

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 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:
Delaware Dept of Education

Address:
401 Federal St
Dover, DE 19901

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Tony Ruggiero
Telephone: 302-735-4260
Fax: 302-739-4483
e-mail: ruggiero@doe.k12.de.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Valeria Woodruff

Wednesday, January 17, 2007, 12:28:51

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

Delaware developed science content standards in 1995. These standards were adopted by the State Board of Education and the Delaware Legislature in June 1995. In June 1998, end-of-grade cluster expectations and performance indicators were developed and adopted for use by science teachers. Both Delaware Science Standards and the performance indicators draw conceptually on nationally recognized science standards endorsed by the science community.

Beginning in September 2004, a comprehensive review of Delaware Science Standards was initiated through the Delaware Department of Education. A broad-based group of stakeholders, including classroom educators, assessment specialists, higher education representatives, and members of the corporate science sector completed the revisions of the science content standards in August 2006.

Delaware's Science Standards can be viewed at the following website:

<http://www.doe.k12.de.us/programs/pcs/science.shtml>

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

A detailed description of the state's progress in developing and implementing assessments in math, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) can be found online at http://www.doe.k12.de.us/AAB/DSTP_intro.html.

The alternate assessment for students with disabilities is an alternate assessment that is aligned to alternate achievement standards. More information regarding this assessment can be found online at <http://www.DAPAonline.org>. Click on the "Users Guide" link for a description of the assessment or for a copy of the academic standards used.

Delaware does not currently have an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

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

A detailed description of the state's progress in setting academic achievement standards in math, reading/language arts, and science can be found online at http://www.doe.k12.de.us/AAB/DSTP_prof_levs_1999.pdf for math and reading/language

arts. Science can be found online at <http://www.doe.k12.de.us/AAB/4%20&%206%20ScSS.pdf>.

A detailed description of the state's progress in setting academic achievement standards in math, reading/language arts, and science for the alternate assessment for students with disabilities can be found at <http://www.DAPAonline.org>. Click on "Reports" in the left column. Then click on the link titled "Report and Recommendations to the Delaware State Board of Education for: Establishing Proficiency Levels for the 5 Delaware Alternate Portfolio Assessment Domains" (May 15, 2003).

Delaware does not currently have an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

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

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

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

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

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	65081	99.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	98.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1877	99.40
Black, non-Hispanic	21442	98.80
Hispanic	5887	98.80
White, non-Hispanic	35670	99.30
Students with Disabilities	10199	98.20
Limited English Proficient	2154	98.90
Economically Disadvantaged	26578	99.00
Migrant	53	100.00
Male	33400	99.10
Female	31681	99.20

Comments:

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

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	64727	98.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	98.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1829	96.80
Black, non-Hispanic	21392	98.50
Hispanic	5692	95.60
White, non-Hispanic	35609	99.20
Students with Disabilities	10182	98.10
Limited English Proficient	1896	87.10
Economically Disadvantaged	26348	98.20
Migrant	47	88.70
Male	33188	98.40
Female	31539	98.70

Comments:

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

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

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

1.2.2

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	9524	99.20
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	675	92.30

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	9505	99.10
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	677	92.60

Comments:

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9090	77.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	28	85.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	285	93.70
Black, non-Hispanic	3008	62.70
Hispanic	995	65.50
White, non-Hispanic	4774	87.10
Students with Disabilities	1584	55.30
Limited English Proficient	518	56.40
Economically Disadvantaged	4180	65.20
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	4665	77.70
Female	4425	76.20

Comments: These student numbers will vary from year to year depending on how many students of each category are in the grade for the year.

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9090	79.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	28	89.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	285	91.20
Black, non-Hispanic	3008	69.00
Hispanic	995	69.40
White, non-Hispanic	4774	88.20
Students with Disabilities	1584	63.70
Limited English Proficient	518	57.30
Economically Disadvantaged	4180	69.50
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	4665	77.10
Female	4425	82.90

Comments: These student numbers will vary from year to year depending on how many students of each category are in the grade for the year.

