

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

Challenging academic content standards in science, along with all other content standards for all subjects, were first adopted into Idaho Administrative rule in March 2003. Following an alignment, validity, and reliability study conducted by HumRRO, Idaho revised content standards in all subjects tested in the state assessment system. Idaho contracted with Dr. Norman Webb to evaluate what approach should be taken, and with the assistance of the content specialists in the Idaho Department of Education and numerous teachers from around the state, the standards were reformatted and modified. Following numerous presentations to educators and public hearings, the revised standards were approved and adopted into administrative rule by the Idaho State Board of Education in February 2006 and were in place for the school year 2005-2006.

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

Idaho has developed and implemented on-grade level assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. This process has included curriculum specialists from the Idaho Department of Education and qualified teachers from around the state in each of the content areas. Idaho's assessments for math and reading/language arts were expanded through grades 3-8 and 10 by Spring 2005. The science test has been piloted for two years in grades 5, 7, and 10 and will become a full part of the ISAT in Spring 2007.

Idaho was notified by the US Education Department on November 16, 2006 that its assessment system has achieved full approval with recommendations.

Idaho Alternate Assessment

Idaho developed alternate knowledge and skills that are downward extensions of the state approved content standards. These alternate knowledge and skills for students with significant cognitive disabilities were developed for reading/language arts and math in order to ensure these academic content standards apply to all public school students in the state. By aligning IEPs to the content standards, students are provided with an equal educational opportunity. A complete description of the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IAA) and instructions for carrying out the assessment at the following web location:

<http://www.sde.state.id.us/SpecialEd/AltAssessment/iaamanual.pdf>

Following peer review in September 2005, the IAA was found to be ready to be approved by the US Education Department except for the fact that it had not been formally adopted by the Idaho State Board of Education. That formal adoption was completed at the February and April (2006) Board meetings, and Idaho has been notified that the IAA has been approved.

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

Following the revisions and reformatting of Idaho academic content standards for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science, new test blueprints were developed based on the revised content standards.

Performance level descriptors by subject and by grade were developed. After the spring 2006 test administration, cut scores for advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic levels for reading and math at grades 3-8 and 10 were set by applying a modified bookmark method. Following a technical review by our Technical Advisory Committee, both the PLDs and achievement standards were adopted by the Idaho State Board of Education in August 2006. Idaho participated in a second peer review in September 2006. Idaho will contract for another alignment study immediately following the Spring 2007 administration of the ISAT.

Following the same procedure standard setting for science will take place during the 2007-2008 school year.

Idaho was notified by the US Education Department on November 16, 2006 that its assessment system has achieved full approval with recommendations.

Idaho Alternate Assessment

The IAA includes proficiency level descriptions for below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced and achievement standards for grades 3-10.

The IAA academic achievement standard setting process in Idaho established cut scores based on what students with significant cognitive disabilities in each achievement level should know and be able to perform. The State first defined what it is the proficient student with significant cognitive disabilities should be expected to perform. The consensus definition of proficient became the basis for making decisions regarding appropriate cut scores on the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IAA) that corresponded to the specified levels of achievement. A modified Bookmark Procedure for Alternate Assessments was used to establish the cut scores. The three-round procedure of bookmarking was followed for each of the content areas and the key materials used to conduct the Standard Setting were a series of tables with the IAA items from each content area rank ordered by difficulty from easiest to hardest, and tables and graphs portraying the total score distribution of students who were administered the IAA.

The outcome of the standard setting was cut scores associated with proficiency levels in each content area and narrative descriptors of what students who achieved the various levels typically know and are able to perform. There is a clear connection between the proficiency level descriptors and the cut scores they are associated with for each content area.

Idaho developed Achievement Content Standards in Science and health with alternate knowledge and skills in 2000 and proposed revisions in 2004 from which test items were selected for the field test in spring 2005. This document will guide the development of the academic achievement descriptors for science.

A Science alternate assessment was field-tested spring 2005 with initial standard setting procedures completed in the fall 2005. After a review of the of the field test data during the initial standard setting procedure, adjustments may be made and another full field test will be conducted in Spring 2006. Final alternate academic achievement standards will be set by Spring 2008.

Idaho has begun work to update the IAA and also to develop an assessment built on modified content standards to test on grade level the additionally allowed 2% of students with disabilities that do not qualify for the 1%.

