

# **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 – *21<sup>st</sup> 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 1995, 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:  
 Part I, 2005-2006                       Part II, 2005-2006

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:  
Office of Federal Grants Programs

Address:  
825 North Capitol Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Victor Vyfhuis  
Telephone: 202-442-5570  
Fax: 202-442-5534  
e-mail: victor.vyfhuis@k12.dc.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Victor Vyfhuis, Executive Director, Office of Federal Grants Programs

\_\_\_\_\_  
Wednesday, February 28, 2007, 12:34:14

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 District of Columbia Public Schools developed comprehensive and rigorous science standards for grades PreK-12. The science standards were modeled after the Indiana science standards and are organized around three domains at the elementary level - earth, life, and physical science; linked by scientific inquiry and at the secondary level - biology, chemistry, physics, earth science, and environmental science. The newly revised science standards were approved by the Board of Education on April 21, 2006 and implementation began in the fall of 2006. To complement the science standards teachers were trained during the months of June, July and August and are ongoing.

**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

#### DC CAS English/language Arts and Mathematics

The District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS) for English/language arts and mathematics was implemented in spring 2006 for students at grades 3-8 and 10. The standard setting was conducted July 17-21, 2006 and the resulting academic achievement scores were presented to the state Board of Education and approved on July 27, 2006. The standard setting for the DC CAS was comprised of teachers and administrators representing DC public schools and public charter schools from across the various quadrants of the city. Special educators from special education schools and centers as well as educators from schools that serve large percentages of ELL students participated in this process. The attachment includes a detailed description of the standard setting process. The full standards setting report will be available in December 2006 and upon request.

#### DC CAS Alternate Assessment

DCPS in collaboration with ILSSA has developed the DC CAS Alternate Assessment which is portfolio system. It has existed since 2000, however it has been revised for SY 2006-2007 to incorporate NCLB requirements. These changes emphasize a more structured system that links to grade level content standards, identifies specific standards by grade and content area from which schools may select target skills for instruction and increases the number of academic entries measured while decreasing the number of program dimensions measured. Specifically, student portfolio entries will have 3 entries per reading and 3 entries per mathematics as opposed to 1 entry for reading and math on the old system. The number of program dimensions has switched from 4 to 1 (supports) and the focus will be on the quality of the support rather than just the presence of a support. An additional change adds a third dimension to the scoring rubric to address the alignment between the depth of the knowledge of the entries to the essence of the grade level standard.

The state convened a committee of practitioners to review and make recommendations about these changes on October 19th. DC public school, public charter school and participants from the special education private schools were invited to attend. On October 26, ILSSA presented the changes and focus group feedback to the TAC. On November 24th and 25th DCPS assessment administrators and ILSSA participated in a seminar sponsored by the National Alternate Assessment Center. This seminar helped to clarify further, issues of required change under NCLB and concerns around the documentation technical quality of alternate assessments. Based on the feedback acquired through these three activities, DCPS and ILSSA have refined the new alternate assessment teacher manual, resource documents and new rubrics. Citywide training for teachers consisted of one full day of training and was conducted November 6-9, 2006. A minimum of two technical support sessions for teachers have been scheduled for January and February. A pre-scoring institute will be conducted in March. The portfolios will be scored in April. DC is collaborating with ILSSA to establish a time line for scheduling an external alignment review and the standard setting. A copy of the proposed changes to the alternate assessment and a draft implementation time line is attached.

#### Revised DC-CAS Alt Timeline 2006-2007

Activity Completion Date

Contract Renewal October - December, 2006

Initial Training November 6-10 (online after November 13)

Complete Learner Characteristic Inventory

and print out summary for each student

participating in the revised DC-CAS Alt November 17, 2006

Choose standards for the portfolio November 13 2006

Collect data for entries December 2006 - March 2007

Technical support January - March 2007

Pre -Scoring Certification Training February and March 2007

Scoring Certification March 2007

Pre Submission Institute for Teachers March 2007

Draft preliminary performance descriptors TBD

Portfolio collection March 28, 2007

Scoring April 2-5 2007

External alignment TBD

Standard setting TBD

Presentation of standard setting data to TAC May 2007

Presentation of alternate achievement standards

to state Board of Education June 2007

DC CAS Science Development

The DC CAS Science assessments will be field tested in spring 2007 at grades 5, 8, and Biology. The state established a DC CAS Science Assessment Task Force to make recommendations about the science assessment design and specifications. In addition to DEAA staff and the Director of Science, the task force is comprised of educators and administrators from DC Public Schools and the public charter schools, Bilingual Education, Division of Special Education and a representation from the Center for Excellence in Education. The DC CAS Science Task Force has met to provide recommendations about the following:

• Identify the grade levels to be measure

• Identify the content standards to be measured

• Identify reporting categories for the science assessment

• Determine the number of items that should be used to measure each strand

• Recommend item format

Their recommendations included the following:

• Grades 5, 8, and Biology were the identified grade levels to be assessed under NCLB. Grade 3 will be measured informally to provide student data for informing science instruction.

• The reporting categories will in general use the science content strand designation.

• The format should include both multiple choice and some constructed response questions.

• The tests will include both field test and operational items

• Test length will vary according to grade level, but should contain a minimum of 6 questions per reporting category.

Currently, the recommendations are being refined and will be presented to the TAC in November and then to the State Board of Education.

