

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



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

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies.*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs.*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children.*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk.*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform.*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund).*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology.*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act.*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants.*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program).*
- Title IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs.*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities.*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program.*

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

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

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **Performance goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "2005-06 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

Under the authority in Section 1116(g)(1)(A)(i) and Section 1138(b) of No Child Left Behind(NCLB), the Secretary of the Interior convened a Negotiated Rulemaking committee to define Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The committee developed definition of AYP resulted in BIE-funded schools following the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook of the state in which the school is located. The Consolidated Application Accountability Workbook developed by the Bureau of Indian Education references each school/LEA using the accountability plan of the state in which they are located and provides information in areas where there would be a process or oversight responsibility for BIE, which is specific to the BIE.

Therefore the BIE will be adopting the challenging contents standards in science of the twenty-three states in which their schools are located. The BIE's progress in adopting challenging standards in science is dependent on the progress of the twenty-three states

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

Under the authority in Section 1116(g)(1)(A)(i) and Section 1138(b) of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the Secretary of the Interior convened a Negotiated Rulemaking committee to define Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The committee developed definition of AYP resulted in BIE-funded schools following the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook of the state in which the school is located. The Consolidated Application Accountability Workbook developed by the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) references each school/LEA using the accountability plan of the state in which they are located and provides information in areas where there would be a process or oversight responsibility for BIE, which is specific to the BIE.

Therefore, the BIE funded schools will be using the alternate assessments systems in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels that have been adopted by the twenty-three states where BIE schools are located.

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

Under the authority in Section 1116(g)(1)(A)(i) and Section 1138(b) of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the Secretary of the Interior convened a Negotiated Rulemaking committee to define Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The committee developed definition of AYP resulted in BIE-funded schools following the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook of the state in which the school is located. The Consolidated Application Accountability Workbook developed by the Bureau of Indian Education references each school/LEA using the accountability plan of the state in which they are located and provides information in areas where there would be a process or oversight responsibility for BIE, which is specific to the BIA.

Therefore, the BIE will be using the alternate achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels that have been adopted by the twenty-three states where BIE schools are located.

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	22294	96.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	22294	96.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0.00
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0.00
Hispanic	0	0.00
White, non-Hispanic	0	0.00
Students with Disabilities	4339	96.00
Limited English Proficient	8116	96.00
Economically Disadvantaged	22294	96.00
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	11163	96.00
Female	11131	96.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	21908	96.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	21908	96.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0.00
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0.00
Hispanic	0	0.00
White, non-Hispanic	0	0.00
Students with Disabilities	4261	97.00
Limited English Proficient	7878	96.00
Economically Disadvantaged	21908	96.00
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	11017	96.00
Female	10891	96.00

Comments: TThis is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	3722	95.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	49	1.50
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	143	3.50

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

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	3789	95.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	48	1.50
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	148	3.50

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

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	2993	44.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	2993	44.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	509	24.00
Limited English Proficient	1162	38.00
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male	1514	43.00
Female	1479	44.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	2971	42.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	2971	42.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	523	21.00
Limited English Proficient	1144	34.00
Economically Disadvantaged	2971	42.00
Migrant		
Male	1516	36.00
Female	1455	48.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	3001	38.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	3001	38.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	524	18.00
Limited English Proficient	1100	30.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3001	38.00
Migrant		
Male	1491	36.00
Female	1510	40.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	2947	39.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	2947	39.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	528	16.00
Limited English Proficient	1078	29.00
Economically Disadvantaged	2947	39.00
Migrant		
Male	1462	36.00
Female	1485	42.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	2846	31.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	2846	31.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	563	14.00
Limited English Proficient	1043	22.00
Economically Disadvantaged	2846	31.00
Migrant		
Male	1478	29.00
Female	1368	34.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	2821	39.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	2821	39.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	581	15.00
Limited English Proficient	1026	25.00
Economically Disadvantaged	2821	39.00
Migrant		
Male	1469	34.00
Female	1352	44.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	3080	27.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	3080	27.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	629	14.00
Limited English Proficient	1195	18.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3080	27.00
Migrant		
Male	1533	25.00
Female	1547	29.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	3056	32.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	3056	32.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	651	13.00
Limited English Proficient	1197	19.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3056	32.00
Migrant		
Male	1524	28.00
Female	1532	36.00

