

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614	
Expiration Date: 07/31/2007	
<p>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</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2005-2006 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2005-2006	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Florida Department of Education	
Address: 325 West Gaines St Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Jay Pfeiffer Telephone: (850)245-0437 Fax: (850)245-9288 e-mail: Jay.Pfeiffer@fldoe.org	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jeanine Blomberg, Commissioner of Education	
_____ Signature	_____ Thursday, March 01, 2007, 10:47:01 AM Date

You may also contact Pamela Kaperak - Pam.Kaperak@fldoe.org or (850)245-5010.

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

Florida's Sunshine State Standards are in full compliance with the requirements of section 1111(b)(1) to develop and adopt challenging academic content standards in science. As described in previously submitted plans and reports, in 1996 Florida adopted challenging academic content standards in several disciplines including science. In summary, the Standards were developed with the involvement of practicing educators from across Florida, reviewed by various interested parties, including the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL), reviewed by all school districts, and adopted by the State Board of Education in 1996. Specific information about the manner in which each set of standards was created is available at the following Department of Education web site: www.firn.edu/doe/menu/sss.htm and will not be repeated here.

The original design of the Standards did not include grade-by-grade expectations, but as decisions were made in 1999 to expand the statewide assessment program to include all grades 3-10, it became necessary to create "grade level expectations" (GLEs). Grade level expectations were developed for science as well as for language arts, mathematics, and social studies. The development of the GLEs is described at length on the Department's web site at www.firn.edu/doe/menu/sss.htm and will not be repeated here.

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

Florida's standards-based assessment program, FCAT (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test), is in full compliance with the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) to develop and implement, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science. A brief summary of the development of FCAT is provided below, but a more detailed summary is found in Appendix B of the Accountability Plan submitted as part of the No Child Left Behind act requirements (<http://www.fldoe.org/NCLB/>).

The current Florida standards-based assessment program has been under development since 1992-93 when the demand writing assessment program was begun at three grade levels (4, 8, and 10). This writing assessment is aligned with the Sunshine State Standards adopted in 1996. Florida expanded its standards-based assessment program by adding reading and mathematics in 1998 with assessments in four grades (4, 5, 8, and 10); and in 2001, added grade levels such that all grades, 3-10, were assessed in reading and mathematics. Standards-based science assessments were implemented at three grade levels (5, 8, and 10) beginning in 2003.

Florida has designed a standards-based assessment system in reading and mathematics for students in grades 3-10 that measures students annually. The annual standards-based assessment, called the Florida's Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), is based on the state's content standards, the Sunshine State Standards, approved in May 1996 by the Florida State Board of Education (SBE). The annual assessment system for all grades 3-10 has been implemented for the past five (5) years, since 2000-01. The core components of the Florida assessment began in 1998 with the administration of tests in reading (grades 4, 8, and 10) and mathematics (grades 5, 8, and 10). With the passage of Governor Bush's A+ Plan in 1999, the assessment was expanded to grades 3-10, and reading and mathematics assessments at all of these grade levels have been administered and reported since 2001, which serves as the baseline.

The A+ Plan for Education also required a science assessment for students in Grades 5, 8, and 10. Development of science test items began in 2000, and a field test of these items was conducted in a representative sample of Florida schools in April 2002. The first operational assessment and reporting of student scores took place in May 2003. Beginning in March 2005, FCAT Science was administered in Grade 11 instead of Grade 10. This change was in response to requests by Florida science educators to allow an additional year for students to receive high-school level science instruction.

Florida has existing alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities in reading/language arts and mathematics for each of the grades 3-10. Under Florida's approved AYP plan, students with significant cognitive disabilities participate in the accountability system through alternate assessments. Grade level specific indicators were identified through course-based performance objectives for grades 6 through 10 and elementary performance objectives for grades 3 through 5.

As Florida developed its standards-based test, input of Florida educators and community representatives has been critical. Annual meetings are held to review the content assessed on the test, to review items proposed for each test (content, bias, and community sensitivity), to develop scoring procedures for items, to set achievement level standards when appropriate, and to advise the Department of Education about various publications, reports and policy decisions. The input provided by local educators helps the

Department ensure the rigor, relevance, and appropriateness of the content assessed.

