessed or under-assessed; 73% of the content objectives are well-covered by AZ-1 test items

Overall, the alignment is superior.

Please note that the State of Arizona is requesting technical assistance from the USDOE.

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 __Yes__
- Other evidence of alignment __No__

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

Please note that the state of Arizona is requesting technical assistance from the USDOE.

1. Answer: Please see 1.6.1.

2. Answer: Identification of gaps and under-assessed content objectives provides part of the blueprint for the development of the next version of AZELLA, Form AZ-2, which will be developed and tested during the 2006-2007 school year. The operational version of AZ-2 will be used for the 2007-2008 school year.

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2005-2006** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information. The information following the chart is meant to explain what is being requested under each column.

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2005-2006 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State

Name of ELP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP (3)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency									
				Number and Percentage at Basic or **Level 1** (4)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or **Level 2** (5)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or **Level 3** (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 4** (7)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 5** (8)	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) Assessment	177048	152962	86.00	12029	8.00	3854	3.00	28855	19.00	82693	54.00	25531	16.00

Comments:

(1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
(2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
(3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
(4-8) In columns four-eight, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-8 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

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	128404	79.90
2. English	20162	12.50
3. Navajo	4731	2.90
4. Other Non-Indian	2165	1.40
5. Vietnamese	1010	0.60
6. Arabic	834	0.50
7. Russian	400	0.30
8. Korean	384	0.20
9. Apache (Whiteriver)	263	0.20
10. Mandarin	219	0.10
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.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2005-2006 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III

Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency										Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (8)	
			Number and Percentage at Basic or **Level 1** (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or **Level 2** (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or **Level 3** (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 4** (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 5** (7)			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) Assessment	152568	99.00	12019	8.00	3852	3.00	28776	19.00	82444	54.00	25477	17.00		

Comments: COLUMN 7 COMMENT- Level 5 *This is an estimate. The State will not know exact measures until the following school year.

COLUMN 8 COMMENT - Totals **This data is not captured until the second year of being an FEP, because academic assessments are administered in the SY spring.

(1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
(2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year.
(3-7) In columns three-seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2005-2006 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
(8) In column eight, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

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
29350	29350	

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.)**

*As per the 2006 CSPR Review:

a. On April 2, 2004, a letter was sent to Celia Sims of the United States Department of Education (USDOE) modifying the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) Consolidated State Application (of June 12, 2002).

b. A copy was also forwarded to USDOE Program Officer Elizabeth Judd.

c. This letter was sent with the understanding (at that time) that immigrant funding was an allowable but not required activity.

d. The modification to the ADE detailed ADE's decision to not reserve Title III funds specifically for immigrant children.

e. It is now clearly understood upon further guidance from USDOE that such monies shall be reserved separately and specifically for the immigrant sub-population on the ELL sub-group; this implementation will begin with the 2006-2007 school year.

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

Please note that the State of Arizona is requesting technical assistance from the USDOE.

#1 The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments

The Definition of "proficient" as legislated 6/21/06 and formally adopted/enacted into Arizona law 30 days after the 2006 session ended, 9/21/06. A.R.S. 15-756 states "The test scores adopted by the Superintendent as indicating English language proficiency shall be based on the test publishers designated scores."

Harcourt Assessment provided the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) with various sources of information in order to obtain the final proficiency cut scores for the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZ ELLA). The AZELLA (State Board of Education [SBOE]-adopted) is the augmented version of the 2004-2005 SBOE-adopted Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) Assessment. The sources of information included:

a. The cut score recommendations from the 77 panelists of the Standard Setting meeting that was held on June 6-7, 2006.

b. The English Language Learner Performance Level Descriptors that were originally developed by the ADE and provided to the standard setting panelists.

c. Impact or consequential data from the Forms Field Testing conducted on Arizona ELL students showing the percentage of students at each performance level given the final cut scores.

d. The placement of the cut scores on the AZ ELLA vertical scale across grades.