Comments: TThis is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico were late in receiving their test results. BIE will provide complete data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	3090	26.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	3090	26.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	614	11.00
Limited English Proficient	1247	20.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3090	26.00
Migrant		
Male	1564	25.00
Female	1526	27.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	3076	37.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	3076	37.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	615	14.00
Limited English Proficient	1244	24.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3076	37.00
Migrant		
Male	1555	33.00
Female	1521	42.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	3283	22.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	3283	22.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	627	9.00
Limited English Proficient	1307	15.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3283	22.00
Migrant		
Male	1631	21.00
Female	1652	22.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	3281	35.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	3281	35.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	645	14.00
Limited English Proficient	1292	22.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3281	35.00
Migrant		
Male	1629	30.00
Female	1652	39.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	3164	30.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	3164	30.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	470	17.00
Limited English Proficient	753	22.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3164	30.00
Migrant		
Male	1512	29.00
Female	1652	31.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	2833	42.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	2833	42.00
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities	436	18.00
Limited English Proficient	628	31.00
Economically Disadvantaged	2833	42.00
Migrant		
Male	1385	38.00
Female	1292	42.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

- 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	172	40	23.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that allschools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

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	172	40	23.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico received their test data late. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools. All BIE schools are LEAS and not included in separate districts.

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	172	40	23.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico received their test data late. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools. All BIE schools are LEAS and not included in separate districts. All schools receive Title I funds.

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	172	40	23.00

Comments: his is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico received their test data late. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools. All BIE schools are LEAS and not included in separate districts. All schools receive Title I funds.

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.

Additional funds are provided for schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. These schools had to submit school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring plans as required by the law. The additional funds are to be used to carry out the activities submitted in the schools' plans. Additional Title II, Part A funds are also available to these schools to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified. These funds may also be used for mentor teachers. A second request for proposals from institutes of higher education has been advertised with the purpose focusing on having highly qualified teachers in every classroom. Post secondary institutions failed to apply for the first proposal due to the fact that we are asking for their partnership with schools located in twenty-three states. These schools are also required to complete quarterly gap analysis of student achievement in reading, math, and science. This involves frequent student assessment and analysis of student data. The schools are to implement scientifically researched programs and strategies to decrease the gap between the percentages of students scoring proficient or advanced versus the percentage required to make AYP on state assessments. National parent involvement trainings are being provided to schools and parents to emphasis the importance of the school and the home working together. Schools in these statuses of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring are given additional points and priority when applying for competitive sub-grants such as 21st Century Learning Centers or Reading First grants. We are also addressing ELL issues more aggressively and continue to ensure FAPE in the LRE for special education students. When permitted and invited, we also strive to work with the various tribes, stres

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.

BIE DOE NOT HAVE DISTRICTS. ALL SCHOOLS ARE LEAS

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.	
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.	
How many of these schools were charter schools?	
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.	
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.	
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: BIE SCHOOLS ARE EXEMPTED FROM SECTION 1116	

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.	
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
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.	
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: BIE SCHOOLS ARE EXEMPTED FROM SECTION 1116	

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	7381	6178	85.00
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	4934	4190	85.00
Low-Poverty Schools	0	0	0.00
All Elementary Schools	4934	4190	85.00
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	2347	1988	85.00
Low-Poverty Schools	0	0	0.00
All Secondary Schools	2347	1988	85.00

Comments: TThis is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

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

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.00
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	10.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	90.00
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)	10.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	20.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	70.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00

Comments: TThis is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

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		
Poverty Metric Used	100% of students at BIE funded schools are considered high poverty	
Secondary Schools		
Poverty Metric Used	100% of students at BIE funded schools are considered high poverty	
Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.		

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	90.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

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	No
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	No
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	No

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

Under the authority in Section 1116(g)(1)(A)(i) and Section 1138(b) of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the Secretary of the Interior convened a Negotiated Rulemaking committee to define Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The committee developed definition of AYP resulted in BIE-funded schools following the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook of the state in which the school is located. The Consolidated Application Accountability Workbook developed by the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) references each school/LEA using the accountability plan of the state in which they are located and provides information in areas where there would be a process or oversight responsibility for BIE, which is specific to the BIE.

BIE funded schools generally use the standards used in the states where they are located.

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

Under the authority in Section 1116(g)(1)(A)(i) and Section 1138(b) of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the Secretary of the Interior convened a Negotiated Rulemaking committee to define Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The committee developed definition of AYP resulted in BIE-funded schools following the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook of the state in which the school is located. The Consolidated Application Accountability Workbook developed by the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), references each school/LEA using the accountability plan of the state in which they are located and provides information in areas where there would be a process or oversight responsibility for BIE, which is specific to the BIE.

BIE funded schools generally use the standards used in the states where they are located which are aligned to standards of the states.

