

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

Hawaii has adopted challenging standards, called the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards III, in science that meet the requirements of section 1111 (b) (1). The Hawaii Board of Education first adopted content standards in science in 1996. Since then the standards were revised in 2000 and again in 2005 as part of a standards based comprehensive reform effort. The Science Standards address all areas of science and correlate to the National Standards for Science and the American Academy for the Advancement of Science Project 2061. The Hawaii Content and Performance Standards in Science set forth minimum learning standards for all students at every grade level, kindergarten through eight, and for high school science courses. The Standards set reasonable targets and expectations for what teachers need to teach and what all students need to learn given aligned instruction, sufficient time, and intervention when necessary. The Standards are intended to set minimum expectations and be incorporated into a broader, locally designed curriculum.

Student performance on the Hawaii Content Standards in Science will be assessed through a statewide criterion referenced assessment directly linked to the Standards. Students will be assessed in grades 5, 7 and 11. The assessments are cumulative and evaluate the prior year's benchmarks inclusively.

Hawaii Content Performance Standards are available at <http://standardstoolkit.k12.hi.us/index.html>

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

The recently developed HCPSIII standards were used to initiate the development of a new series of standards-based tests in Math and Reading. Development of science tests in grades 5, 7 and 11, that will measure student attainment of our statewide content and performance standards was started. Detailed descriptions of these developmental steps will be contained in a series of technical reports which are scheduled for completion in Spring 2007.

The steps outlined below are identical to those used in the current versions of our statewide tests.

The first step requires access to the content and performance standards. The Department works with its contractors (Harcourt Educational Measurement initially and then American Institutes for Research) to begin all of the steps necessary to create valid and reliable tests for English Language Arts, Mathematics and Science.

The state and the contractors work on the development of appropriate blueprints and item specifications for each grade level and content area. Following approval of these blueprints full scale item development begins. Reviews of the item pools by qualified teachers versed in our standards takes place prior to creation of field tests incorporating these items. Only items that have been deemed appropriate by the panel are field tested. These field tests are administered during the spring.. All data from the field tests are scheduled for review by state, district and teacher panels. These panels are comprised of representatives of each of the major subcategory groups, e.g. ethnicity, gender, etc.

After field testing is complete the data are reviewed to create item pools for creation of the final forms of the new tests. Again, representative groups of teachers and district and state staff are selected. After creation of the final forms a comprehensive alignment study will be performed on each live form of the tests to ensure that the tests are appropriately aligned with our standards. After the tests have been assembled and aligned a final review is scheduled to scrutinize the final forms for gender and ethnic and other potential bias. Assuming successful completion of these steps the tests are administered statewide and proficiency levels created after the first live administration of the tests.

A parallel development track was used for development of our Alternate Assessment.

In September 2004, Hawaii received an IDEA General Supervision Enhancement Grant from the USDOE to develop and enhance the Hawaii State Alternate Assessment (HSAA) based on alternate achievement standards. HIDEOE was awarded the grant in partnership with Dr. Stephen Elliott, Vanderbilt University; Dr. H. Gary Cook, University of Wisconsin; and Harcourt Assessment, Inc. This new assessment, which is now being used in the state, allows students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to demonstrate their progress toward a set of grade-level content standards.

In March 2005, the Alternate Assessment Workgroup used drafts of the HCPS III to understand the grade-level content standards and benchmarks that apply to all students. The workgroup reviewed the content standards and grade-level benchmarks in reading and mathematics for grades 3-8 and 10. The writing content standards and grade-level benchmarks were also reviewed for grades 3, 5, 8, and 10. The workgroup determined the "essence" of the grade-level benchmarks and how this applies to students with significant cognitive disabilities. The essence describes the essential or critical function of the benchmark for that content area.

A representative group of Hawaii Special Education (SPED) teachers and resource teachers; curriculum resource consultants, specialists, and teachers; parents; and administrators developed a list of Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs) for each grade-level benchmark. These alternate indicators identify a performance at a less complex, introductory level (or entry level) in relation to the grade-level benchmarks. Alternate assessment items were developed based on the APIs that link to the grade-level benchmarks to create an enhanced HSAA. An online review of these indicators and items was conducted in July 2005. In addition, sample classroom tasks were developed to indicate how a student might demonstrate performance on these APIs. Science APIs were developed using the same process in June-August 2006.