DC CAS Alternate Assessment Science

DC CAS Alternate Assessment Science

The District will begin developing a science component for the DC CAS Alt for students at grades 5, 8 and biology during the summer 2007. The state will convene a committee of special and general educators to identify grade level science standards that align with the DC CAS science assessments and reporting categories. The recommendations will be presented to the TAC for discussion in September 2007. At that time sample lesson templates and resource documents will be presented as well. Upon approval from the TAC, recommendations, the identified science content standards and all components required for implementation will be incorporated into the teachers manual and training.

The DC CAS Alt science achievement scores will be developed in spring 2008. As with the DC CAS Alt reading and mathematics system, an external contractor will be hired to conduct an external alignment review. Preliminary science performance descriptors will be developed in April 2008, a standard setting will be conducted in May and the achievement scores will be presented to the State Board of Education in June. Ongoing status updates on the development of the science components will be provided to the TAC to review and discussions.

---

**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**

##### DC CAS English/language Arts and Mathematics

The District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System for English/language arts and mathematics was implemented in spring 2006 for students at grades 3-8 and 10. The standard setting was conducted July 17-21, 2006 and the resulting academic achievement scores were presented to the state Board of Education and approved on July 27, 2006. The standard setting for the DC CAS was comprised of teachers and administrators representing DC public schools and public charter schools from across the various quadrants of the city. Special educators from special education schools and centers as well as educators from schools that serve large percentages of ELL students participated in this process. The attachment includes a detailed description of the standard setting process. The full standards setting report will be available in December 2006.

##### DC CAS Alternate Assessment

DCPS in collaboration with ILSSA has developed the DC CAS Alternate Assessment. This is a revised portfolio system which has incorporated NCLB requirements. Citywide training for teachers is scheduled for November 6-9th. Technical support will be ongoing through March. The portfolios will be scored in April. DC in collaboration with ILSSA and consultation from the National Assessment Center is working to secure a contractor to conduct the external alignment review in spring 2007. Preliminary performance descriptors will be developed in April 2007 by a panel of special and general educators from DCPS public and non-public schools. The standard setting will be conducted in May 2007. The alternate achievement standards will be established through a panel of practitioners comprised of special educators, general educators, content coaches and school improvement specialists. The achievement standards will be presented to the TAC in May and to the state Board of Education in June 2007. A copy of the proposed timelines for the development cycle is included. Some aspects of the timelines are still under discussion with contractors and TAC.

##### Revised DC-CAS Alt

##### Draft Timeline

2006-2007

Activity Due Date/Date offered

Contract Renewal October - December, 2006

Initial Training November 6-10 (online after November 13) Complete Learner Characteristic

Inventory and print out summary for

each student participating in

the revised DC-CAS Alt November 17

Choose standards for the portfolio November 13, 2006

Collect data for entries December 2006 - March 2007

Technical support January - March 2007

Pre -Scoring Certification Training February and March 2007

Scoring Certification March 2007

Pre Submission Institute for Teachers March 2007

Draft preliminary performance

descriptors April 2007

Portfolio collection March 28, 2007

Scoring April 2-5 2007

External alignment Spring 2007

Standard setting May 2007

Presentation of standard setting

to TAC May 2007

Presentation of alternate

achievement standards to state

Board of Education June 2007

Reports available July 2007

Technical reports for DC CAS Alt August 2007

DC CAS Science Development

The DC CAS Science assessments will be field tested in spring 2007 at grades 5, 8, and Biology. The state established a DC CAS Science Assessment Task Force to make recommendations about the science assessment design and specifications. In addition to DEAA staff and the Director of Science, the task force is comprised of educators and administrators from DC Public Schools and the public charter schools, Bilingual Education, Division of Special Education and a representation from the Center for Excellence in Education.

The DC CAS Science test will be field tested in spring 2007 and the operational test will be administered in spring 2008. Draft science descriptors will be written in June 2007. A formal standard setting will be conducted to develop the achievement standards in July 2008. The achievement standards will be presented to the state Board of Education for approval in July 2008. Please see the assessment development timeline presented below:

Development of Science Assessments

Process Tracking Timeline/System

Activity Status

Complete Science Standards May 2006

Adoption of Science Standards by BOE June 2006

Complete Procurement July 2006 - (Office of Contracts and Acquisitions agreed to permit the state to modify the CTB test development contract to include science)

Kickoff Meeting with SEA Science Specialists September 14, 2006

Finalize grades and subjects September 25, 2006

Complete specifications for development

of science test October 2006

Present recommendation to BOE - e.g.,

grades 3, 5, 8, and biology October/November 2006

Item development/selection meetings November-December 2006

First draft - booklets and answer

document(science) January 2007

First draft - science test

coordinator's manual February 2007

Blue line copies - booklet, manual,

and answer document February 2007

Field test DC CAS Science Assessment April-May 2007

Item selection/development workshops

- science June-July 2007

Operational Administration

- DC CAS Science April-May 2008

Draft Science descriptors

Formal Standard Setting with development

of achievement standards and State

Board of Education approval June-July 2008

Science reports available September 2008

Technical reports for DC CAS-Science

assessment On or before December 2008

DC CAS Alternate Achievement Standards for Science

The DC CAS Alt science achievement scores will be developed in spring 2008. As with the DC CAS Alt reading and mathematics system, an external contractor will be hired to conduct an external alignment review. Preliminary science performance descriptors will be developed in April 2008, a standard setting will be conducted in May and the achievement scores will be presented to the State Board of Education in June. Panels of special and general educators from public and special educators from non-public schools will be involved in the alignment review, standard setting and development of performance descriptors. Ongoing status updates on the development of the science components will be provided to the TAC to review and discussions.