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	138332	99.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	2314	99.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	2076	99.10
Black, non-Hispanic	1356	99.20
Hispanic	18151	99.10
White, non-Hispanic	113695	99.40
Students with Disabilities	14050	98.50
Limited English Proficient	10686	99.20
Economically Disadvantaged	57639	99.30
Migrant	2440	99.00
Male	71177	99.40
Female	67155	99.40

Comments:

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

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	138015	99.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	2310	98.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	2055	98.10
Black, non-Hispanic	1344	98.30
Hispanic	17917	97.80
White, non-Hispanic	113649	99.40
Students with Disabilities	14038	98.40
Limited English Proficient	10365	96.20
Economically Disadvantaged	57397	98.90
Migrant	2368	96.00
Male	70982	99.10
Female	67033	99.20

Comments:

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

1.2.2 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	13049	98.80
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1001	94.30

Comments: Idaho does not yet have an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

Student coding errors identified and corrected.

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	13024	98.70
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1014	95.50

Comments: Idaho does not yet have an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

Student coding errors identified and corrected.

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	19577	91.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	348	82.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	306	94.10
Black, non-Hispanic	207	79.20
Hispanic	2766	81.40
White, non-Hispanic	15819	93.40
Students with Disabilities	2104	73.70
Limited English Proficient	1847	77.40
Economically Disadvantaged	9066	87.30
Migrant	390	76.20
Male	10060	92.30
Female	9517	90.40

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	19527	82.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	347	69.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	304	87.20
Black, non-Hispanic	207	74.40
Hispanic	2719	66.90
White, non-Hispanic	15819	85.00
Students with Disabilities	2099	50.60
Limited English Proficient	1795	63.20
Economically Disadvantaged	9021	74.90
Migrant	383	62.10
Male	10034	79.80

Female	9493	84.50
--------	------	-------

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	19954	89.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	331	82.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	312	88.80
Black, non-Hispanic	226	74.30
Hispanic	2784	77.00
White, non-Hispanic	16168	92.00
Students with Disabilities	2200	66.20
Limited English Proficient	1776	73.50
Economically Disadvantaged	8962	84.30
Migrant	379	76.80
Male	10230	90.00
Female	9724	89.00

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	19882	84.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	331	71.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	307	89.90
Black, non-Hispanic	221	76.50
Hispanic	2742	69.70
White, non-Hispanic	16149	87.70
Students with Disabilities	2195	51.80
Limited English Proficient	1715	64.70
Economically Disadvantaged	8924	77.90
Migrant	366	61.20
Male	10189	83.60

Female

9693

86.20

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	19525	87.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	362	78.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	307	93.20
Black, non-Hispanic	211	77.70
Hispanic	2675	74.10
White, non-Hispanic	15849	90.50
Students with Disabilities	2049	58.70
Limited English Proficient	1655	68.30
Economically Disadvantaged	8645	82.50
Migrant	358	69.80
Male	9960	88.30
Female	9565	87.40

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	19475	82.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	361	69.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	302	85.40
Black, non-Hispanic	208	74.50
Hispanic	2647	65.40
White, non-Hispanic	15835	85.90
Students with Disabilities	2043	43.40
Limited English Proficient	1609	58.20
Economically Disadvantaged	8607	74.60
Migrant	346	54.10
Male	9927	80.40

Female	9548	84.90
--------	------	-------

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	19673	85.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	362	70.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	297	89.90
Black, non-Hispanic	199	72.40
Hispanic	2612	71.30
White, non-Hispanic	16090	88.40
Students with Disabilities	2101	53.00
Limited English Proficient	1565	64.50
Economically Disadvantaged	8424	78.50
Migrant	361	62.30
Male	10211	85.50
Female	9462	85.80

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	19639	82.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	360	63.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	296	87.20
Black, non-Hispanic	199	69.40
Hispanic	2577	62.40
White, non-Hispanic	16094	85.70
Students with Disabilities	2101	42.90
Limited English Proficient	1525	53.70
Economically Disadvantaged	8407	72.90
Migrant	350	46.90
Male	10193	80.60

Female	9446	83.60
--------	------	-------

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	20010	75.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	357	60.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	290	86.60
Black, non-Hispanic	167	68.90
Hispanic	2665	55.30
White, non-Hispanic	16432	79.40
Students with Disabilities	1949	34.90
Limited English Proficient	1445	46.00
Economically Disadvantaged	8336	65.60
Migrant	353	47.00
Male	10358	76.40
Female	9652	75.20

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	19994	85.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	358	76.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	288	87.50
Black, non-Hispanic	165	84.20
Hispanic	2646	67.30
White, non-Hispanic	16438	88.40
Students with Disabilities	1955	46.30
Limited English Proficient	1413	58.50
Economically Disadvantaged	8322	77.20
Migrant	346	53.80
Male	10342	83.60