By examining these sources of information, a set of coherent and consistent cut scores were developed that took into account the expert judgment of ELL teachers, explicit achievement expectations for ELL students, the actual performance of students on the AZ ELLA, and the psychometric characteristics of growth along a vertical scale. The final cut scores are in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 shows the cut scores as raw scores while Table 2 presents the scale score equivalents of the cut scores on the AZ ELLA vertical scale. Table 3 presents the impact of applying the final cut scores to student performance data taken from the Forms Field Test for AZ ELLA.

TABLE 1: RAW SCORE CUTS for the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZ ELLA).

Grade-Emergent-Basic-Intermediate-Proficient-Max Points

K 11 18 40 58 72

1 18 27 59 82 100

2 20 30 60 85 100

3 15 25 55 80 100

4 18 27 59 82 100

5 20 30 60 84 100

6 17 28 61 88 110

7 19 30 64 91 110

8 22 33 66 94 110

9 17 28 61 88 110

10 18 29 63 90 110

11 20 31 64 92 110

12 22 33 66 94 110

TABLE 2: SCALE SCORE CUTS for the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZ ELLA).

Grade-Emergent-Basic-Intermediate-Proficient

K 459 485 546 605

1 506 530 588 637

2 512 537 590 646

3 540 564 615 664

4 549 568 621 669

5 554 574 623 675

6 557 581 630 677

7 562 584 635 684

8 569 589 637 692

9 581 605 656 703

10 583 607 659 707

11 588 610 660 712

12 593 614 663 718

TABLE 3: Percent of Students at Performance Level Based on the Forms Field Test for the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZ ELLA).

PreEmergent-Emergent-Basic-Intermediate-Proficient

K 0% 1% 15% 62% 21%

1 0% 1% 31% 61% 7%

2 0% 1% 11% 59% 29%

3 0% 4% 25% 56% 15%

4 1% 5% 20% 49% 25%

5 1% 5% 9% 46% 38%

6 1% 3% 23% 42% 31%

7 1% 5% 27% 49% 17%

8 1% 1% 23% 60% 14%

9 1% 5% 33% 49% 11%

10 0% 7% 33% 49% 11%

11 2% 4% 35% 55% 5%

12 3% 9% 44% 40% 4%

#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

The subtests include Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing Conventions, and Writing. The Comprehension score is derived by combining the Listening and Reading scores. The assessment is a compensatory model that provides a total composite score, which incorporates the scores of the subtests. The performance level is determined by the range within which the students' scaled score falls.

#3 Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

There is no other criterion other than the assessment used for determining proficiency. Please note this excerpt from Arizona State Board of Education Rule R7-2-306:

"G.) 4. Reassessment for reclassification.

1. The purpose of reassessment is to determine if an ELL has developed the English language skills necessary to succeed in the English language curricula.

2. An ELL may be reassessed for reclassification at any time, but shall be reassessed for reclassification at least once per year.

3. ELLs in kindergarten or first grade shall be reassessed with an alternate version of the oral test of English language proficiency used for initial assessment, unless the same test is no longer published or available when a student is to be reassessed. In such case, the school shall select a test from the Board approved tests for reassessment. Students who score at or above the test publisher's designated score for English language proficiency, or such other score adopted by the Board based on the publisher's designated score, may be reclassified as FEP. LEAs may also consider other indications of a student's overall progress, including teacher evaluation, and subject matter assessments that are aligned with grade level state content and performance standards in deciding whether to reclassify a student who has passed the oral proficiency test.

4. ELLs in grades 2-12 shall be reassessed with an alternate version of the oral, reading and writing English language proficiency tests used for initial assessment, unless the same test is no longer published or available when a student is to be reassessed. In such case the school shall select a test from the Board approved tests for reassessment. Students who score at or above the test publisher's designated score for English language proficiency, or such other score adopted by the Board, in all of the tests shall be reclassified as FEP."

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

A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments.

#1 ANSWER

Both the Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) Assessment the used for 2005-2006 and it's augmented version, the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA) have the same proficiency level. These proficiency levels are Pre-Emergent, Emergent, Basic, Intermediate, and Proficient.

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).