DC CAS Alt Science Process/Tracking System

Activity Projected Date

Convene initial meeting with panel of  
expert special and general educators to  
discuss purpose, goals and to recommend  
content standards and reporting categories Summer 2007

Convene expert panel to identify types of  
lessons, resources needed, data collection,  
and profession development requirements Summer 2007

Presentation to TAC September 2007

Implementation October/November 2007

Technical Support Winter 2008

Preliminary Performance Descriptors Spring 2008

Standard Setting Spring 2008

Presentation to TAC May 2008

Presentation to State BD of ED June 2008

Standard Setting Report July 2008

Technical Report August 2008

---

**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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Tested</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| All Students                     | 35633                                  | 94.90                             |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 14                                     | 93.30                             |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 436                                    | 97.30                             |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 30600                                  | 94.50                             |
| Hispanic                         | 3115                                   | 97.20                             |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 1420                                   | 97.00                             |
| Students with Disabilities       | 6592                                   | 89.00                             |
| Limited English Proficient       | 3034                                   | 98.60                             |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 23344                                  | 95.80                             |
| Migrant                          | 34                                     | 97.10                             |
| Male                             | 17620                                  | 93.90                             |
| Female                           | 17989                                  | 95.90                             |

**Comments:** The totals for all students including unassigned are (males 17620 + females 17989 + 24 unassigned) = 35633

Additional Subgroup Data:

Ethnic-Unknown tested 48 Percent tested 96.00

Gender-Unknown tested 24 Percent Tested 92.31

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Tested</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| All Students                     | 35760                                  | 95.20                             |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 14                                     | 93.30                             |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 436                                    | 97.30                             |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 30738                                  | 95.00                             |
| Hispanic                         | 3103                                   | 96.80                             |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 1421                                   | 97.10                             |
| Students with Disabilities       | 6649                                   | 89.80                             |
| Limited English Proficient       | 3035                                   | 98.60                             |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 23403                                  | 96.10                             |
| Migrant                          | 34                                     | 97.10                             |
| Male                             | 17709                                  | 94.30                             |
| Female                           | 18028                                  | 96.20                             |

**Comments:** The totals for all students including unassigned are (males 17709 + females 18028 + 23 unassigned) = 35760

Additional Subgroup Data:

Ethnic-Unknown tested 48 Percent tested 96.00

Gender-Unknown tested 23 Percent Tested 88.46

- 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                | 6165  | 83.20  |
| Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards | 427   | 5.80   |
| Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards   | 0   | 0.00   |

**Comments:**

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

|   | Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested | Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested |
|---|---|--|
| Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations                | 6222  | 84.00  |
| Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards | 427   | 5.80   |
| Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards   | 0   | 0.00   |

**Comments:**

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

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

**1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 4960                                   | 28.50   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 66                                     | 55.20   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4123                                   | 24.50   |
| Hispanic                         | 474                                    | 30.10   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 290                                    | 76.90   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 745                                    | 7.90  |
| Limited English Proficient       | 527                                    | 21.30   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3418                                   | 23.40   |
| Migrant                          |  |   |
| Male                             | 2510                                   | 27.90   |
| Female                           | 2448                                   | 29.20   |

**Comments:** Additional subgroup data:

Ethnic: Unknown - Number tested 7, Percent tested .42.9%

Gender: Unknown - Number tested 2, Percent tested .0%

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 4916                                   | 38.40   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 62                                     | 58.20   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4102                                   | 35.00   |
| Hispanic                         | 460                                    | 38.20   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 285                                    | 82.00   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 721                                    | 15.30   |
| Limited English Proficient       | 530                                    | 27.30   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3404                                   | 33.30   |
| Migrant                          |  |   |
| Male                             | 2422                                   | 34.90   |
| Female                           | 2492                                   | 41.90   |

**Comments:** Additional subgroup data:

Ethnic: Unknown - Number tested 7, Percent tested 42.9%

Gender: Unknown - Number tested 2, Percent tested .0%

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 5070                                   | 26.80   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 66                                     | 67.20   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4240                                   | 21.80   |
| Hispanic                         | 504                                    | 35.90   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 251                                    | 81.20   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 860                                    | 7.50  |
| Limited English Proficient       | 423                                    | 21.30   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3518                                   | 20.40   |
| Migrant                          |  |   |
| Male                             | 2509                                   | 24.70   |
| Female                           | 2561                                   | 28.80   |

**Comments:** Additional subgroup data:

Ethnic: Unknown - Number tested 6, Percent tested 33.3%

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 5027                                   | 35.90   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 61                                     | 67.20   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4216                                   | 31.90   |
| Hispanic                         | 493                                    | 41.00   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 251                                    | 83.50   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 841                                    | 13.50   |
| Limited English Proficient       | 427                                    | 20.00   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3500                                   | 29.80   |
| Migrant                          |  |   |
| Male                             | 2500                                   | 31.70   |
| Female                           | 2527                                   | 40.10   |

**Comments:** Additional subgroup data:

Ethnic: Unknown - Number tested 6, Percent tested 66.7%

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 5073                                   | 24.10   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 73                                     | 67.10   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4318                                   | 20.00   |
| Hispanic                         | 459                                    | 27.90   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 214                                    | 82.20   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 971                                    | 5.20  |
| Limited English Proficient       | 379                                    | 12.90   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3505                                   | 18.40   |
| Migrant                          |  |   |
| Male                             | 2538                                   | 21.70   |
| Female                           | 2534                                   | 26.50   |