Female	9652	87.30
<p>Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.</p> <p>Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.</p> <p>Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.</p> <p>One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.</p> <p>Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.</p> <p>LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	20369	71.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	318	47.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	284	79.60
Black, non-Hispanic	195	62.60
Hispanic	2564	49.90
White, non-Hispanic	16899	75.30
Students with Disabilities	1961	28.90
Limited English Proficient	1345	41.30
Economically Disadvantaged	8137	59.80
Migrant	337	46.00
Male	10548	71.30
Female	9821	71.90

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	20329	82.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	317	63.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	281	87.20
Black, non-Hispanic	194	79.90
Hispanic	2533	57.40
White, non-Hispanic	16894	86.60
Students with Disabilities	1963	38.70
Limited English Proficient	1301	45.30
Economically Disadvantaged	8099	72.20
Migrant	324	38.30
Male	10519	81.40

Female	9810	83.70
<p>Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.</p> <p>Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.</p> <p>Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.</p> <p>One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.</p> <p>Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.</p> <p>LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	19224	71.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	236	50.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	280	78.90
Black, non-Hispanic	151	60.30
Hispanic	2085	44.30
White, non-Hispanic	16438	74.70
Students with Disabilities	1686	30.40
Limited English Proficient	1053	33.20
Economically Disadvantaged	6069	56.50
Migrant	262	34.00
Male	9810	73.10
Female	9414	68.90

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	19169	83.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	236	74.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	277	88.10
Black, non-Hispanic	150	80.70
Hispanic	2053	59.60
White, non-Hispanic	16420	86.70
Students with Disabilities	1682	43.50
Limited English Proficient	1007	45.60
Economically Disadvantaged	6017	72.40
Migrant	253	41.90
Male	9778	81.90
Female	9391	85.30

Comments: Idaho has undertaken a substantive review of its data. The final results of this review will take time; but

Idaho will revise and provide another upload to EDEN.

Idaho erred in 04-05 by aggregating Hawaiian/Pacific Islander subgroup with American Indian subgroup instead of with Asian subgroup. Result: little change in percentages.

Idaho data submitted in 04-05 did not accurately pre-populate the CSPR. With originally submitted data, most of the number differentials would not show up.

One school with one of the state's highest proficiency rates has been identified that incorrectly coded all of its students to the American Indian sub-group but has none of the sub group in its population.

Idaho surveyed migrant students and families last year with the result a reduced number of migrant students in the state.

LEP numbers changed by the decision of some districts not to count their Am.Ind. population in the LEP sub group because of home language.

- 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	619	454	73.00

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	123	64	52.00

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	383	285	74.00

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	112	54	48.00

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.

Abbreviated Report

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

No Idaho Schools Identified for Restructuring

Idaho schools are in year five of the accountability process, so we have no schools at this time in the restructuring category for failure to make adequate yearly progress (AYP).

Notification and Appeals Process

It is important to note that the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) gives schools a 48-hour preliminary report on student results. General Title I Ongoing Assistance

General Technical Assistance and Statewide Meetings for Directors

Technical assistance begins with the first reading of the district consolidated plan for federal funds submitted by June 30. At that time, the Student Achievement/ School Accountability (SASA) staff checks for set-asides required for schools identified for school improvement. New federal programs directors attend training in August; the requirements for schools and districts at all levels are discussed at that time. All federal programs directors attend a fall meeting; the requirements of NCLB are presented and discussed with specific reference to each district and school situation. Consolidated plans are read and monitored for compliance through the months leading up to final allocations in December. The SDE SASA staff are also on call to provide technical assistance through telephone and email as well as numerous trainings listed later in this response.

School / District Improvement Plan Writing Workshops

Four School / District Improvement Plan Writing Workshops were offered regionally in August and September 2006. Based on Spring 2006 ISAT results, some Idaho schools who were identified as Needs Improvement Year 1, Needs Improvement Year 2, and Corrective Action, brought teams of three or four staff members, including their chief administrators, to the training. Topics covered included:

Approximately 350 teachers, principals, and district administrators attended.

Schoolwide Planning Workshops

As a department, we support the implementation of a schoolwide model for schools with 40 percent or more students in poverty. In November, five regional half-day workshops were offered to schools interested in moving from a Title I Targeted Assistance Plan to a Title I Schoolwide Plan

Solutions Teams-Schoolwide Model Implementation Support

Training was provided for a 12-member team comprised of educators from around the state who will assist the SDE. Five days of training were completed by October 2006. The role of the solutions team includes

• Availability to local district and schools to assist in writing a Schoolwide Plan,

• Availability to the SDE to review and make recommendations for approval of Schoolwide Plans that have been submitted to the SDE.