Florida is currently revising its academic content standards and developing extensions to support access to the general curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Once these revisions are adopted, a statewide alternate assessment to address the extensions will be designed in the areas of reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.

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

Florida has formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards for FCAT reading and FCAT mathematics in grades 3-10. Student scores on these tests are reported and aggregated into five levels of achievement based on the scores adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) in Rule 6A-1.09422.

Florida has been reporting student results in reading and mathematics using achievement standards in five (5) levels since 1999, and the results of these test administrations and Florida NAEP scores provide evidence that the academic achievement standards are challenging.

State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.09422, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test Requirements, was amended March 27, 2006, to specify the five achievement levels for the science portion of the FCAT for grades 5, 8, and 11. The spring 2006 student scores were reported using these challenging academic achievement standards.

Florida has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities in reading/language arts and mathematics for each of the grades 3-10. Through the Florida Alternate Assessment Report (FAAR) student progress toward mastery of standards is reported on grade level specific indicators. Rubrics were written to distinguish achievement levels.

Each rubric was designed to insure that students participated in assessment activities and that decreasing levels of support required for students to complete the activities would reflect increased proficiency. Once extensions to the Sunshine State Standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and the assessment tied to these extensions are developed; a formal standard setting process will be used to establish academic achievement levels.

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	1609070	97.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	4745	97.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	35977	98.80
Black, non-Hispanic	371548	97.10
Hispanic	377659	97.80
White, non-Hispanic	773684	98.00
Students with Disabilities	245395	96.10
Limited English Proficient	158224	97.70
Economically Disadvantaged	762796	97.50
Migrant	15920	97.20
Male	823189	97.40
Female	785881	98.10

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.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	1613407	97.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	4757	98.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	36011	98.80
Black, non-Hispanic	372930	97.30
Hispanic	378994	98.00
White, non-Hispanic	775199	98.10
Students with Disabilities	246249	96.30
Limited English Proficient	158807	98.00
Economically Disadvantaged	765218	97.70
Migrant	15964	97.30
Male	825869	97.60
Female	787538	98.20

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.

1.2.2 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	223968	91.30
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	21427	8.70

Comments: Florida did not have have alternative achievement standards during the 2005-06 school year.

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	224718	91.30
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	21531	8.80

Comments: Florida did not have alternative achievement standards during the 2005-06 school year. These data have been verified as accurate.

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	200390	72.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	598	76.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	4491	87.20
Black, non-Hispanic	47125	54.50
Hispanic	49245	68.40
White, non-Hispanic	91298	82.30
Students with Disabilities	34688	50.60
Limited English Proficient	31544	58.80
Economically Disadvantaged	108507	61.70
Migrant	2316	55.40
Male	103826	72.90
Female	96564	71.30

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	200428	75.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	597	79.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	4488	85.60
Black, non-Hispanic	47134	61.00
Hispanic	49259	69.80
White, non-Hispanic	91316	84.70
Students with Disabilities	34644	49.10
Limited English Proficient	31553	59.50
Economically Disadvantaged	108536	65.70
Migrant	2312	53.60
Male	103821	72.50
Female	96607	78.30

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	189014	68.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	556	71.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	4295	86.20
Black, non-Hispanic	42086	50.70
Hispanic	45662	64.10
White, non-Hispanic	89637	76.90
Students with Disabilities	32179	42.40
Limited English Proficient	23994	52.30
Economically Disadvantaged	98530	56.50
Migrant	1921	52.10
Male	96063	69.00
Female	92951	66.90

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	189069	66.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	557	72.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	4298	81.70
Black, non-Hispanic	42098	49.40
Hispanic	45690	61.00
White, non-Hispanic	89647	75.70
Students with Disabilities	32195	38.30
Limited English Proficient	24008	46.80
Economically Disadvantaged	98590	54.30
Migrant	1924	43.80
Male	96069	61.90
Female	93000	70.80