**Comments:** Additional subgroup data:

Ethnic: Unknown - Number tested 4 Percent tested 25.0%

Gender: Unknown - Number tested 1 Percent tested 0.0

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 5086                                   | 35.00   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 71                                     | 63.00   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4332                                   | 31.70   |
| Hispanic                         | 459                                    | 39.00   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 215                                    | 85.40   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 969                                    | 10.50   |
| Limited English Proficient       | 386                                    | 12.90   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3489                                   | 28.60   |
| Migrant                          |  |   |
| Male                             | 2533                                   | 29.70   |
| Female                           | 2552                                   | 40.50   |

**Comments:** Additional subgroup data:

Ethnic: Unknown - Number tested 4 Percent tested 25.0%

Gender: Unknown - Number tested 1 Percent tested 0.0

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 5386                                   | 23.10   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 55                                     | 56.60   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4659                                   | 19.90   |
| Hispanic                         | 447                                    | 25.50   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 215                                    | 76.50   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 1074                                   | 4.10  |
| Limited English Proficient       | 490                                    | 16.70   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3693                                   | 17.90   |
| Migrant                          |  |   |
| Male                             | 2678                                   | 22.70   |
| Female                           | 2708                                   | 23.50   |

**Comments:** Additional Subgroup Data:

Ethnic: Unknown- Number tested 5, Percent tested 80.0

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 5419                                   | 35.10   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 65                                     | 66.00   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4669                                   | 32.30   |
| Hispanic                         | 459                                    | 34.50   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 214                                    | 88.70   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 1047                                   | 11.00   |
| Limited English Proficient       | 500                                    | 25.40   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3689                                   | 29.60   |
| Migrant                          |  |   |
| Male                             | 2637                                   | 30.10   |
| Female                           | 2782                                   | 40.20   |

**Comments:** Additional Subgroup Data:

Ethnic: Unknown- Number tested 5, Percent tested 80.0

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 5364                                   | 26.20   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 42                                     | 61.70   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4746                                   | 24.10   |
| Hispanic                         | 420                                    | 27.50   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 148                                    | 77.60   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 1090                                   | 5.70  |
| Limited English Proficient       | 439                                    | 20.10   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3372                                   | 21.50   |
| Migrant                          | 15                                     | 33.30   |
| Male                             | 2665                                   | 23.70   |
| Female                           | 2693                                   | 28.70   |

**Comments:** Additional Subgroup Data:

Ethnic- Unknown tested 8, Percent tested 50.0%

Gender-Unknown tested 6, Percent tested .0

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 5348                                   | 33.00   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 46                                     | 68.10   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4737                                   | 30.70   |
| Hispanic                         | 400                                    | 37.90   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 157                                    | 82.70   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 1165                                   | 8.50  |
| Limited English Proficient       | 472                                    | 27.80   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3377                                   | 28.00   |
| Migrant                          | 13                                     | 6.70  |
| Male                             | 2573                                   | 26.80   |
| Female                           | 2770                                   | 39.50   |

**Comments:** Additional Subgroup Data:

Ethnic- Unknown tested 8, Percent tested 50.0%

Gender- Unknown tested 5, Percent tested .0%

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 5221                                   | 28.00   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 69                                     | 70.00   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4584                                   | 25.30   |
| Hispanic                         | 414                                    | 32.90   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 137                                    | 82.80   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 1074                                   | 6.60  |
| Limited English Proficient       | 416                                    | 22.60   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3344                                   | 23.90   |
| Migrant                          |  |   |
| Male                             | 2520                                   | 25.30   |
| Female                           | 2693                                   | 30.60   |

**Comments:** Additional Subgroup Data:

Ethnic- Unknown tested 12, Percent tested 25.0%

Gender- Unknown tested 8, Percent tested .0

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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**

|                                  | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| All Students                     | 5242                                   | 32.70   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 65                                     | 50.00   |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 4621                                   | 30.50   |
| Hispanic                         | 397                                    | 36.90   |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 147                                    | 84.80   |
| Students with Disabilities       | 1147                                   | 9.30  |
| Limited English Proficient       | 418                                    | 19.20   |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 3330                                   | 27.90   |
| Migrant                          |  |   |
| Male                             | 2535                                   | 27.60   |
| Female                           | 2700                                   | 37.80   |

**Comments:** Additional Subgroup Data:

Ethnic- Unknown tested 11, Percent tested 36.4%

Gender-Unknown tested 7, Percent tested .0

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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.



| <b>1.3.13 High School - Mathematics</b> |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
| All Students                            | 4559                                   | 23.20   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native        |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander               | 67                                     | 67.60   |
| Black, non-Hispanic                     | 3932                                   | 19.90   |
| Hispanic                                | 406                                    | 31.70   |
| White, non-Hispanic                     | 145                                    | 76.20   |
| Students with Disabilities              | 817                                    | 2.70  |
| Limited English Proficient              | 341                                    | 25.60   |
| Economically Disadvantaged              | 2494                                   | 19.50   |
| Migrant                                 |  |   |
| Male                                    | 2200                                   | 22.40   |
| Female                                  | 2352                                   | 24.00   |