Statewide Title I Conference for Administrators, Teachers, Paraprofessionals, Parents, and Community Members • Planned for April 2007

Stakeholder Committee to Support Corrective Action and Restructuring

The SDE SASA convened a meeting of stakeholders to create a proposal for the Office of the State Board of Education (OSBE) to consider in June 2006. The team included school, district and higher education representatives; and SDE and OSBE staff. The objective for the committee was to create a plan that was do-able for schools and one that the SDE: SASA could support. The plan outlines the district responsibility for planning corrective action or reform model in year 5 and implementing the plan in year 6.

Math and Reading Support

Math Intervention

Four math intervention workshops were presented regionally in the spring of 2006. The focus was on schools identified as not meeting AYP for students with disabilities and other subpopulations.

Math Intervention Conference

A second math opportunity focused on instructional strategies. The training was offered to all schools identified for not meeting AYP in math.

Reading Coach Institute

This ongoing three-year institute trains anyone coaching K-8 teachers in reading, including reading teachers, literacy coaches, reading coordinators, teacher leaders, and some principals.

Reading Leader Institute, Elementary

This ongoing three-year institute trains K-6 principals and district leaders responsible for literacy programs.

2006-2007 Reading Academies

Reading Academies 2006 will be presented regionally in 2006-2007. The training requires a team of classroom teachers, Title I teachers, special educators and principals to attend together to revisit the topics of phonemic awareness, structure of language, vocabulary, fluency, reading comprehension and a new consideration for writing, both expository and narrative.

Leadership Support

Principal Academy of Leadership

This academy is offered to middle school principals serving in schools that have been identified as facing especially big challenges. In some cases, special conditions, such as restructuring, have allowed schools to appear as if they are meeting AYP, but a closer examination of data clearly demonstrates the challenges they are facing. Through the academy, principals have created a network of middle school principals across the state. Four meetings each year focus on curriculum through Surveys of Enacted Curriculum and on instructional practice through an Idaho Academy Walk-Through; both are research-based models.

Standards Based Lesson Delivery

December 5, 2006, is the first of 20 sessions of a graduated Train-the-Trainer Model for Standard-based Lesson Delivery. This year, 2006-07, we will train four trainers in each of the 24 participating schools, a total of 48 in English language arts and 48 in math. Each teacher trainer will complete five full days of training. These teacher trainers will train the teachers in their schools, including teachers teaching outside the areas of math and English Language Arts. At the end of this 2006-07 school year, we will have reached 828 classroom teachers.

Professional Development to Impact Instructional Quality

The Idaho model of professional development for paraprofessionals was developed and presented by consultants from the Northwest Regional Educational Lab. It was modeled after academies that were offered, by grade-level, to Idaho teachers in grades K-3 in 2002-05. Eight two-day trainings prepared paraprofessionals with knowledge and

strategies to support them in delivering reading instruction. Over 800 paraprofessionals completed training in 2005-06. The success of these trainings prompted inclusion of another opportunity for this training at the statewide Title I conference scheduled for April 2007.

Curricular Materials Review

In September SASA staff joined the Bureau of Educational Improvement to complete curriculum reviews for reading.

Additional Opportunities

Limited English Proficiency (LEP)

Although the LEP Title III federal funds are administered by the OSBE, the Idaho legislature appropriates funding and this year made a special appropriation that is administered by SASA.

Idaho LEP Legislative Appropriation

The 2006 Idaho Legislature allocated an additional \$750,000 in LEP funds to Idaho schools. The purpose of the one-time allocation is to create or enhance successful programs that improve educational outcomes for LEP students.

Implementation Grants

For schools and/or districts with existing LEP programs, the SDE offered grants of up to \$50,000 to enhance existing programs. The funds may not be used to hire additional classified (paraprofessional) or non-classified staff. Funds may be used for additional professional development of all staff. Particular emphasis will be placed on supporting:

Please see website listed below for the entire report.

<http://www.sde.idaho.gov/sasa/documents/WordDocumentforCSPRlink.doc>

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.

Abbreviated Report

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

All of the work with schools described in 1.4.3.2 supports district improvement. Many Idaho districts are so small that they do not meet minimum reporting requirements (N=34). The result is that as numbers aggregate in district reporting, districts are identified when schools have not been identified. In all communications with districts and statewide meetings for superintendents and federal programs directors, we have encouraged all districts to analyze their data to identify the gaps in student achievement so that district improvement can specifically target the areas of need. In addition to all the school-level support, there are several training opportunities for districts.

Integrated Focused Reviews

In January 2005, the Bureau of Special Education and Student Achievement / School Accountability (SASA) were combined into the Bureau of Special Populations Services in an effort to better address the needs of at risk students. Our first combined effort is a focus on districts. The Integrated Focused Review takes us to the districts that appear to have big challenges.