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8953	76.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	42	88.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	282	92.20
Black, non-Hispanic	2901	63.00
Hispanic	931	66.90
White, non-Hispanic	4797	86.20
Students with Disabilities	1543	50.70
Limited English Proficient	363	42.70
Economically Disadvantaged	3951	66.70
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	4526	77.40
Female	4427	76.40

Comments:

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8953	76.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	42	83.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	282	86.50
Black, non-Hispanic	2901	64.60
Hispanic	931	66.10
White, non-Hispanic	4797	85.80
Students with Disabilities	1543	54.00
Limited English Proficient	363	39.10
Economically Disadvantaged	3951	67.00
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	4526	73.50
Female	4427	80.40

Comments:

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9094	76.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	30	80.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	253	89.70
Black, non-Hispanic	3053	61.60
Hispanic	897	70.30
White, non-Hispanic	4861	85.40
Students with Disabilities	1576	48.50
Limited English Proficient	297	47.80
Economically Disadvantaged	3940	64.60
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	4755	76.40
Female	4339	75.50

Comments: These student numbers will vary from year to year depending on how many students of each category are in the grade for the year.

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9094	80.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	30	83.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	253	87.70
Black, non-Hispanic	3053	70.00
Hispanic	897	72.00
White, non-Hispanic	4861	87.40
Students with Disabilities	1576	57.30
Limited English Proficient	297	43.80
Economically Disadvantaged	3940	70.40
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	4755	76.40
Female	4339	84.00

Comments: student numbers will vary from year to year depending on how many students of each category are in the grade for the year.

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9585	70.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	91.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	278	91.70
Black, non-Hispanic	3229	55.50
Hispanic	824	58.60
White, non-Hispanic	5230	80.50
Students with Disabilities	1486	32.70
Limited English Proficient	240	35.40
Economically Disadvantaged	4010	57.50
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	4876	70.00
Female	4709	71.10

Comments:

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

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9585	76.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	87.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	278	89.90
Black, non-Hispanic	3229	65.30
Hispanic	824	63.40
White, non-Hispanic	5230	83.80
Students with Disabilities	1486	39.80
Limited English Proficient	240	32.10
Economically Disadvantaged	4010	64.40
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	4876	71.20
Female	4709	80.90

Comments:

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9899	63.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	33	66.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	275	86.20
Black, non-Hispanic	3378	45.40
Hispanic	867	48.20
White, non-Hispanic	5346	76.50
Students with Disabilities	1459	27.20
Limited English Proficient	239	20.50
Economically Disadvantaged	4058	47.70
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	5158	63.10
Female	4741	64.20

Comments:

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9899	77.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	33	78.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	275	88.40
Black, non-Hispanic	3378	66.90
Hispanic	867	62.90
White, non-Hispanic	5346	85.90
Students with Disabilities	1459	40.80
Limited English Proficient	239	23.90
Economically Disadvantaged	4058	65.90
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	5158	73.00
Female	4741	82.30

Comments:

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	10502	60.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	22	63.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	277	85.60
Black, non-Hispanic	3648	41.10
Hispanic	902	43.40
White, non-Hispanic	5653	75.00
Students with Disabilities	1610	26.30
Limited English Proficient	321	26.20
Economically Disadvantaged	4279	44.20
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	5355	61.50
Female	5147	60.00

Comments: These student numbers will vary from year to year depending on how many students of each category are in the grade for the year.

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	10502	77.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	22	81.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	277	86.60
Black, non-Hispanic	3648	66.60
Hispanic	902	63.10
White, non-Hispanic	5653	86.80
Students with Disabilities	1610	39.50
Limited English Proficient	321	30.20
Economically Disadvantaged	4279	66.30
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	5355	72.60
Female	5147	83.10

Comments: These student numbers will vary from year to year depending on how many students of each category are in the grade for the year.