**Comments:** Additional Subgroup Data:

Ethnic- Unknown tested 6, Percent tested .0%

Gender-Unknown tested 7, Percent tested .0

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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.

| <b>1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts</b> |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <b>Total Number of Students Tested</b> | <b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b> |
| All Students                                      | 4722                                   | 28.40   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native                  |  |   |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                         | 67                                     | 45.10   |
| Black, non-Hispanic                               | 4080                                   | 25.90   |
| Hispanic  | 409                                    | 35.40   |
| White, non-Hispanic                               | 155                                    | 75.60   |
| Students with Disabilities                        | 1039                                   | 4.20  |
| Limited English Proficient                        | 352                                    | 19.00   |
| Economically Disadvantaged                        | 2570                                   | 24.60   |
| Migrant   |  |   |
| Male  | 2279                                   | 23.50   |
| Female  | 2435                                   | 33.30   |

**Comments:** Additional Subgroup Data:

Ethnic- Unknown tested 7, Percent tested 14.3%

Gender- Unknown tested 8, Percent tested 12.5

The percent of advanced or proficient students are excluded from the report for counts fewer than 10.

- 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 | 221  | 32   | 14.50  |

**Comments:** In the 2004-2005 school year, we reported the number of facilities or school buildings. In SY 2005-2006 we reported all schools with district- certified cost centers.

The difference in the number of schools making AYP occurs because many schools failed to meet the academic rigors of the new State test (DC CAS)

| 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 | 52   | 3  | 5.80   |

**Comments:** For school year 2005-2006, the total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in the State increased by 6.

**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 | 193                                      | 20   | 10.40  |

**Comments:** This number includes all 5 Targeted Assistance Schools (3 DCPS and 2 Public Charters).

| 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 | 52   | 3  | 5.80   |

**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.

As a part of an overall state-wide system of support and guidance to increase student achievement across the board for SY 2005-2006, the Chief State School Officer set the following performance goals for all LEAs/schools: (1) Administer the new state assessment and re-establish rigorous performance standards. To meet this goal, LEAs/schools received extensive professional development and technical assistance around implementing a standard-setting process, setting rigorous standards for the new state assessment, and setting consistent performance targets across grades and subjects; (2) Increase the percent of students in reading and mathematics at the proficient level for grades 3-8 and 10. To meet this goal, LEAs/schools were provided guidance on how to identify struggling students and provided with a menu of interventions; (3) Put systems in place to determine accurately achievement by schools, teachers, and student groups. To meet this goal, the state established baseline data for gap analysis from the new spring operational assessment; (4) Decrease the number of schools not meeting AYP in math and/or reading. To meet this goal, LEAs/schools received technical assistance on developing a school improvement plan that focused on activities and initiatives that addressed the root cause of not meeting AYP. Additionally, LEAs/schools not making AYP were offered interventions specified in the newly introduced accountability model; and (5) Implement the new state-wide school accountability system. To meet this goal, training/support on the affects of the accountability model and the overall accountability of school staff continues to be implemented.

In addition to the overall state-wide measures, the Chief State School Officer has established an expectation that academic supports for struggling LEAs/schools will embody the following core elements as a part of its approach to its support system for school improvement:

â€¢ Further develop and fully implement a consistent and coherent approach to academics and accountability including the full alignment of standards, textbooks, curricula, assessments, and supports for principals and teachers.

â€¢ Create a culture of inclusion and offer multiple supports to students, depending on their individual needs.

â€¢ Expand and articulate school-community partnerships to better and more strategically support students and schools through a full-service community school model, clear partnership priorities, and internal capacity building to support partnerships.

â€¢ Provide a professional development program for teachers and principals aligned with standards.

Also, as a part of the state-wide system of support, the Chief State School Officer host intensive monthly meetings where all LEAs/schools receive targeted and focused technical assistance through workshops, networking, and peer presentations. Topics range from school improvement, using Title I and Title II funds to increase student achievement, special education strategies, improving literacy, and school management. Culminating the intensive monthly meetings, the Chief State School Officer hosted an intensive two-day summer conference for LEAs/schools where they received their most intensive and comprehensive support around school improvement and student achievement. Specifically, LEAs/schools received the following technical assistance sessions: (1) Assessment & Data Analysis using the Tulsa Public School Model; (2) LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance; (3) Elements of a Comprehensive School Improvement Plan; (4) Supplemental Educational Services; (5) Special Education; (5) ELL - Charter LEAs Only; and (6) NCLB Overview.

Recognizing the specific state duties and responsibilities under NCLB, the State has implemented an accelerated school improvement model with five levels of performance. This plan, for the first time, provides recognitions as well as interventions. In addition, LEAs/schools that fail to achieve the AYP goals for the first time are identified so that steps can be taken to prevent them from being classified as "in need of improvement." By accelerating this process for the DCPS LEA, in SY 2005-2006, 12 DCPS schools were identified as being in need of restructuring and received major interventions. All high schools in restructuring implemented as part of their interventions the America's Choice Program. (America's Choice is a national school restructuring model that features intense leadership training and professional development, with a focus on accelerating student gains in reading and mathematics.) All the middle grade schools in restructuring implemented the part of the America' Choice Program called Ramp-Up. As other LEAs/schools approach the restructuring level, they too will receive guidance on implementing research-based school-wide reform models.

**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.

DCPS state is comprised of several LEAs (Districts), therefore the school improvement strategies outlined in section 1.4.3.2 are applicable to section 1.4.4.2.