District Improvement Planning Workshops

Four School / District Improvement Plan Writing Workshops were offered regionally in August and September 2006. Based on Spring 2006 ISAT results, some Idaho schools who were identified as Needs Improvement Year 1, Needs Improvement Year 2, and Corrective Action, brought teams of three or four staff members, including their chief administrators, to the training. Topics covered included:

• Technical aspects of entering the plan in the online tool,

• Additional training in planning for Continuous School Improvement that was specific to school data and students.

Idaho LEP Legislative Appropriation

The 2006 Idaho Legislature allocated an additional \$750,000 in LEP funds to Idaho schools. The purpose of the one-time allocation is to create or enhance successful programs that improve educational outcomes for LEP students. The funding is available to schools struggling to meet AYP in reading and math among English language learners.

For complete report, please go to the website listed below.

<http://www.sde.idaho.gov/sasa/documents/WordDocumentforCSPRlink.doc>

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.	8
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.	3
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	10
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.	13358
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.	11
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.	870
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.	6
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	121
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.	5231
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.	245
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	33060	19345	58.51
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	2162	1362	63.00
Low-Poverty Schools	2137	1357	63.50
All Elementary Schools	8882	5454	61.14
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	3636	1869	51.40
Low-Poverty Schools	8897	5412	60.93
All Secondary Schools	24178	13891	57.45
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	
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	
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
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)	
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
d) Other (please explain)	

Comments: 3428 elementary classes and 10,287 secondary classes were taught by not highly qualified teachers in 2005-2006 school year. Idaho has recalculated its numbers, but records do not contain the reason for being non-HQT. While HOUSSE was in place in the districts during 2005-2006 data was not collected by the state during that year. HOUSSE data was collected beginning in October 2006 for the 2006-2007 school year and will be reported in the appropriate CSPR.

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	61.48	37.04
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced-price School Lunch Eligibility	
Secondary Schools	54.18	26.78
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced-price School Lunch Eligibility	

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	

Comments: Data analysis for the percentage of 2005-2006 qualified Title I paraprofessionals is not complete.

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

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

English Language Proficiency standards were originally approved by the Idaho Board of Education in June 2004. Subsequently in 2005, an external review of the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISATs) recommended a revision of Idaho English Language Arts standards. In addition, the Limited English Proficiency Program reviewed existing English language proficiency standards and concluded that they did not appropriately reflect second language acquisition skills and needed to be linked to the updated Language Arts standards, which were revised and reformatted in November 2005.

The State LEP Program worked with a committee of 12 Idaho educators and WestEd, a well respected educational research organization, to revise the standards. It was determined that they would be referred to as English Language Development (ELD) standards, rather than proficiency standards, as development better reflects the intent of the standards. The new ELD standards reflect the domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing and are aligned to the Idaho Language Arts/communications standards.

These Standards were approved by the Idaho Board of Education in August 2006. 2 day trainings are being facilitated by WestEd and the Idaho LEP Program throughout the fall of 2006. Over 230 Idaho Educators are being trained as ELD Standards trainers for their districts.

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

Idaho's process for development and alignment of the standards to the language arts/communication standards can be seen in the following criterion used to develop the English language development (ELD) standards.

Criterion 1: Organization, Format, Specificity

Each ELD standard has a hierarchical organization of a general Standard descriptor, Goals as major skills within a Standard, and specific Objective statements within each Goal. The ELD Standards are broad descriptors of student performance in each domain that reflect the highest level of English language acquisition at the "Fluent" level. Each Standard can be divided into major parts or strands. Idaho calls these parts "Goals" in the Language Arts standards so this term remains intact for the ELD standards. Within each Goal are Objectives that clearly and succinctly describe student performance in measurable terms. These Objectives:

- o Reflect final mastery of skills for each ELD level;
- o Provide sufficient specificity to create state assessment items; and
- o Allow sufficient generality to limit the number of Objectives and to keep teachers' attention on major language skills when planning and delivering standards-based lessons.

A meaningful format of ELD standards (including Goals and Objectives) can greatly assist educators, especially teachers, to understand the Objectives, their interconnections, and their link to Language Arts objectives. By grouping ELD objectives according to "like skill," Idaho's ELD standards form a sequential cluster from the beginning to advanced (Fluent) levels for a specific skill area. Each cluster resembles a rubric that can be used by teachers for ongoing classroom assessment as well as by state test developers.

Criterion 2: Linkage

ELD Standards in the four domains, with comprehension covered within listening and reading Goals, are clearly linked to Idaho's six Language Arts Standards and the most important Language Arts Objectives. Showing the match between ELD and Language Arts Objectives in the chart of Objectives (as stated above) assists teachers in designing standards-based lessons when they have both English learners and native English speakers in the class. The rigor of the highest ELD level (Fluent) in a cluster of ELD Objectives is near the expected performance at the higher grades on the linked Language Arts Objective.