The HSAA measures a student's progress toward the same Hawaii reading and mathematics content standards for grades 3-8 and 10. Writing content standards for grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 will be assessed starting in the fall 2006 for students in grades 4, 6, 9 and 11. Science content standards for grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 (Earth and Space), 9 (Scientific Process), Biology, and Physical Science will be assessed in fall 2007 for grades 5, 7, and 11. These standards define what all students should know and be able to do; however, students' levels of performance along the path toward attainment of these standards will vary. The purpose of the HSAA is to provide valid and reliable data regarding all students' attainment of the knowledge and skills in the grade level benchmarks. The essence of each benchmark has been defined to include performances and behaviors at appropriate levels for students with significant cognitive disabilities. These APIs represent a continuum so that every student can be accurately assessed. They also serve as a tool for SPED teachers who are in the process of aligning a student's IEP goals and objectives with the Hawaii content standards for the HSAA.

The HSAA in reading, writing, and mathematics was piloted in the fall of 2005. The purpose of the pilot test was to gather feedback on the item clarity, directions for administration, scoring, and the assessment's general use. SPED teachers were asked to complete a survey/questionnaire to provide feedback on the assessment. A focus group of SPED teachers who participated in the HSAA pilot was convened in November 2005 to provide additional input, which resulted in reducing the number of items assessed without compromising the content coverage and technical soundness of the instrument. The HSAA was administered to all qualifying students for the first time in the spring of 2006. The pilot test for science was done in the fall of 2006, and the science assessment will be administered for the first time in the fall of 2007.

The new HSAA features a rating scale approach. Literature on the validity of teacher judgments of students' academic performance by Hoge and Coladarci (1989) and other researchers (e.g., Demaray & Elliott, 1998; Hurwitz, Elliott, & Braden, in press) has reported consistently that teachers can be highly accurate in judging a student's academic performance when provided a structure for documenting and reporting their observations. To provide additional support to such observations, the HSAA requires that evidence being gathered from IEP goals and objectives that are aligned to the extended APIs and HSAA items be collected and rated by two or more raters.

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

Academic achievement standards for Math and English were created for our previous versions of our statewide tests. However, for the newly created versions of our statewide tests for grades 3-8 and 10 scheduled for administration in spring 2007, standard setting is scheduled for the first quarter of 2007.

Our academic standards will be derived using item mapping methodology. Data from our field tests will be used to generate the ordered item difficulty booklets using p and theta values for each item in each content area by grade. A panel of teachers, community members and LEA staff knowledgeable about our content standards will be convened. They will be selected to be representative of each grade level, major demographic group and geographic administrative area.

This panel will be first asked to come to consensus about their vision of what the marginally proficient student might be and able to do at each grade level within each content area. In the next panel members will then asked to scrutinize the booklets to position markers at the dividing line between proficient and non-proficient students. A similar procedure was then employed for positioning markers between "Well Below" and "Approaching" students and between students "Meeting" proficiency and those "Exceeding" proficiency.

On May 10th and 11th of 2006, a standard setting workshop was conducted with 45 educators, educational administrators and parents from the state of Hawaii. The primary purpose of this workshop was to establish Alternate Achievement Standards (AAS) for the Hawaii State Alternate Assessment (HSAA). The HSAA tests students with significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10. The workshop was conducted by Dr. Stephen Elliott of Vanderbilt University, Dr. H. Gary Cook of the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Selvin Chin-Chance, Ms. Leola Sueoka, and Mr. Jerald Plett of the Hawaii State Department of Education, Ms. Liz Arakaki of Harcourt Assessment, Inc.

A modified bookmark procedure was used to set alternate assessment performance standards. A general description of the steps involved in this procedure is presented below:

• Introduction to standard setting

• Review all items on the rating scale

• Review and discuss the current proficiency/performance descriptors for each proficiency level

• Reach consensus on the definition of proficient as measured by the HSAA

• Round 1: Individuals independently place marks in test booklets to indicate proficiency cut score

• Post-Round 1: Individuals at each table discuss their placements of marks for the proficiency cut score

• Round 2: Table teams make a consensus decision about marks for the proficient level of performance

• Post-Round 2: Feedback is provided about the mean cut scores and the likely distribution of students at each level, then the group can discuss rationale for their ratings

• Round 3: Teams make final decisions about marks for each of four levels of proficiency

• Post-Round 3: Feedback is provided about the committee's mean cut scores and likely impact on student distributions as well as pre-assigned proficiency ratings given by educators who administered the HSAA.