#### 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. |  | 100    |
| 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.   |  | 31     |
| How many of these schools were charter schools?  |  | 0      |
| 3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.  |  | 324    |
| 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.  |  | 38708  |
| <b>Optional Information:</b>   |  |        |
| 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.   |  | 407    |
| 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.              |  | 324    |
| <b>Comments:</b> For questions #2a, #2b, and #6 above, the information entered is only from our largest LEA which serves approximately 75% of the public school students in DC   |  |        |

**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. | 100    |
| 2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.  | 2554   |
| 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.  | 27011  |

**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:**

**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.

| <b>School Type</b>            | <b>Total Number of Core Academic Classes</b> | <b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b> | <b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b> |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>All Schools in State</b>   | 15919  | 8402   | 52.78  |
| <b>Elementary Level</b>       |  |  |  |
| <b>High-Poverty Schools</b>   | 873  | 625  | 71.59  |
| <b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>    | 665  | 455  | 68.42  |
| <b>All Elementary Schools</b> | 2374   | 1666   | 70.18  |
| <b>Secondary Level</b>        |  |  |  |
| <b>High-Poverty Schools</b>   | 1926   | 1036   | 53.79  |
| <b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>    | 6104   | 3188   | 52.23  |
| <b>All Secondary Schools</b>  | 13545  | 6736   | 49.73  |
| <b>Comments:</b>              |  |  |  |

**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).

| <b>Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified</b>  | <b>Percentage</b> |
|---|-------------------|
| <b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>  |                   |
| 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 | 1.62              |
| 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               | 0.00              |
| c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)  | 7.89              |
| d) Other (please explain)   | 0.00              |
| <b>SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>   |                   |
| 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)                         | 0.00              |
| b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects  | 10.04             |
| c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)   | 80.09             |
| d) Other (please explain)   | 0.00              |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |                   |

**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<br>(more than what %)              | Low-Poverty Schools<br>(less than what %) |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Elementary Schools</b>  | 86.60   | 72.00                                     |
| <b>Poverty Metric Used</b> | Percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch. |   |
| <b>Secondary Schools</b>   | 84.60   | 65.50                                     |
| <b>Poverty Metric Used</b> | Percentage of students receiving free or reduced 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 | 38.10   |

**Comments:**

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

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

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

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

The District of Columbia, as a member of the WIDA consortium of states, has adopted the WIDA Consortium English Language Proficiency Standards for English language learners (ELLs) in grades K through 12. The ELP standards were operationalized on May 18 and May 19, 2004 with the professional development training session English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners for bilingual/ESL teachers. The two-day training was conducted by Margo Gottlieb. Additional standards-related trainings were provided during the 2004-2005 school year, including the following: Overview of WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards, August 30, 2004; New Teachers and Counselors Training 2004-2005, September 9, 2004; Creating Standards-Based Lessons and Thematic Units for English Language Learners, October 7, 2004; Creating Standards-Based Lessons and Thematic Units for English Language Learners, November 10, 2004. A workshop on reading strategies for ELLs was also held on December 15, 2004 and a workshop on math strategies for ELLs was held on February 25, 2005. During the 2005-2006 school year, additional trainings on the standards were provided. The New Teachers Orientation in August 2005 addressed the standards through workshop sessions, and the NCLB: Linking Instruction to ACCESS for ELLs training provided on November 15, 2005 focused on linking instruction to ACCESS for ELLs using the WIDA ELP Standards.

**1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards**

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

The ELP standards are aligned with the academic content standards. Initial alignment was conducted through the WIDA consortium, led by Margo Gottlieb, and an additional alignment study between the ELP standards and the District's Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics academic content standards was also conducted on October 19, 2005 through the WIDA consortium, in conjunction with the University of Illinois and Margo Gottlieb.

**1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments**

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

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

**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**

During SY 2005-2006, the District of Columbia conducted the annual assessment of LEP students in grades K-12 in the spring with the ACCESS for ELLs English language proficiency test. Through the WIDA Consortium and with the Center for Applied Linguistics, the District of Columbia developed the ACCESS for ELLs, an English language proficiency assessment. Each of the test items on ACCESS for ELLs addresses a performance indicator contained in the ELP standards. The ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment is the single measure for the District of Columbia. In SY 2005-2006, ACCESS for ELLs replaced the LAS and Pre-LAS tests for students in grades K through 12. The state will develop new AMAOs based on this improved measure of social, instructional and academic language, which is linked to the WIDA ELP Standards. This assessment measure is fully NCLB compliant in assessing ELLs across grades K-12 in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Comprehension is a derived score from listening and reading. The District of Columbia used the bridge study developed by the Center for Applied Linguistics to quantify the relationship between the old and new assessment, and establish baseline ACCESS for ELLs AMAO data. ACCESS for ELLs was administered during the testing window of Feb 6 to March 24, 2006, and will be administered on an annual basis each spring thereafter. The Center for Applied Linguistics has confirmed the reliability and validity of ACCESS for ELLs for all WIDA states, using accepted psychometric practice for establishing test validity and reliability, and CAL has produced a testing manual.



| <b>1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State</b> |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs</b>            |  |  |
| <b>Language</b>  | <b>Number of ALL LEP Students in the State</b> | <b>Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State</b> |
| 1. Spanish   | 3634   | 75.90  |
| 2. Chinese   | 171  | 3.60   |
| 3. Vietnamese  | 113  | 2.40   |
| 4. Amharic   | 112  | 2.30   |
| 5. French  | 78   | 1.60   |
| 6. English/Other*  | 63   | 1.30   |
| 7. Arabic  | 41   | 0.90   |
| 8. Tagalog   | 25   | 0.50   |
| 9. Russian   | 21   | 0.40   |
| 10. Yoruba   | 13   | 0.30   |

**Comments:** \*English/Other = languages that consists of English/ African, English/Caribbean, English/Creole and English/Patois.