Criterion 3: Theory-based

Idaho's ELD standards were developed specifically for English learners and reflect prevailing research and expert knowledge about second language acquisition.

In addition, English Language Proficiency Level Descriptors were developed to detail the skills needed to move from one language proficiency level to the next. These general performance indicators serve as anchors for establishing ELD Objectives within each grade span (K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12), and help align the Objectives across grade spans.

â€¢ Level 1: Beginning

â€¢ Level 2: Advanced Beginning

â€¢ Level 3: Intermediate

â€¢ Level 4: Early Fluent

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 No Response

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

Idaho began implementation of its new ELP Assessment in Spring 2006. The Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA) was developed from the items created for the Mountain West Assessment Consortium (MWAC). The MWAC was formed through a U.S. Department of Education grant.

Idaho was a member of the Mountain West Assessment Consortium that began in March 2003 to develop test items for an ELP Assessment. The Consortium included the states of Alaska, Colorado, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Utah, Michigan and Wyoming. The test support contractor was Measured Progress, and the grant fiscal agent was the State of Utah.

The MWAC test items were developed with input from language acquisition experts, including Dr. Frances Butler and Dr. Alison Bailey of UCLA. Educators in each consortium state reviewed tests in April 2004, with field-testing conducted in the fall 2004. MWAC developed a rigorous assessment that has some key distinctions from previously used commercial tests. Rationale for using the MWAC test items in Idaho is:

1. The assessment is based on the latest research that defines the construct of language acquisition as the acquisition of the following knowledge and skills: Vocabulary, Syntax, Discourse and Function.
2. The MWAC assessment uses content-based passages and asks students to use the function of the content, such as compare/contrast, identify hypothesis supporting evidence, or cause and effect.
3. The MWAC assessment is owned by the member states and therefore is Idaho's to use, edit, alter, or change to meet the needs of the students. While any change to the test would require additional field-testing and validation, it is Idaho's right and ability to do that. Further, the assessment costs are well below that of commercially available tests since Idaho owns the test items and will pay only for initial production and annual distribution.

The MWAC product reflects a significant change in the construct and definition of language proficiency, and it will provide superior information to teachers, schools, and districts. The MWAC assessment has significantly improved the measure of the skills and knowledge that is needed for the success of LEP students.

Following the work of the MWAC consortium, Idaho contracted with TASA, Inc. (Touchstone Applied Sciences Associates) to finish creating the assessment, inclusive of printing, distributing, receiving, scanning, scoring and reporting. After the first administration in spring 2006, TASA facilitated a standard setting session to develop cut scores for the scoring and scaling of the assessment.

1. Idaho requires that all districts test all K-12 English language learners with the IELA. This is explained in the Title III Accountability Procedure document for the state: <http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/lep/documents/AMAOsandLEAproceduresAug2006.pdf>. The Title III program also requires all districts to pre identify their English language learners K-12 for assessment each spring.

2. The IELA is comprised of 4 separate subtests, inclusive of listening, speaking, reading and writing. A comprehension score is derived through a combination of the listening and reading items.

3. The original MWAC test was developed based on a foundational document of English language proficiency standards that most consortium states adopted or utilized. Since then, Idaho has revised their ELD standards, as stated above. As a part of the overall test development and administration for the IELA, Idaho had the new testing vendor complete an alignment study with the new ELD standards. This alignment study took place in September 2006. The results indicated an overall strong alignment between the ELD standards and the ELP assessment, with a gap in the range of knowledge within the assessment. The range-of-knowledge correspondence criterion is used to judge whether a comparable span of knowledge expected of students by a standard is the same as, or corresponds to, the span of knowledge that students need in order to correctly. The information that the alignment study provided will inform the new item development, so that the new items reflect all the areas for a solid alignment inclusive of Categorical Concurrence, Linguistic Difficulty Level, Range-of-Knowledge and Balance of Representation.

Idaho will work with the testing vendor to ensure that 30% of the testing items are changed each year in order to refresh the test and maintain complete alignment with the ELD standards.

4. Idaho is confident that the MWAC consortium created a test that is of high technical quality. However, Idaho will still conduct an external validity and reliability review in 2007, after the second administration of the assessment.