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8548	52.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	30	56.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	239	69.90
Black, non-Hispanic	2492	32.00
Hispanic	541	39.00
White, non-Hispanic	5246	63.50
Students with Disabilities	1124	20.00
Limited English Proficient	200	29.00
Economically Disadvantaged	2420	36.40
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	4387	53.60
Female	4161	52.10

Comments: These student numbers will vary from year to year depending on how many students of each category are in the grade for the year

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

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8548	63.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	30	53.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	239	74.50
Black, non-Hispanic	2492	47.90
Hispanic	541	44.70
White, non-Hispanic	5246	73.10
Students with Disabilities	1124	23.00
Limited English Proficient	200	18.50
Economically Disadvantaged	2420	46.00
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	4387	60.00
Female	4161	68.10

Comments: These student numbers will vary from year to year depending on how many students of each category are in the grade for the year

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

1.4 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	183	149	81.50

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	19	17	89.40

Comments:

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

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	100	93	93.00

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	19	17	89.40

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.

The Delaware Department of Education provided comprehensive support to all Title 1

schools identified for improvement as part of its overall support system to schools. The

Department, in partnership with the Region III, the Mid Atlantic Comprehensive Center, worked with each of the schools identified throughout the 2005-2006 school year. These services were built around the Delaware School Improvement Process with the data driven decision making and the use of scientifically based programs. Services included, but were not limited to:

Analysis of data and revision of school plans to address requirements of NCLB and identified needs

Assistance with the use of resources for improvement activities and strategies

On-going technical assistance and support to school improvement teams and district

leadership throughout the school year

Monitoring and evaluation (formative and summative)

Support effective school improvement team functioning

Support for district staff and building principals

Additionally, DOE staff provided content specific professional development to these

schools based on the requests of the districts and the identified needs of the schools.

The Department's Director of Title 1 and Education Associate for School Improvement

oversee the support and funding provided to these schools and provides support to

districts in the implementation of improvement strategies.

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.

The Delaware Department of Education provided comprehensive support to all Title 1

schools identified for improvement as part of its overall support system to schools. The

Department, in partnership with the Region III, the Mid Atlantic Comprehensive Center, worked with each of the schools identified throughout the 2005-2006 school year. These services were built around the Delaware School Improvement Process with the data driven decision making and the use of scientifically based programs. Services included, but were not limited to:

Analysis of data and revision of school plans to address requirements of NCLB and identified needs

Assistance with the use of resources for improvement activities and strategies

On-going technical assistance and support to school improvement teams and district

leadership throughout the school year

Monitoring and evaluation (formative and summative)

Support effective school improvement team functioning

Support for district staff and building principals

Additionally, DOE staff provided content specific professional development to these

schools based on the requests of the districts and the identified needs of the schools.

The Department's Director of Title 1 and Education Associate for School Improvement

oversee the support and funding provided to these schools and provides support to

districts in the implementation of improvement strategies.

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.	6
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.	13
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.	166
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.	4663
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments:	

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.	5
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	203
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.	5230
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.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	20909	16555	79.20
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	896	706	78.80
Low-Poverty Schools	851	778	91.40
All Elementary Schools	3594	3143	87.50
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	2789	1677	60.10
Low-Poverty Schools	3762	2911	77.40
All Secondary Schools	17315	13412	77.50
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

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

How is a teacher defined?

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

How is a class defined?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	20.00
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	3.50
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	3.50
d) Other (please explain)	73.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	14.90
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	5.20
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.90
d) Other (please explain)	77.00

Comments: Other reasons for a teacher being classified as not highly qualified are:

- (1) The teacher's unique identifier is missing from the student accounting system through which teachers and students are assigned to classes or the identifier cannot be found in the electronic statewide certification system.
- (2) The teacher completed the Teacher Quality Survey (on-line survey for determining teachers' HQT status) but the district/charter school did not verify it (review the responses and documentation and either accept or reject the survey).
- (3) The teacher did not take the Teacher Quality Survey.
- (4) The teacher started the Teacher Quality Survey but did not complete it.