- 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 |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1240                               | 1074                             | 0                     |

**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.)**

Decreased overall population; greater population from Mexico.

**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**

The state has not made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission.

The District of Columbia, however, transitioned from the Language Assessment Scales (LAS) test to the ACCESS for ELLs test during the 2005-2006 school year.

To be considered "proficient" on ACCESS for ELLs, LEP students must perform at ELP Level 5.0 or above on the overall composite score. The test score range on ACCESS for ELLs is 1.0 - 6.0. ELP Level 1 corresponds to cut scores 1.0-1.9; ELP Level 2 to scores 2.0-2.9; ELP Level 3 to scores 3.0-3.9; ELP Level 4 to scores 4.0-4.9; and, ELP Level 5 corresponds to scores 5.0-5.9. ELP Level 6 = 6.0.

Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing are weighted in the overall composite scores as follows:

Listening: 15%

Speaking: 15%

Reading: 35%

Writing: 35%

The Comprehension score is derived from the reading (70%) and listening (30%) scores.

**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**

The state has not made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission.

The WIDA Consortium English Language Proficiency Standards contain five levels: Level 1 (Entering), Level 2 (Beginning), Level 3 (Developing), Level 4 (Expanding) and Level 5 (Bridging). The aligned ELP test, ACCESS for ELLs, produces overall composite scores ranging from 1.0 - 6.0. The corresponding composite scores for each level are as follows:

ELP Level 1: 1.0 - 1.9

ELP Level 2: 2.0 - 2.9

ELP Level 3: 3.0 - 3.9

ELP Level 4: 4.0 - 4.9

ELP Level 5: 5.0 - 5.9

For the purposes of meeting AMAOs, the District of Columbia defines making progress as moving from one ELP Level to a higher ELP Level on the overall composite score. The overall composite score reflects a students scores in Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing.

**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**

The State has not made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission.

For the purposes of Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives, each cohort is defined as the group of students in grades K-12, who as a result of the number of years in an English language instruction educational program, have been categorized into the cohort. Students in Cohort 1 have been in an English language program for less than 2 years. Students in Cohort 2 have been in an English language program for at least 2 years, and less than 3 years. Students in Cohort 3 have been in an English language program for at least 3 years, and less than 4 years. Students in Cohort 4 have been in an English language program for at least 4 years, and less than 5 years. Students in Cohort 5 have been in an English language program for at least 5 years, and less than 6 years. Students in Cohort 6 have been in an English language program for at least 6 years.

**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

**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        | % 79.80   | # 2363 | % 32.40 | # 988 | % 20.60  | # 476 | % 2.50 | # 76 |

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

The State applied AMAOs to all LEP students in the DCPS LEA. The following Charter School LEA data was not available: 1) List of Charter School LEAs that received funding during SY 05-06, 2) SY 04-05 Charter School ELP test data. It is anticipated that the State will apply AMAOs to all Title III recipients in SY 06-07, as two years of ACCESS for ELLs ELP test data will be available for all LEAs.

Additional Note: The AMAO targets for progress and attainment were developed for the LAS test and are not appropriate for the ACCESS for ELLs test. The State will be submitting revised AMAO targets for SY 06-07.

### 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.

| <b>1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants</b> |                    |                            |          |
|---|--------------------|----------------------------|----------|
|   | <b>2005-2006</b>   |                            |          |
|   | <b>AMAO TARGET</b> | <b>ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS</b> |          |
|   | <b>%</b>           | <b>#</b>                   | <b>%</b> |
| <b>MAKING PROGRESS</b>  | 79.80              | 988                        | 32.40    |
| <b>DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS</b>  |                    | 2063                       |          |
| <b>ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>   | 20.60              | 76                         | 2.50     |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  |                    | 3051                       |          |

**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**

|  | <b>2005-2006</b> |
|--|------------------|
| Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year  | 1                |
| Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>making progress</b>                                | 0                |
| Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>attaining</b> English proficiency                  | 0                |
| Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>AYP</b>  | 0                |
| Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*  | 0                |
| Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs   | 0                |
| Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO  | 0                |
| Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet <b>any</b> AMAO  | 1                |
| Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years                                  | 1                |
| Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs                           | 1                |
| Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08) |                  |
| Did the <b>State</b> meet <b>all</b> three Title III AMAOs? *  | <u>No</u>        |

**Comments:** The State applied AMAOs to all LEP students in the DCPS LEA. The following Public Charter School LEA data was not available: 1) List of Public Charter School LEAs that received funding during SY 05-06, 2) SY 04-05 Public Charter School ELP test data. It is anticipated that the State will apply AMAOs to all Title III recipients in SY 06-07, as two years of ACCESS for ELLs ELP test data will be available for all LEAs.

Additional Note: The AMAO targets for progress and attainment were developed for the LAS test and are not appropriate for the ACCESS for ELLs test. The State will be submitting revised AMAO targets for SY 06-07.