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	13789	80.00
2. other/unknown	2095	12.20
3. Shoshone	341	2.00
4. Serbo-Croatian	247	1.40
5. Russian	239	1.40
6. Bosnian	163	1.00
7. Ukraninian	116	0.70
8. Vietnamese	98	0.60
9. Chinese	75	0.40
10. Lao	67	0.40
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 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
1337	650	16

Comments:

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

Idaho consistently receives between 1200 and 2500 immigrant children into schools each year. This number is reflective of the refugee resettlement in the larger school districts, as well as immigrant and migrant families moving into the state. The refugee resettlement in the area creates a sudden population change within the district and resources are used to educate staff about particular cultures and also to assist the students and families in the transition to US schooling. This was the case particularly in the past two years with the resettlement efforts for the Somali Bantu population. This population proved extremely difficult to resettle and subsequently serve within the education system. Otherwise, the immigrant children served within Idaho's districts have remained consistent over the past two 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

Idaho's new definition of proficient is as follows:

English Language Proficiency ("Proficiency"): On an annual basis, 20% of LEP students within an LEA will achieve "proficiency" on the Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA) (as defined below), in order to begin transition out of a language development program.

A student is defined as "proficient" in English on the IELA, if both the following are met:

1. the student tests at the overall Fluent level on the IELA; and
2. the student tests at the Early Fluent and above (EF+) within each individual domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing, comprehension) assessed on the IELA.

1. A.

Spring 2006 Idaho-ELA

Total Test Scaled Score Cuts from Final Theta Cuts

Form Grade(s) Advanced Intermediate Early Fluent Fluent

A K 362 381 400 425

B 1 345 372 400 425

2 354 385 425 466

C 3 359 380 400 425

4 362 383 415 434

5 370 390 417 438

D 6-8 357 374 400 425

E 9-12 364 376 400 425

1. B.

Spring 2006 Idaho-ELA

Individual Test/Modality Scaled Score Cuts from Final Theta Cuts

Form Grade Advanced Beginning Intermediate Early Fluent Fluent

A K 80 90 100 113

B 1 80 90 100 109

2 83 94 109 124

C 3 80 90 100 112

4 81 92 107 117

5 85 95 108 118

D 6-8 80 88 100 112

E 9-12 80 87 100 114

2. All domains are weighted equally within the definition of proficient.

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

English Language Progress/Growth ("Progress"): On an annual basis, 55% (fifty-five percent) of LEP students within a cohort will achieve progress, as measured on the IELA, within each LEA.

Progress is defined as advancing one level of language proficiency per year, as indicated by the Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA) and associated cut scores. Students at the Fluent level will be considered as making progress if they are not exited and maintain their level of English proficiency. The IELA details 5 levels of English proficiency and assesses the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension (listening + reading) in grades K-12.

The 5 English language development levels as defined for Idaho are:

(1) Beginning: Students performing at mastery of this level of English language proficiency begin to demonstrate basic communication skills. They can understand brief, very simple speech on familiar topics, with visual support. They can respond to simple social talk and academic instruction by using gestures or a few words or phrases, or very simple subject-predicate sentences. With assistance, they can read very brief text with simple sentences and familiar vocabulary, supported by graphics or pictures. They can write words, phrases and very simple sentences. They exhibit frequent errors in pronunciation, grammar, and writing conventions that often impede meaning.

(2) Advanced Beginning: Students performing at mastery of this level of English language proficiency communicate with increasing ease in a greater variety of social and academic situations. They can understand brief, simple speech on mostly familiar topics, and need visual support. They can engage in basic social talk and academic instruction by using phrases or simple subject-predicate sentences. With assistance, they can read brief text with simple sentences and mostly familiar vocabulary, supported by graphics or pictures. They can write phrases and simple sentences. They exhibit frequent errors in pronunciation, grammar, and writing conventions that often impede meaning.

(3) Intermediate: Students performing at mastery of this level of English language proficiency begin to expand the complexity and variety of their communication skills. They can understand speech on familiar and some unfamiliar topics, and may need some visual support. They can engage in social talk and academic instruction using increasingly detailed sentences. They can independently read simple text with mostly familiar vocabulary, and can read more complex text supported by graphics or pictures. They can write simple texts with support. They exhibit fairly frequent errors in pronunciation, grammar, and writing conventions that may impede meaning.

(4) Early Fluent: Students performing at mastery of this level of English language proficiency communicate adequately in complex, cognitively demanding situations. They can understand social and academic speech at their grade level, and may need some visual support for unfamiliar topics. They can engage in social talk and academic instruction using detailed sentences and expanded vocabulary. They can write texts near grade level. They exhibit some errors in pronunciation, grammar, and writing conventions that usually do not impede meaning.

(5) Fluent: Students performing at mastery of this level of English language proficiency communicate effectively with various audiences on a wide range of topics, though they may need further enhancement and refinement of English language skills to reach the native level of their peers. They can understand a variety of social and academic speech at their grade level. They can engage in social talk and academic instruction using varied sentence structures and vocabulary appropriate to the context. They can independently read grade-level text, including technical text. They can

write expanded texts appropriate to their grade level. They may exhibit a few errors in pronunciation, grammar, and writing conventions that do not impede meaning.