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	194084	57.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	575	57.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	4327	80.20
Black, non-Hispanic	44167	36.40
Hispanic	46195	53.00
White, non-Hispanic	92425	68.00
Students with Disabilities	32837	32.30
Limited English Proficient	19704	39.40
Economically Disadvantaged	100349	44.20
Migrant	1974	39.80
Male	99369	58.60
Female	94715	56.00

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	194233	67.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	577	73.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	4327	79.50
Black, non-Hispanic	44229	50.80
Hispanic	46248	61.90
White, non-Hispanic	92459	77.70
Students with Disabilities	32843	38.80
Limited English Proficient	19728	43.80
Economically Disadvantaged	100452	56.00
Migrant	1973	42.80
Male	99458	63.50
Female	94775	72.20

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	184260	53.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	559	56.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	4053	77.00
Black, non-Hispanic	41332	32.50
Hispanic	41895	47.90
White, non-Hispanic	90788	64.00
Students with Disabilities	24801	23.80
Limited English Proficient	15707	30.10
Economically Disadvantaged	90374	39.00
Migrant	1618	31.40
Male	94634	53.40
Female	89626	53.30

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	184421	64.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	559	69.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	4051	78.70
Black, non-Hispanic	41340	46.10
Hispanic	41943	59.20
White, non-Hispanic	90893	74.70
Students with Disabilities	24865	32.60
Limited English Proficient	15717	35.40
Economically Disadvantaged	90426	51.60
Migrant	1620	36.40
Male	94752	61.70
Female	89669	68.00

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	199485	55.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	583	64.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	4217	79.70
Black, non-Hispanic	47345	35.20
Hispanic	46092	49.00
White, non-Hispanic	95918	66.90
Students with Disabilities	29392	24.00
Limited English Proficient	15990	31.50
Economically Disadvantaged	98222	41.10
Migrant	1936	34.80
Male	102292	55.50
Female	97193	55.20

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	199672	61.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	587	64.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	4220	76.40
Black, non-Hispanic	47376	44.00
Hispanic	46113	53.60
White, non-Hispanic	96037	72.40
Students with Disabilities	29488	27.60
Limited English Proficient	15990	28.20
Economically Disadvantaged	98331	47.90
Migrant	1936	32.90
Male	102431	57.60
Female	97241	65.20

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	198487	60.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	575	65.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	4361	82.50
Black, non-Hispanic	46350	38.60
Hispanic	45274	54.10
White, non-Hispanic	96958	72.00
Students with Disabilities	29071	25.30
Limited English Proficient	14303	34.20
Economically Disadvantaged	92887	45.80
Migrant	1865	37.60
Male	101125	59.40
Female	97362	61.10

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	199073	46.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	580	51.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	4363	63.40
Black, non-Hispanic	46529	27.90
Hispanic	45402	39.80
White, non-Hispanic	97225	58.10
Students with Disabilities	29240	17.70
Limited English Proficient	14353	16.20
Economically Disadvantaged	93271	31.80
Migrant	1871	19.50
Male	101497	43.10
Female	97576	50.80

Comments: There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	211065	59.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	612	66.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	4596	82.00
Black, non-Hispanic	49987	37.00
Hispanic	47476	52.00
White, non-Hispanic	104136	71.00
Students with Disabilities	30391	25.00
Limited English Proficient	14967	33.00
Economically Disadvantaged	84785	45.00
Migrant	1757	37.00
Male	108079	60.00
Female	102986	58.00

Comments: Florida tests both 9th and 10th grad in high school. Only 9th grade is reflected in Florida's response.

There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.

2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.

a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.

b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.

- 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	211643	41.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	604	45.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	4601	56.00
Black, non-Hispanic	50182	21.00
Hispanic	47607	32.00
White, non-Hispanic	104397	53.00
Students with Disabilities	30524	17.00
Limited English Proficient	14985	11.00
Economically Disadvantaged	85096	26.00
Migrant	1764	13.00
Male	108404	38.00
Female	103239	43.00

Comments: Florida tests both 9th and 10th grad in high school. Only 9th grade is reflected in Florida's response.