• Review and revise, if necessary, the descriptions associated with each of the four levels of proficiency

The three-round procedure of bookmarking was followed for each of the content areas assessed by the HSAA at each grade level (i.e., 3rd - 8th and 10th grades for reading and mathematics). This modified Bookmark Procedure for each of the alternate assessment content areas resulted in cut scores and a refined definition of a proficient performance on the HSAA in each content area. The detailed result about what constitutes a "proficient performance" on the HSAA contributes information that can be integrated with other students' results on the Hawaii State Assessment (HSA). Together the results from the HSAA and the HSA provide a summary of all students in Hawaii Public Schools who are achieving at a proficient level for purposes of the federally required Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculation and report.

By design, HSAA Reading forms at the Elementary and Secondary levels have 40 items and the HSAA Mathematics forms have 75 items. With a possible 3 points for each item, the maximum total number correct for HSAA Reading is 120, and for Mathematics it is 225. HSAA has two forms: Elementary and Secondary. However, standards were set for each subject and form at the grade level

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	94784	99.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	510	99.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	74752	98.00
Black, non-Hispanic	2246	99.00
Hispanic	2755	98.00
White, non-Hispanic	14521	99.00
Students with Disabilities	10714	96.00
Limited English Proficient	6668	93.00
Economically Disadvantaged	41283	99.00
Migrant	478	100.00
Male	48780	98.00
Female	46004	99.00

Comments:

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

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	94845	99.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	511	100.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	74801	99.00
Black, non-Hispanic	2246	99.00
Hispanic	2754	98.00
White, non-Hispanic	14533	99.00
Students with Disabilities	10730	96.00
Limited English Proficient	6668	96.00
Economically Disadvantaged	41309	99.00
Migrant	478	100.00
Male	48808	98.00
Female	46037	99.00

Comments:

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

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

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

1.2.2

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	10348	92.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	366	3.00

Comments:

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	10364	92.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	366	3.00

Comments:

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	13640	30.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	83	27.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10519	29.00
Black, non-Hispanic	369	17.00
Hispanic	483	19.00
White, non-Hispanic	2186	41.00
Students with Disabilities	1285	9.00
Limited English Proficient	1322	10.00
Economically Disadvantaged	6279	21.00
Migrant	73	10.00
Male	7026	29.00
Female	6614	31.00

Comments: x

- 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	13651	50.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	84	46.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10529	48.00
Black, non-Hispanic	368	46.00
Hispanic	483	46.00
White, non-Hispanic	2187	66.00
Students with Disabilities	1289	13.00
Limited English Proficient	1326	19.00
Economically Disadvantaged	6281	38.00
Migrant	73	27.00
Male	7034	45.00
Female	6617	57.00

Comments: x

- 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	13922	33.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	28.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10825	32.00
Black, non-Hispanic	324	24.00
Hispanic	431	25.00
White, non-Hispanic	2266	40.00
Students with Disabilities	1382	8.00
Limited English Proficient	1168	10.00
Economically Disadvantaged	6318	21.00
Migrant	64	14.00
Male	7117	31.00
Female	6805	34.00

Comments: x

- 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	13934	58.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	76	55.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10831	56.00
Black, non-Hispanic	324	58.00
Hispanic	432	52.00
White, non-Hispanic	2271	70.00
Students with Disabilities	1386	14.00
Limited English Proficient	1166	22.00
Economically Disadvantaged	6324	46.00
Migrant	63	30.00
Male	7125	51.00
Female	6809	66.00

Comments: x

- 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	13954	24.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	74	12.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10907	24.00
Black, non-Hispanic	338	12.00
Hispanic	374	19.00
White, non-Hispanic	2261	30.00
Students with Disabilities	1482	4.00
Limited English Proficient	892	4.00
Economically Disadvantaged	6239	15.00
Migrant	68	9.00
Male	7074	23.00
Female	6880	25.00

Comments: x

- 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	13957	44.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	74	34.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10908	41.00
Black, non-Hispanic	338	42.00
Hispanic	374	40.00
White, non-Hispanic	2263	55.00
Students with Disabilities	1484	8.00
Limited English Proficient	892	7.00
Economically Disadvantaged	6239	31.00
Migrant	68	19.00
Male	7075	38.00
Female	6882	50.00

Comments: x

- 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	13856	28.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	79	22.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10970	27.00
Black, non-Hispanic	334	17.00
Hispanic	412	20.00
White, non-Hispanic	2061	35.00
Students with Disabilities	1584	4.00
Limited English Proficient	824	5.00
Economically Disadvantaged	6188	17.00
Migrant	70	10.00
Male	7149	27.00
Female	6707	29.00