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	54.00	26.60
Poverty Metric Used	Free/reduced lunch participation	
Secondary Schools	45.10	23.20
Poverty Metric Used	Free/reduced lunch participation	

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	84.40

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

Delaware's ELP Standards were developed by the WIDA consortium of states, of which Delaware is a part. The standards encompass frameworks for large-scale state and classroom assessment, and address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Within each framework there is a separate set of model performance indicators for each of the 4 language domains. There are 5 ELP standards that address the social and instructional settings as well as language arts, math, science, and social studies in grades K-12 using the grade clusters of K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. There are 5 language proficiency levels, which delineate expected performance and describe what ELLs can do within each domain of the standard.

The following is taken from the WIDA Standards overview. The primary use of the English language proficiency standards is to guide and align curriculum, instruction, and assessment for English language learners. In doing so, the English language proficiency standards, by incorporating the language of the classroom as well as that of the academic subject areas, provide a pathway for

English language learners to academic success.

Acquiring a new language involves the integration of all language domains; listening, speaking, reading, and writing are naturally interwoven in the instruction of English language learners. It is suggested, therefore, that for teaching, the series of model performance indicators at a grade level cluster serve as the starting point for creating integrated language lessons. By enhancing the model performance indicators across language domains and frameworks described in this document, teachers and administrators

will gain a sense of how to maximize the use of the language proficiency standards.

Likewise, the intersection of different content areas lends itself to thematic teaching, an endorsed approach for English language learners (Freeman & Freeman, 2002). Teachers are invited to use the model performance indicators to develop curricular themes or units of instruction that involve multiple content areas. Furthermore, teachers can formulate both language and content objectives for both curriculum and instruction from the standards' model performance indicators.

The large-scale state assessment framework provides a skeleton and the parameters for the creation of the specifications for the English language proficiency test. Concomitantly, it offers teachers and administrators a measurable index for supporting instruction. The classroom framework dovetails with that for large-scale state assessment. Its primary use is to serve as a tool for instruction and formative assessment.

The standards became operational in Delaware in September 2004. In 2004 Delaware provided statewide professional development for teachers and administrators introducing the standards. In 2005 Delaware provided strategies for successful implementation in the classroom. This is on-going professional development that will be provided each year.

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

Delaware used the English language proficiency assessment, ACCESS, developed by the WIDA consortium in April 2006.

The following is a description of the alignment process the WIDA states went through. It is taken from the ELP Standards overview.

Because TESOL's (1997) ESL standards for preK-12 students have served as the national template, this document was used as a starting point for the analysis. First, descriptors and sample progress indicators for each grade level cluster (preK-3, 4-8, 9-12) were classified as being amenable or not to large-scale state or classroom assessment. Next, the descriptors and sample progress

indicators applicable to large-scale state assessment were sorted and color-coded according to language domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). Then a matrix was created consisting of 5 language proficiency levels (as used by the lead states in the Consortium) and 4 language domains with relevant progress indicators inserted from TESOL and other states' English language

proficiency standards.

A two-day meeting was set where the goal was to determine the breadth and depth of the English language proficiency standards and the role of the standards in the enhanced assessment system for English language learners. The first day was devoted to inspecting and expanding existing English language proficiency and English language development standards from TESOL and around the country. Groups applied specific criteria for the selection of model performance indicators determining their relevance and potential adoption by the Consortium.

On the second day, representatives from individual states examined their academic content standards and, based on a set of criteria derived from linguistic theory (Bachman, 1990; Halliday, 1973, 1976), agreed on a common set of language functions to be used across content areas for the various levels of cognitive engagement. Groups worked with their individual state academic

content standards in the areas of language arts/reading, mathematics, science, and social studies to extract the language functions to be applied to the English language proficiency standards.