There are two reasons the number of students tested broken out by grade level do not match the total number of students tested.

1. It appears for the high school section of the CSPR only the 9th grade number was used. When adding the 10th grade tests the difference between the two numbers decreases.
 2. The number used for the percent of students tested is our tested numerator. Florida used the proficiency denominator for the Proficiency portion.
 - a. The tested numerator includes student tested off grade level and students with invalid test.
 - b. The proficiency denominator is only students with valid tests and students tested on grade level.
 - 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	3197	916	28.70

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	67	0	0.00

Comments:

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

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1401	294	21.00

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	67	0	0.00

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

Currently district planned restructure plans are being collected from districts with schools in planned restructuring, there are no schools in restructuring.

--Web-based submitted school improvement plans are analyzed by school improvement specialists at the state level and recommendations for improvement are sent back to the school districts for implementation.

--Web-based district assistance and intervention plans are analyzed by school improvement specialists primarily for alignment of student needs and school improvement plans and recommendations for improvement are sent back to the school districts for implementation.

--Schools with the highest percent of students in the lowest performance levels are eligible for school improvement funds.

--District plans for schools in corrective action are reviewed and site visits are made to determine that the corrective actions are in place.

--Schools with the lowest performance are served by Assistance Plus teams made up of school improvement specialists and curriculum specialists, school matches are provided (schools of similar student demographics and higher student performance), the state requires districts to provide these schools site-based reading and mathematics coaches, staff development is provided in Florida's continuous improvement model, the state requires districts to fully staff these schools.

--Choice and SES

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.

--Web-based district improvement plans are analyzed by school improvement specialists at the state level and recommendations for improvement are sent back to the school districts for implementation.

--Districts apply for corrective action funds to be spent on school level improvement efforts in areas that district failed to reach adequate yearly progress targets.

--Florida Department of K-12 Student Achievement provide district staff with professional development in school reform efforts and student data analysis.

--Florida Department of K-12 Student Achievement provide districts with information on research-based K-12 school reform models for the purposes of improving student achievement.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	1102
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.	770
How many of these schools were charter schools?	17
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.	9220
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.	753342
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: The data required for items 5 and 6 are not available for the 2005-06 school year. We are collecting this data for the 2006-07 school year.	

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.	720
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	23225
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.	332174

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: The data requested for item 4 is not available for the 2005-06 school year. We are collecting this data for the 2006-07 school year.

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	768636	688963	89.60
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	75780	67273	88.80
Low-Poverty Schools	95405	89621	93.90
All Elementary Schools	364019	336033	92.30
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	85320	71482	83.80
Low-Poverty Schools	84198	76655	91.00
All Secondary Schools	404617	352930	87.20
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	68.80
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	31.20
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	78.80
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	21.20
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	
Comments: In 2006-07, nonHQ elementary school teachers who are out of field but who are also certified in general education will be included in category C. For 2005-06 these teachers were included in category A above.	

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	75.00	33.40
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch.	
Secondary Schools	57.40	20.50
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students eligible for free and reduced-price 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	85.30

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

As described in Florida's 2003 Consolidated Application and in the 2004-05 Consolidated State Performance Report, the English Language Proficiency Standards are performance indicators for each of the Language Arts benchmarks derived from the Sunshine State Standards which are aligned to the state-wide assessment system (FCAT). Florida's ELLs continue to be assessed in reading/language arts, mathematics, and writing through the use of the FCAT. As required by Florida law, all instruction for LEP students in all core subject areas is not only aligned to the Sunshine State Standards, but must be equal in amount, sequence and scope to that provided to non-ELLs. Florida is in the process of revising the reading and language arts standards and are scheduled to be adopted in December 2006 by Florida's State Board of Education. The new Reading and Language Arts Through ESOL English Language Proficiency Standards will be completed by January 30, 2007 and will continue to be aligned to the Sunshine State Standards. Florida's ELP standards are derived from the four English language domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing and provide for four levels of proficiency: beginning, intermediate, advanced, and proficient. The proficient level is grade level mastery that is required of all students.