Comments: x

- 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	13864	48.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	79	58.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10978	45.00
Black, non-Hispanic	335	44.00
Hispanic	411	48.00
White, non-Hispanic	2061	63.00
Students with Disabilities	1586	8.00
Limited English Proficient	824	8.00
Economically Disadvantaged	6193	34.00
Migrant	71	37.00
Male	7455	42.00
Female	6709	54.00

Comments: x

- 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	13364	29.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	71	13.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10711	28.00
Black, non-Hispanic	309	23.00
Hispanic	369	22.00
White, non-Hispanic	1904	36.00
Students with Disabilities	1620	4.00
Limited English Proficient	847	6.00
Economically Disadvantaged	6066	19.00
Migrant	73	11.00
Male	6973	27.00
Female	6391	31.00

Comments: x

- 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	13365	47.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	71	46.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10711	45.00
Black, non-Hispanic	308	55.00
Hispanic	369	45.00
White, non-Hispanic	1906	59.00
Students with Disabilities	1621	8.00
Limited English Proficient	845	9.00
Economically Disadvantaged	6064	35.00
Migrant	73	27.00
Male	6972	39.00
Female	6393	57.00

Comments: x

- 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	13407	25.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	70	16.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10728	25.00
Black, non-Hispanic	317	18.00
Hispanic	383	14.00
White, non-Hispanic	1909	31.00
Students with Disabilities	1719	4.00
Limited English Proficient	840	8.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5858	16.00
Migrant	70	14.00
Male	6991	24.00
Female	6416	27.00

Comments: x

- 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	13412	39.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	70	37.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10735	37.00
Black, non-Hispanic	318	36.00
Hispanic	383	32.00
White, non-Hispanic	1906	52.00
Students with Disabilities	1717	7.00
Limited English Proficient	843	7.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5861	27.00
Migrant	71	24.00
Male	6989	31.00
Female	6423	47.00

Comments: x

- 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	12641	19.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	57	11.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10092	18.00
Black, non-Hispanic	255	16.00
Hispanic	303	10.00
White, non-Hispanic	1934	23.00
Students with Disabilities	1642	1.00
Limited English Proficient	775	8.00
Economically Disadvantaged	4335	10.00
Migrant	60	10.00
Male	6450	16.00
Female	6191	21.00

Comments: x

- 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	13712	40.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	60	40.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	10985	38.00
Black, non-Hispanic	275	43.00
Hispanic	338	34.00
White, non-Hispanic	2054	50.00
Students with Disabilities	1877	5.00
Limited English Proficient	904	8.00
Economically Disadvantaged	4815	26.00
Migrant	65	22.00
Male	7084	33.00
Female	6628	47.00

Comments: x

- 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	282	100	35.00

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1	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	201	52	26.00

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	1	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.

The Hawaii Department of Education has developed a Framework for School Improvement which outlines the NCLB requirements, sanctions, support services, reports, assessments, etc. that are required for the different levels of accountability. For example, restructuring schools may select (1) Conversion to a Charter school or (2) State Takeover. Under the state takeover, the Complex Area Superintendents (CAS) determine one of two options based on a comprehensive assessment of the school: (1) comprehensive restructuring with the CAS as the Restructuring Provider or an external professional services provider or (2) An array of services coordinated by the CAS as the Restructuring Provider. Significant funding and technical assistance is provided to support the schools' improvement efforts, and quarterly assessments and reports are required of the schools and providers. In addition, the Framework outlines the requirements and procedures to provide Supplemental Educational Services and Public School Choice, Parent Notifications, etc.

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.

Not applicable.

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.	47
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.	59
How many of these schools were charter schools?	1
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	358
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.	75180
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments:	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	100
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	4353
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.	40955
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.	0
Comments: #4 Zero count represents information currently not available.	

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	21946	17785	81.00
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	1206	1130	94.00
Low-Poverty Schools	1240	1205	97.00
All Elementary Schools	4655	4530	97.00
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	3310	2428	73.00
Low-Poverty Schools	5176	4053	78.00
All Secondary Schools	17291	13255	77.00

Comments: Method for all schools in state count changed from 2004-05. Elementary classes are now unweighed.