From the two-day discussion emerged a consensus among the eight participating states on key decision points. It was agreed upon that there would be four standards (to represent the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing) to be defined by progress indicators, six areas of language proficiency confined to the school setting (to represent social language, academic language and the language of the content areas of language arts, math, science, and social studies), five levels of language proficiency, four grade

level clusters, and two applications: large-scale state and classroom frameworks.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments
1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent alignment study <u>Yes</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of alignment <u>No</u>
2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12; 2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension; 3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards; 4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)
STATE RESPONSE
<p>1. Delaware is part of the WIDA consortia of states and has adopted the ACCESS test. Training was provided on-site for every teacher K-12 who will administer the test. They must also do the on-line training course and pass the quizzes in order to be certified to administer the ACCESS test. Data is kept on a WIDA database. Dates have been set for the statewide administration of the test in the Spring of each year. The test is scored by the vendor and scores will be sent to the state in July to be uploaded into the state database.</p> <p>The WIDA Consortium has contracted with Dr. Gary Cook from the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER) to conduct an independent alignment study of the alignment between the WIDA ELP Standards adopted by Delaware and the ACCESS for ELLs® ELP assessment, Delaware's measure of English proficiency growth. The alignment will be conducted by teachers from Delaware Department of Education and the 14 other WIDA Consortium states in Madison, Wisconsin, December 4-5, 2006. Dr. Norman Webb's alignment procedures will be used and the teachers will enter their findings in the Web Alignment Tool, a federally funded on-line alignment framework that identifies match, depth of knowledge, and balance between the standards and the assessment. Webb's system is one of four federally recognized methodologies for conducting alignments. Dr. Cook has adapted the Webb system for use with English proficiency standards and ELP tests. Dr. Cook is one of the leading authorities in this area. Dr. Cook will analyze and synthesize the teachers' finding and write the summary report on the degree of alignment including any recommendations for changes to the standards or the assessment. The report should be available by March 1, 2007 and will be shared with all WIDA member states and the US Department of Education.</p> <p>2. The WIDA ACCESS test was developed by the Center for Applied Linguistics and consists of the 5 domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension. There are 5 levels of proficiency, and the grade configurations of K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12.</p> <p>3. The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) developed the WIDA ACCESS test, which is aligned with the WIDA ELP Standards. CAL was part of the ELP Standards development and alignment process.</p> <p>4. The Center for Applied Linguistics has written the technical report that addresses the validity and reliability based on the field test cycle that was done. It was distributed in Spring 2006.</p>

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

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	4630	77.00
2. Creole	262	4.30
3. Chinese	131	2.20
4. Korean	113	1.90
5. Arabic	67	1.10
6. Gujarati	68	1.10
7. Turkish	66	1.10
8. English (non US)	58	1.00
9. French	45	0.70
10. Vietnamese	43	0.70
Comments:		

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities
- **# of immigrant 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
1505	1492	16

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.)

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

Delaware is using the WIDA ACCESS test.

1. Each section of the test has a range of scores that determine the total scale score for each of the 4 domains. this converts to a proficiency level of 1-5. There is an oral, literacy, comprehension scale score that is converted to a proficiency level. This then is converted to an overall composite scale score and proficiency level. This was developed by the Center for Applied Linguistics.
2. With only 1 year of data Delaware has developed an interim definition of "proficient". In order to transition a student:
 - a. A student in grades 1 - 12 must be in Tier C with an overall composite proficiency level of 5.0 or above.
 - b. Kindergarten students must be at an overall composite proficiency level of 5 or above.

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

Due to implementing a new assessment (ACCESS) in spring 2006 Delaware will be submitting a plan to revise the AMAOs to the USDOE by the middle of December. Once USDOE approves the plan then we will be able to determine progress and attainment.