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

As reported in Florida's 2004-05 Consolidated State Performance Report, Florida continues to have the same fully developed standards for ELLs as for non-ELLs. As described in section 1.6.1.1, the proficient level is the level required for all students to demonstrate mastery for each benchmark. The table included as Attachment 1 to Section 1.6.1.2 provides an example and illustrates how the Florida's current ELP standards are aligned and linked to Florida's Sunshine State Standards for Reading and Language Arts. As mentioned in 1.6.1.1, Florida is in the process of revising the Sunshine State Standards, Reading and Language Arts have been completed and mathematics will be completed prior the end of the 2006-07 school year. The revised Reading and Language Arts through ESOL - ELP Standards will be completed in January 2007 and will continue to be aligned to the Sunshine State Standards for Reading and Language Arts.

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

Florida continues to emphasize the participation of ALL students in the state-wide assessment program, FCAT, to measure academic achievement. ELLs are required to participate in the FCAT assessment. The academic achievement of all students classified as English language learners is measured and reported.

Since 1990, English language speaking and listening comprehension skills were determined by approximately 12 different state-approved English language aural/oral proficiency tests. According to test-specific measurements, students who scored within the LEP range were determined to be LEP. Accordingly, any student in grade 4 or above was assessed for English language proficiency in reading and writing using sub-parts of a norm-referenced test. Students scoring below a 32nd percentile on these sub-parts were determined to be LEP.

Due to Florida's continued commitment to achieve the goals of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Florida joined a five-state consortium to develop a new instrument to be used uniformly throughout the State. The field test was completed by November 5, 2004, with item review completed in May 2005. The annual assessment of language proficiency of all Florida's ELLs using the Comprehensive English Language Learner Assessment (CELLA) was conducted August 28, 2006 through September 29, 2006. Due to the impact of the 2005-06 hurricanes that struck the State of Florida, the Spring administration of CELLA was delayed until August 2006. Florida submitted a detailed plan for the 2006 administration and reporting, which was approved by USDE, Office of English Language Acquisition. Florida will conduct the second administration of CELLA in the Spring of 2007. As reported in the plan submitted to USED, at the end of January 2007, upon completion of the scoring, reporting and standard-setting process for 2006 administration of CELLA, the progress of individual LEP students shall be added to Florida's definition of making progress and shall be based on the number and percent of students that have met annual measurable achievement objectives.

Listening and speaking is assessed on CELLA by grade span. ELLs are required to be tested in listening and speaking on grade level. While reading and writing assessment on CELLA is also based on grade span, ELLs may be assessed in reading and writing based on their level of proficiency and may be tested one or two levels below their assigned grade level. Each form of the test is designed to be useable with students at any grade whose skills fit the functional level and is aligned to the English language proficiency required to be successful in a English-speaking class.

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	191709	75.70
2. Haitian-Creole (Includes French Creole)	26137	10.30
3. English	10067	4.00
4. Portuguese	3916	1.60
5. Vietnamese	2545	1.00
6. French	2009	0.80
7. Arabic	1794	0.70
8. Chinese, Zhongwen	1541	0.60
9. Russian	1092	0.40
10. Tagalog	849	0.30
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
123100	123100	48

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.)

Florida has experienced a decline in the number of recently arrived immigrants. Currently, Florida's ELL population is comprised of more than 50% born in the United States or U.S. territories. While some school districts have experienced an increase in the number of recently arrived immigrants, statewide there was a decrease.

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

As reported in Florida's 2004-05 Consolidated State Performance Report, the definition of proficient in English has been as follows:

Grades K-3: A full-English proficient score in listening and speaking on the language proficiency assessment test as indicated by the test publisher's guidelines.