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	80.00
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	12.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	8.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	49.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	31.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	20.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

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	63.50	29.50
Poverty Metric Used	Free and reduced lunch count	
Secondary Schools	49.00	27.00
Poverty Metric Used	Free and reduced lunch count	

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	93.00

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

The Hawaii Department of Education commenced development of its Hawaii English Language Proficiency Standards (HELPS) by convening multilevel groups of ESLL classroom teachers, district level resource teachers, district level educational specialists, and state level personnel to design the English language proficiency standards for our English language learners. By using the English Language Arts (ELA) Standards of the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards (HCPS) II as its foundation, the HELPS had a direct correlation to its four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, maintaining the alignment necessary to insure that our ELLs meet the same challenging academic content and student academic achievement standards as regular education students.

In August 2003 a preliminary set of Hawaii English Language Proficiency Standards (HELPS) for grade K through 12 resulted. However, with state board approval of the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards (HCPS) III, in June 2005 the existing HELPS, based on the HCPS II had to be redesigned to accommodate the updated HCPS III.

In February 2006 the final edit of the Hawaii English Language Proficiency Standards (HELPS) was submitted to the Director of the Instructional Services Branch, Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support and is pending approval. Once approved, the HELPS will be submitted to the Assistant Superintendent and then to the State Board of Education for approval. Subsequent actions will include presentations to complex area superintendents, principals, and district level support personnel, who will, in turn, train school level teachers for implementation in their classrooms.

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

By using the English language arts and mathematics standards of the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards III (HCPS III) as its foundation, there is a direct correlation at the standard, topic, and benchmark levels. Proficient level descriptors of the Hawaii English Language Proficiency Standards (HELPS) duplicate the proficient level of the HCPS III. The major difference between the two documents is in the levels of proficiency. The HCPS III has four proficiency levels: Novice, Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced.

RUBRIC

Advanced Proficient Partially Proficient Novice

Identify similarities and differences of sounds in similar and unlike words, with fluency and accuracy
 Identify similarities and differences of sounds in similar and unlike words, with minimal difficulty and no significant errors
 Identify similarities and differences of sounds in similar and unlike words, with difficulty and a few significant and/or many minor errors
 Identify similarities and differences of sounds in similar and unlike words, with great difficulty and many significant errors

The HELPS has five levels: Entering, Beginning, Developing, Approaching, and Proficient.

HELPS PERFORMANCE DEFINITIONS BY LEVELS

Proficient Approaching Developing Beginning Entering

Identify similarities and differences of sounds in similar and unlike words, with fluency and accuracy
 Identify similarities and differences of sounds in similar and unlike words, with few minor errors
 Identify similarities and differences of sounds words, with errors. Match words that have similar/different sounds. Using oral cues, point to objects with similar/different sounds.

The connection between the two sets of standards is in the performance description of the benchmark at the proficient level. In addition, in the case of the HCPS III, there is a rubric that describes behaviors characteristic of each level. With the HELPS, this same element is defined as Performance Definitions, a formative assessment perspective, rather than the more summative description used in the HCPS III.

Like the HELPS, the mathematics and science standards for our English language learners will have to undergo a process to upgrade them from an HCPS II perspective to the HCPS III perspective.

In its assessment arena, upon approval by the state Board of Education, CTB McGraw-Hill will conduct an alignment study between the Hawaii English Language Proficiency Standards (HELPS) and the existing LAS Links, their "off-the-shelf" English language proficiency test. Such an alignment study will not only include a broad review across the standards, but will especially note the depth and complexity of knowledge required at each of the benchmark levels. By insuring that there is alignment across and within the taxonomic levels (Marzano, 2001) rigorous instruction through a balanced curriculum can be more easily assessed.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

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

- An independent alignment study Yes
- Other evidence of alignment 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

1. The State insures the annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades K-12 by:

Comparing student data counts from its English language learners database (EDB) with the Department's Test Development Section database and insuring a one-to one correspondence

Requiring the administration oversight of the district resource teachers and district educational specialists in each of their respective schools to monitor the administration of ELL in their schools

Requiring school test coordinators to carefully monitor the Hawaii State Assessment (HSA) accommodations offered to our English language learners

2. For the spring 2006 data point collection, the State will administer the LAS Links to all students in the ESLL program. The LAS Links was specifically developed to measure English language proficiency standards across the four modalities (reading, writing, speaking, listening) using a composite score for comprehension.

3. After a lengthy process that involved a series of meetings with district educational specialists and resource teachers, the LAS Links assessment was selected to measure the English language proficiency levels in our ELLs. This instrument was selected because of the strong relationship found with the State's HELPS (draft) standards and benchmark levels.