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

Due to implementing a new assessment (ACCESS) in spring 2006 Delaware will be submitting a plan to revise the AMAOs to the USDOE by the middle of December. Once USDOE approves the plan then we will be able to determine progress and attainment.

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

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

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? Yes

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 82.00	#	% 79.70	#	% 5.00	#	% 4.40	#

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.

Due to implementing a new assessment (ACCESS) in spring 2006 Delaware will be submitting a plan to revise the AMAOs to the USDOE by the middle of December. Once USDOE approves the plan then we will be able to determine progress and attainment.

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

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

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

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

Definitions:

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

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
2005-2006			
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
		#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	82.00		79.70
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS			
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	5.00		4.40
TOTAL			

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	22
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	14
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	20
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	8
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	10
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	1
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	4
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments: Due to implementing a new assessment (ACCESS) in spring 2006 Delaware will be submitting a plan to revise the AMAOs to the USDOE by the middle of December. Once USDOE approves the plan then we will be able to determine progress and attainment.

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

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

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments		
Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	184	93.90
4	253	79.30
5	149	81.40
6	86	76.80
7	97	72.90
8	39	72.20
H.S.	26	31.00

Comments:

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	172	87.80
4	249	78.10
5	138	75.40
6	82	73.20
7	74	55.60
8	30	55.60
H.S.	22	26.20

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

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

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	83.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	86.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.60
Black, non-Hispanic	77.30
Hispanic	67.30
White, non-Hispanic	87.80
Students with Disabilities	71.50
Limited English Proficient	71.30
Economically Disadvantaged	73.00
Migrant	54.50
Male	80.40
Female	86.90

Comments: These have been verified and are correct.
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	5.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.50
Black, non-Hispanic	6.60
Hispanic	10.40
White, non-Hispanic	4.30
Students with Disabilities	5.00
Limited English Proficient	10.50
Economically Disadvantaged	5.10
Migrant	16.60
Male	6.00
Female	4.60
Comments:	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

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

STATE RESPONSE

The school year is a total of 180 instructional days.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	9	9
LEAs with Subgrants	10	10

Comments: We have 19 school districts in the state.

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	59	99
1	70	90
2	70	80
3	72	71
4	68	64
5	82	59
6	71	48
7	69	58
8	52	55
9	79	69
10	38	31
11	18	36
12	20	37

Comments: 80 of these students were Katrina students in public schools.

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	<n	28
Doubled-up	58	203
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	<n	<n
Hotels/Motels	19	71
Unknown	685	494

Comments: This is still a relatively new statewide data system and districts are not necessarily filling in all drop down boxes.

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2.1 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	99
1	90
2	80
3	71
4	64
5	59
6	48
7	58
8	55
9	69
10	31
11	36
12	37

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

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

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

<n

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

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

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

<n

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

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

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

0

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

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

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	82
English Language Learners (ELL)	21
Gifted and Talented	
Vocational Education	47

Comments: Gifted and talented data not collected.

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

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

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	3
Expedited evaluations	1
Staff professional development and awareness	3
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	4
Transportation	9
Early childhood programs	2
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	5
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	4
Coordination between schools and agencies	5
Counseling	6
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	4
Clothing to meet a school requirement	7
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	5
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional)	5

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School selection	0
Transportation	0
School records	0
Immunizations or other medical records	1
Other enrollment issues	0

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

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

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

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

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	43	32
Grade 4	Yes	44	31
Grade 5	Yes	40	26
Grade 6	Yes	30	22
Grade 7	Yes	28	23
Grade 8	Yes	32	24
Grade 9	Yes	43	22
Grade 10	Yes	22	<n
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	51	33
Grade 4	Yes	50	31
Grade 5	Yes	48	28
Grade 6	Yes	33	21
Grade 7	Yes	37	16
Grade 8	Yes	40	19
Grade 9	Yes	42	<n
Grade 10	Yes	20	<n
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:

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