Grades 4-12: A full-English proficient score in listening and speaking on the language proficiency assessment and a score of at least 32% on a nationally-norm referenced test (NRT) in reading or reading comprehension and language usage or language mechanics. Another criterion that may be used to determine proficiency is a school-level committee (LEP Committee), whose function and memberships are outlined in Rule 6A-6.0902, F.A.C., <http://www.firn.edu/doe/rules/6a-69.htm#6A-6.0902>. LEP committees may determine a student who scores as full-English proficient to be LEP or not based on at least two of the following criteria, in addition to the test results: (1) extent and nature of prior educational and social experiences; and a student interview; (2) written recommendation and observation by current and previous instructional and supportive services staff; (3) level of mastery of basic competencies or skills in English and/or home language according to appropriate local, state and national criterion-referenced standards; (4) grades from the current or previous years; and (5) test results other than those used to determine initial English language proficiency.

As mentioned in previous sections of this report, the results of the August 2006 administration of CELLA will be used to establish cut scores and proficiency levels and will provide baseline data from which annual progress will be determined. The 2006 CELLA standard setting process is scheduled for December 2006 and Florida will report to USDE the number and percent of ELLs scoring at beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of proficiency.

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

At this time, until the statewide administration of CELLA, Florida's definition of making progress is based on the statewide percent of LEP students who attain English proficiency, defined as the LEP students in required English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) programs and who, within three years, attained sufficient proficiency to compete in non-ESOL supported classes with their English speaking peers. Attachment B is included which provides the average length of time LEP students spend in ESOL support programs.

In January 2007, upon completion of the scoring, reporting and standard setting process for the 2006 CELLA, the progress of individual LEP students shall be added to Florida's definition of making progress and shall be based on the number and percent of students that have met annual measurable achievement objectives.

As mentioned in previous section of this report, CELLA listening and speaking assessments are organized by grade span, CELLA reading and writing assessments are organized into four functional levels based on language proficiency:

Level A - Initial literacy skills

Level B - Applying literacy skills to the development of new knowledge

Level C - More advanced applications of literacy skills for the development of new knowledge

Level D - Literacy skills necessary for success in higher education or the workforce

While each of the four functional levels does align with the level of language proficiency needed to succeed in the English-speaking classroom at a specific grade span (grades Pre K-2 for Level A; grades 3-5 for Level B; grades 6-8 for Level C; and grades 9-12 for Level D), each form is designed to be useable with students at any grade whose skills fit the functional level.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

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

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have been made to Florida definition of cohort. As reported in Florida's 2004-05 Consolidated State Performance Report Florida continues to use a grade-span cohort, in the following groups: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Florida's complete response deferred until 2007 upon completion of the scoring, reporting and standard-setting process for the 2006 administration of CELLA. In addition, Florida is awaiting clarification from USDE regarding the requirement to conduct a concordance study between the scores of the previous assessment instruments and CELLA.

Florida's Response to 1.6.8 and 1.6.9:

As previously reported and as approved by the USDE, Office of English Language Acquisition, Florida will report in 2007, the new baseline data for all ELLs upon completion of the scoring, reporting and the standard setting of 2006 CELLA. ELLs in Florida are making progress towards mastery not only in English, but in mastery of academic standards. In 2005, 68 percent of ELLs in the lowest 25th percent made learning gains in reading (the highest learning gains in reading of the lowest 25th percentile) and in 2006, 70 percent of ELLs in the lowest 25th percent made learning gains in reading. Again, the highest learning gains of any of the subgroups.

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

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

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

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

Definitions:

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

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

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information	
	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	48
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No Response</u>

Comments: Florida's complete response deferred until 2007 upon completion of the scoring, reporting and standard-setting process for the 2006 administration of CELLA. In addition, Florida is awaiting clarification from USDE regarding the requirement to conduct a concordance study between the scores of the previous assessment instruments and CELLA.

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

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

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
H.S.		

Comments: As previously reported Florida has been under a federal court order which requires that all English language learners be provided with instruction that is equal in amount, sequence as scope as that provided to non-ELLs. In accordance with the court order and Florida statutes, all students classified as ELL are enrolled in the English for Speakers of Other Languages program, which is funded under the Florida Education Finance Program. Title III funds awarded in the form of subgrants to LEAs provide for supplementary services (direct and indirect) which focus on increasing the language proficiency of all ELLs and increasing the academic achievement of all ELLs. It is important to note that Florida includes all ELLs in statewide assessments and reports the results of current and former ELLs. Attached please find a data report extracted from the 2006 AYP state reporting system on the academic achievement of current and former ELLs.