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:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent alignment study <u>No Response</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of alignment <u>No Response</u>
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:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p>Under the authority in Section 1116(g)(1)(A)(i) and Section 1138(b) of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the Secretary of the Interior convened a Negotiated Rulemaking committee to define Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The committee developed definition of AYP resulted in BIE-funded schools following the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook of the state in which the school is located. The Consolidated Application Accountability Workbook developed by the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), references each school/LEA using the accountability plan of the state in which they are located and provides information in areas where there would be a process or oversight responsibility for BIE, which is specific to the BIE.</p> <p>BIE funded schools generally use the assessments used in the states where they are located which are aligned to standards of the states.</p>

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)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
				1446										
AZ	7641		5541	75.50	426	26.10	2767	49.90	902	7.70	902	16.30		
CA	0		0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
FL	113		11	9.70	11	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
IA	0		0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
ID	117		42	35.90	38	90.50	< n	< n	< n	< n	< n	< n		
ME	269		219	81.40	51	23.30	87	39.70	0	0.00	0	0.00		
MI	150		38	25.50	38	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
MN	169		169	100.00	88	52.10	67	39.60	0	0.00	0	0.00		
MS	907		907	100.00	828	91.30	79	8.70	0	0.00	0	0.00		
MT	31		27	87.10	24	88.90	< n	< n	< n	< n	< n	< n		
ND	2802		1396	49.80	347	24.90	253	18.10	546	39.10	250	17.90		
SD	< n		781	7.06	246	31.50	474	60.69	< n	< n	59	7.55		
UT	346		229	66.20	83	36.20	88	38.40	43	18.80	15	6.70		
WA	130		110	84.62	106	96.36	< n	< n	< n	< n	< n	< n		
NM	4682		3706	79.15	397	10.71	1319	35.59	1073	28.95	917	21.74		

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.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
Comments: No Current Data. Data will be available for school year 2005-06.		

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

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

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

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

Comments: BIE is not provided any Title III funds.

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.)

BIE is not provided any Title III funds.

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

BIE is not provided any Title III funds.

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

BIE is not provided any Title III funds.

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

BIE is not provided any Title III funds.

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

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

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

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

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

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

BIE is not provided any Title III funds.

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

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

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

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

Definitions:

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

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

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information	
	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No Response</u>
Comments: BIE is not provided Title III funds.	
* 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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
H.S.		

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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
H.S.		

Comments: BIE is not provided any Title III funds.

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	

Comments: The BIE is not required to identify persistently dangerous schools.

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	51.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	51.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00
Black, non-Hispanic	0.00
Hispanic	0.00
White, non-Hispanic	0.00
Students with Disabilities	50.00
Limited English Proficient	52.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	51.00
Female	51.00

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools.

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	10.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	10.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00
Black, non-Hispanic	0.00
Hispanic	0.00
White, non-Hispanic	0.00
Students with Disabilities	11.00
Limited English Proficient	14.00
Economically Disadvantaged	10.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	12.10
Female	9.30

Comments: This is a partial report due to the fact that schools in New Mexico have not received test data that they can report to BIE. BIE will provide the data once schools receive test data and it is reported by the schools. Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

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

STATE RESPONSE

A full time program provides the following number of instructional/student hours to the corresponding grade level:

Grade Hours

K.....	720
1-3.....	810
4-8.....	900
9-12.....	970

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	172	0
LEAs with Subgrants	5	2

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

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		13
1		11
2		16
3		< n
4		< n
5		< n
6		< n
7		11
8		< n
9		< n
10		11
11		< n

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

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		
Doubled-up		
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)		
Hotels/Motels		
Unknown		

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

* 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 <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	13
1	11
2	16
3	< n
4	< n
5	< n
6	< n
7	11
8	< n
9	< n
10	11
11	< n
12	< n

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

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
0

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

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

3

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

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)

0

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

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)	12
English Language Learners (ELL)	
Gifted and Talented	< n
Vocational Education	20

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

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	2
Expedited evaluations	2
Staff professional development and awareness	2
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	2
Transportation	2
Early childhood programs	2
Assistance with participation in school programs	2
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	2
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	2
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	2
Coordination between schools and agencies	2
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	2
Clothing to meet a school requirement	2
School supplies	2
Referral to other programs and services	2
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	2
Other (optional)	2

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

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	0
School selection	0
Transportation	0
School records	0
Immunizations or other medical records	0
Other enrollment issues	0

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

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
	0
	0
	0

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

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		
Grade 4	Yes		
Grade 5	Yes		
Grade 6	Yes		
Grade 7			
Grade 8	Yes		
Grade 9	Yes		
Grade 10	Yes		
Grade 11	Yes		
Grade 12	Yes		

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

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		
Grade 4	Yes		
Grade 5	Yes		
Grade 6	Yes		
Grade 7	Yes		
Grade 8	Yes		
Grade 9	Yes		
Grade 10	Yes		
Grade 11	Yes		
Grade 12	Yes		

Comments: BIE did not have the capacity to collect this information from all schools for school year 2005-06. The BIE will be able to collect this information for school year 2006-07.

* 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.