#2 ANSWER

The Arizona Department of Education conducts a longitudinal analysis of student level data to calculate the AMAO's for making progress or positive growth from a lower level to a higher proficiency level one of the identified domains which include Oral Language, Reading, or Writing. Students are matched by their SAIS id numbers so the state can monitor the individual progress of students from year to year. The ADE aggregates the results of the student level data by LEA and grade to provide each district with the proportion of students making progress. The data is then aggregated by grade to report how the state performed in regards to meeting the annual measurable achievement objectives.

Again, please note that the State of Arizona is requesting technical assistance from the USDOE.

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
There have been no changes.

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?	Yes

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**			
2005-2006 School Year	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
	% 12.00	# 11001	% 57.00	# 52442	% 12.00	# 18355	% 16.00	# 23880

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.

COMMENT TO "YES"

* Although the AMAOs are applied to all LEP students in the state, the district improvement process is focused on districts that have received Title III funds.

COMMENT TO AMAOs

** Target is based on the number of students who had two years of data in order to calculate the "making progress" objective. "Making progress" only reflects the number of matched cases over a two-year period.

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	12.00	52442	57.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		39045	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	12.00	23880	16.00
TOTAL		115367	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

*** 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	295
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **making progress**	270
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **attaining** English proficiency	149
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **AYP**	234
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	96
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	167
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	31
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet **any** AMAO	1
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	101
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	101
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? *	No

Comments: The count of 101 for the "Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years" includes the total number of sub-grantees that did not meet AMAOs for two OR THREE years.

* 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	3492	76.00
4	3286	73.00
5	3901	67.00
6	3271	57.00
7	3045	60.00
8	2047	50.00
H.S.	1622	54.00

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	3795	82.00
4	3775	84.00
5	4190	72.00
6	3295	57.00
7	3366	66.00
8	2044	50.00
H.S.	1572	52.00

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	75.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	59.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	86.00
Black, non-Hispanic	72.00
Hispanic	64.00
White, non-Hispanic	83.00
Students with Disabilities	61.00
Limited English Proficient	59.00
Economically Disadvantaged	75.00
Migrant	75.00
Male	70.00
Female	77.00
Comments:	
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	8.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	12.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	6.00
Black, non-Hispanic	10.00
Hispanic	10.00
White, non-Hispanic	6.00
Students with Disabilities	7.00
Limited English Proficient	11.00
Economically Disadvantaged	9.00
Migrant	6.00
Male	8.00
Female	7.00
Comments: The 3% difference in the Dropout Rate for American Indian or Alaska Native is due to a transition in the way the data is collected for dropout rates.	
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
The school year shall begin July 1st and end June 30th.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	593	474
LEAs with Subgrants	27	27

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	1058	1122
1	843	1127
2	812	1022
3	706	962
4	679	957
5	670	882
6	636	826
7	586	740
8	514	772
9	439	907
10	404	700
11	335	518
12	435	471

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	1477	1937
Doubled-up	5552	7113
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	442	470
Hotels/Motels	275	621
Unknown	371	865

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	1147
1	1153
2	1045
3	984
4	979
5	902
6	845
7	757
8	790
9	928
10	716
11	530
12	482
Comments:	

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
63
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
1024
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)
57
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)	1144
English Language Learners (ELL)	2292
Gifted and Talented	70
Vocational Education	260
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	16
Expedited evaluations	5
Staff professional development and awareness	17
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	18
Transportation	23
Early childhood programs	4
Assistance with participation in school programs	14
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	16
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	14
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	16
Coordination between schools and agencies	19
Counseling	13
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	7
Clothing to meet a school requirement	19
School supplies	21
Referral to other programs and services	17
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	11
Other (optional)	0

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	4
School selection	3
Transportation	12
School records	5
Immunizations or other medical records	5
Other enrollment issues	7

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
Student Identification	3
Staff Development	3
Child Welfare	2

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	810	457
Grade 4	Yes	777	431
Grade 5	Yes	737	337
Grade 6	Yes	668	268
Grade 7	Yes	580	233
Grade 8	Yes	613	217
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	487	191
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

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	826	376
Grade 4	Yes	776	319
Grade 5	Yes	738	324
Grade 6	Yes	669	272
Grade 7	Yes	581	237
Grade 8	Yes	613	230
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	335	153
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

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.