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

**1.6.11.1** 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                | 88                             | 23.90 |
| 4                | 73                             | 19.80 |
| 5                | 20                             | 5.40  |
| 6                | 22                             | 6.00  |
| 7                | 13                             | 3.50  |
| 8                | <n                             | <n    |
| H.S.             | <n                             | <n    |

**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                | 70                             | 19.00 |
| 4                | 56                             | 15.20 |
| 5                | 13                             | 3.50  |
| 6                | 10                             | 2.70  |
| 7                | 11                             | 3.00  |
| 8                | <n                             | <n    |
| H.S.             | <n                             | <n    |

**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:** This year, no schools were identified as persistently dangerous.

## 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                     | 69.90                 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0.00                  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 78.50                 |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 70.70                 |
| Hispanic                         | 45.20                 |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 84.60                 |
| Students with Disabilities       | 0.00                  |
| Limited English Proficient       | 0.00                  |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 0.00                  |
| Migrant                          | 0.00                  |
| Male                             | 65.30                 |
| Female                           | 73.80                 |

**Comments:** Zero reflects a "not available" status for the groups.  
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                     | 7.60                  |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 38.60                 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander        | 4.40                  |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 7.60                  |
| Hispanic                         | 9.30                  |
| White, non-Hispanic              | 4.70                  |
| Students with Disabilities       | 0.00                  |
| Limited English Proficient       | 0.00                  |
| Economically Disadvantaged       | 0.00                  |
| Migrant                          | 0.00                  |
| Male                             | 8.60                  |
| Female                           | 6.60                  |

**Comments:** For Asian or Pacific Islander, the number reported for 2003-2004 should be 5.2. The tables require a value, so where there are 0's data are not available.

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

**1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:**

|                        | Total Number in State | Total Number LEAs Reporting |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| LEAs without Subgrants |                       |                             |
| LEAs with Subgrants    |                       |                             |

**Comments:** DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006

**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           |   |  |
| 1           |   |  |
| 2           |   |  |
| 3           |   |  |
| 4           |   |  |
| 5           |   |  |
| 6           |   |  |
| 7           |   |  |
| 8           |   |  |
| 9           |   |  |
| 10          |   |  |
| 11          |   |  |
| 12          |   |  |

**Comments:** DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006

**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--<br>excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>without</b><br>subgrants | * Number of homeless children/ youth--<br>excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>with</b><br>subgrants |
|---|---|--|
| Shelters  |   |  |
| Doubled-up  |   |  |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars,<br>parks, campgrounds, etc.) |   |  |
| Hotels/Motels   |   |  |
| Unknown   |   |  |

**Comments:** DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006

\* 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  |  |
| 1  |  |
| 2  |  |
| 3  |  |
| 4  |  |
| 5  |  |
| 6  |  |
| 7  |  |
| 8  |  |
| 9  |  |
| 10   |  |
| 11   |  |
| 12   |  |

**Comments:** DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006

**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 |
|--|
|  |

**Comments:** DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths</b></p> <p>Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.</p> <p><b>Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006</b></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006</p> |
|--|

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served</b></p> <p>Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.</p> <p><b>Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)</b></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006</p> |
|--|

| <p><b>1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services</b></p> <p>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</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Educational and school related activities and services</b></th> <th><b>Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Special Education (IDEA)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Language Learners (ELL)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gifted and Talented</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vocational Education</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Comments:</b> DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006</p> | <b>Educational and school related activities and services</b>  | <b>Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services</b> | Special Education (IDEA) |  | English Language Learners (ELL) |  | Gifted and Talented |  | Vocational Education |  |
|---|--|--|--------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|---------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| <b>Educational and school related activities and services</b>   | <b>Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services</b> |  |                          |  |                                 |  |                     |  |                      |  |
| Special Education (IDEA)  |  |  |                          |  |                                 |  |                     |  |                      |  |
| English Language Learners (ELL)   |  |  |                          |  |                                 |  |                     |  |                      |  |
| Gifted and Talented   |  |  |                          |  |                                 |  |                     |  |                      |  |
| Vocational Education  |  |  |                          |  |                                 |  |                     |  |                      |  |

**1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services**

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

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

**Comments:** DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006

**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.

| <b>Barriers</b>                        | <b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b> |
|--|--|
| Eligibility for homeless services      |  |
| School selection                       |  |
| Transportation                         |  |
| School records                         |  |
| Immunizations or other medical records |  |
| Other enrollment issues                |  |

**Comments:** DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006

**1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)**

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

| <b>List other barriers</b> | <b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b> |
|----------------------------|--|
|                            |  |
|                            |  |
|                            |  |

**Comments:** DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006

**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               | N/A  |  |  |
| Grade 4               |  |  |  |
| Grade 5               |  |  |  |
| Grade 6               |  |  |  |
| Grade 7               |  |  |  |
| Grade 8               |  |  |  |
| Grade 9               |  |  |  |
| Grade 10              |  |  |  |
| Grade 11              |  |  |  |
| Grade 12              |  |  |  |

**Comments:** DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006

**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               |  |  |  |
| Grade 4               |  |  |  |
| Grade 5               |  |  |  |
| Grade 6               |  |  |  |
| Grade 7               |  |  |  |
| Grade 8               |  |  |  |
| Grade 9               |  |  |  |
| Grade 10              |  |  |  |
| Grade 11              |  |  |  |
| Grade 12              |  |  |  |

**Comments:** DCPS did not receive any funding for this program for SY 2005-2006

\* 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.