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
H.S.		

Comments: As previously reported Florida has been under a federal court order which requires that all English language learners be provided with instruction that is equal in amount, sequence as scope as that provided to non-ELLs. In accordance with the court order and Florida statutes, all students classified as ELL are enrolled in the English for Speakers of Other Languages program, which is funded under the Florida Education Finance Program. Title III funds awarded in the form of subgrants to LEAs provide for supplementary services (direct and indirect) which focus on increasing the language proficiency of all ELLs and increasing the academic achievement of all ELLs. It is important to note that Florida includes all ELLs in statewide assessments and reports the results of current and former ELLs. Attached please find a data report extracted from the 2006 AYP state reporting system on the academic achievement of current and former ELLs. [See Section 1.6.11]

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	69.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	68.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	81.20
Black, non-Hispanic	52.90
Hispanic	62.10
White, non-Hispanic	78.30
Students with Disabilities	36.80
Limited English Proficient	47.20
Economically Disadvantaged	54.30
Migrant	43.90
Male	64.70
Female	72.90
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.	

1.8.2 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	3.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.50
Black, non-Hispanic	3.90
Hispanic	3.60
White, non-Hispanic	2.40
Students with Disabilities	4.60
Limited English Proficient	5.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3.50
Migrant	6.90
Male	3.30
Female	2.70

Comments: These data have been cross verified as accurate.
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

Florida defines a school year as a 180-day period beginning with the first day of the LEA's calendar year.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	36	36
LEAs with Subgrants	31	31

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

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

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	230	2955
1	277	2836
2	227	2643
3	209	2633
4	189	2319
5	177	2220
6	117	1999
7	113	2132
8	94	2034
9	95	1956
10	51	1401
11	45	1058
12	43	881

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth		
Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.		
Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- <u>excluding preschoolers</u> LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- <u>excluding preschoolers</u> LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	498	6624
Doubled-up	1007	15547
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	104	1025
Hotels/Motels	253	2514
Unknown	<n	1357
Comments:		
* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.		

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

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	2955
1	2836
2	2643
3	2633
4	2319
5	2220
6	1999
7	2132
8	2034
9	1956
10	1401
11	1058
12	881

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

564

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

2725

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)

1043

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)	5072
English Language Learners (ELL)	2533
Gifted and Talented	300
Vocational Education	4771

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

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

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	23
Expedited evaluations	17
Staff professional development and awareness	25
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	24
Transportation	22
Early childhood programs	16
Assistance with participation in school programs	23
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	20
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	23
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	24
Coordination between schools and agencies	24
Counseling	22
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	21
Clothing to meet a school requirement	22
School supplies	23
Referral to other programs and services	24
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	25
Other (optional)	

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School selection	7
Transportation	10
School records	5
Immunizations or other medical records	7
Other enrollment issues	7

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

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

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier

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	2100	1276
Grade 4	Yes	1812	852
Grade 5	Yes	1720	853
Grade 6	Yes	1485	656
Grade 7	Yes	1548	661
Grade 8	Yes	1439	380
Grade 9	Yes	1251	281
Grade 10	Yes	854	142
Grade 11	Yes	334	23
Grade 12	Yes	163	7

Comments: The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) is the assessment used. In 11th and 12th grade students taking the FCAT are those that have not passed the 10th grade FCAT as required for graduation.

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	2063	1136
Grade 4	Yes	1793	808
Grade 5	Yes	1691	633
Grade 6	Yes	1473	435
Grade 7	Yes	1551	520
Grade 8	Yes	1399	525
Grade 9	Yes	1249	496
Grade 10	Yes	809	358
Grade 11	Yes	190	56
Grade 12	Yes	76	14

Comments: The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) is the assessment used. In 11th and 12th grade students taking the FCAT are those that have not passed the 10th grade FCAT as required for graduation.

* 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.