4. An approximation method was used to obtain reliability estimates based on the assumptions of classical true-score theory and the numbers of items in three tests comprising each composite. Using the Spearman-Brown formula, an average item reliability was estimated for each test in the composite. These average item reliabilities were then used to produce two composite reliability estimates. In producing each composite reliability estimate, true scores from different tests were assumed to have a correlation of 0.8, rather than 1.0, which is the traditional assumption within tests. The 0.8 value was arrived at by a review of a large number of achievement tests. Use of the 0.8 value rather than a uniform 1.0 value lowers the reliability estimates in a manner consistent with the fact that the tests measure different but correlated skills. Lastly, the two composite reliability estimates were averaged to yield final composite reliability estimate.

Primary inferences from the LAS Links results include measurement of the proficiency of individual students relative to an international sample and relative program effectiveness based on the results of groups of students. Content and construct validity procedures were conducted to ensure test efficacy.

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. Ilokano	4466	25.10
2. Tagalog	1656	9.30
3. Samoan	1468	8.30
4. Marshallese	1461	8.20
5. Chuukese	1358	7.60
6. Spanish	1160	6.50
7. Japanese	1005	5.70
8. Cantonese	819	4.60
9. Korean	640	4.60
10. Vietnamese	596	3.40
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 immigrants subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

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

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
3608	3608	8

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

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

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

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 81.00	# 10313	% 56.00	# 6125	% 7.00	# 597	% 13.00	# 2197

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.

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	81.00	6125	56.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		4721	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	7.00	2197	13.00
TOTAL		13043	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	8
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	8
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments:

* 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	224	58.30
4	121	64.70
5	79	31.20
6	69	42.90
7	34	36.60
8	41	31.30
H.S.	33	38.80

Comments:

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	114	29.80
4	67	35.80
5	46	18.20
6	62	38.50
7	24	25.80
8	38	29.00
H.S.	17	20.00

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

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

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

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

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	79.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	78.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	80.00
Black, non-Hispanic	74.30
Hispanic	72.40
White, non-Hispanic	78.40
Students with Disabilities	71.60
Limited English Proficient	71.50
Economically Disadvantaged	74.10
Migrant	79.20
Male	77.00
Female	82.40

Comments: 5% difference in data for American Indian or Alaska Native and Black, non-Hispanic, have been checked and verified. The denominators of these groups are small, American Indian or Alaska Native less than 50 and Black, non-Hispanic less than 150.

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	4.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.40
Black, non-Hispanic	5.70
Hispanic	5.90
White, non-Hispanic	5.60
Students with Disabilities	4.40
Limited English Proficient	8.20
Economically Disadvantaged	5.00
Migrant	3.10
Male	5.20
Female	4.10

Comments: 3% difference in data has been checked and verified.
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

Hawaii's school year requirement is 180 days. Schools may choose to use a modified year-round calendar.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	0	0
LEAs with Subgrants	1	1

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	0	98
1	0	78
2	0	77
3	0	105
4	0	90
5	0	56
6	0	86
7	0	65
8	0	85
9	0	66
10	0	45
11	0	36
12	0	21

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth		
Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.		
Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	0	532
Doubled-up	0	19
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	0	156
Hotels/Motels	0	0
Unknown	0	201
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	101
1	60
2	64
3	63
4	58
5	55
6	58
7	51
8	51
9	54
10	46
11	26
12	24

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

61

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

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

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

<n

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

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

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

42

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)	33
English Language Learners (ELL)	53
Gifted and Talented	0
Vocational Education	0

Comments: The Gifted and Talented as well as Vocational Education zero count represents that this data is not being collected at this time.

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	1
Expedited evaluations	1
Staff professional development and awareness	1
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	1
Transportation	1
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	1
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	1
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	1
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	1
Coordination between schools and agencies	1
Counseling	1
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	1
Clothing to meet a school requirement	1
School supplies	1
Referral to other programs and services	1
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	1
Other (optional)	0

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

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

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
N/A	0
N/A	0
N/A	0

Comments: No additional barriers have been reported.

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	52	18
Grade 4	Yes	46	<n
Grade 5	Yes	47	14
Grade 6	Yes	32	12
Grade 7	Yes	38	<n
Grade 8	Yes	50	<n
Grade 9	No	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	15	<n
Grade 11	No	0	0
Grade 12	No	0	0

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	52	<n
Grade 4	Yes	46	<n
Grade 5	Yes	47	<n
Grade 6	Yes	32	<n
Grade 7	Yes	38	<n
Grade 8	Yes	50	<n
Grade 9	No	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	15	<n
Grade 11	No	0	0
Grade 12	No	0	0

Comments:

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