The AMAO growth target of 55% is informed by three considerations:

First, research suggests that it is inaccurate to assume that all students will progress at the same rate. Second, because the proficiency levels are relatively broad categories, students starting a year near the top of a category are much more likely to progress to the next level than students who begin a year near the bottom of a category. Third, according to second language development research, it is likely that progress from the Intermediate level may require more time than progress between any of the other levels, as this is the time when students are making the transition from social to academic language.

If Idaho's data consistently over time reflects this growth within proficiency levels and/or the "plateau" at the intermediate level, then Idaho anticipates adding a provision for a growth measurement within proficiency levels (scale score point growth) to the AMAO defined as "progress".

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

Idaho will determine AMAOs for 2 "cohort" groups (grouping of students) (1) an unmatched cohort, which will include every student tested each year and a (2) matched cohort which will include only those students who were tested in the prior and current years. Each cohort will include all grade spans and all levels of proficiency.

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

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

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

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

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

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.

As of August 2006, Idaho has revised the state AMAOs, received approval of the new AMAO targets from the Idaho State Board of Education, and notified all LEAs of the new targets.

Due to spring 2006 being the first administration of the new statewide assessment (the Idaho English Language Assessment - IELA), Idaho will not have two consistent and reliable data points for the LEP students until the spring 2007 testing is completed. At that point Idaho will be able to calculate AMAOs that are reliable across the state. Therefore, by August 2007 and each year thereafter, LEA AMAO percentages will be calculated, LEAs will be informed of their AMAO status and letters will be required to be sent home.

Idaho intends to apply the Title III AMAOs to all districts that have more than 10 students, which is the state determined minimum number for the protection of student information.

Therefore, Idaho is basing the 05-06 evaluation mechanism on the AYP determinations for the state assessment for reading/language usage for those LEAs receiving Title III funds. The following # and % of LEAs met the targets for the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests in Reading/Language Usage.

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	55.00		
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS			
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	20.00	3425	18.40
TOTAL			

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? Yes

* 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	24
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	24
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: Blank responses indicate information not available at this time. Due to spring 2006 being the first administration of the new statewide assessment (the Idaho English Language Assessment - IELA), Idaho will not have two consistent and reliable data points for the LEP students until the spring 2007 testing is completed. At that point Idaho will be able to calculate AMAOs that are reliable across the state. Therefore, by August 2007 and each year thereafter, AMAO targets will be calculated, LEAs will be informed of their AMAO status and letters will be required to be sent home.

* 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	909	59.60
4	833	59.50
5	682	52.40
6	548	47.00
7	559	52.30
8	429	41.20
H.S.	359	42.90

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	1179	74.80
4	1014	69.50
5	863	64.00
6	698	57.80
7	434	39.40
8	401	37.00
H.S.	273	31.00

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	86.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

Comments: Idaho has in place a data collection system that allows calculation of the graduation rates for all subgroups. The system requires 4 years of this subpopulation data collection. Idaho will be able to report graduation rates disaggregated by subgroups following the 06-07 school year. For 04-05, Idaho's calculated high school completion rate was 86.63%. The comparable figure for 05-06 will be available following the completion of the school district-level appeals process that will close in March 2007.

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	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	
<p>Comments: Idaho has in place a data collection system that allows the State to calculate the annual event dropout rates for all subgroups. Idaho will be able to report annual event dropout rates disaggregated by subgroups following the 06-07 school year. For 04-05, Idaho's calculated annual event dropout rate was 3.04%. Additional detailed data for Idaho's annual</p> <p>event dropout rates, including estimated Hispanic dropout rates, are presented on the dept. Website at: www.sde.state.id.us/finance/dropout.asp</p> <p>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.</p>	

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

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

STATE RESPONSE
 A school year for Idaho Public Schools:

 Kindergarten: 450 hours

 Grades 1-3: 810 hours

 Grades 4-8: 900 hours

 Grades 9-12: 990 hours

 Idaho has a number of year-round schools so we do not define a single start date or ending date.

 Further explanation of what constitutes a school day is described in Idaho Code 33-512.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	115	107
LEAs with Subgrants	8	8

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	86	99
1	75	110
2	66	117
3	49	97
4	51	91
5	43	93
6	35	82
7	34	68
8	37	47
9	41	92
10	31	88
11	45	91
12	53	113

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	88	143
Doubled-up	392	763
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	121	116
Hotels/Motels	17	77
Unknown	<n	94

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	60
1	79
2	64
3	66
4	63
5	66
6	50
7	52
8	41
9	53
10	71
11	74
12	88

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

64

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

49

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)

11

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)	196
English Language Learners (ELL)	40
Gifted and Talented	14
Vocational Education	51

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	7
Expedited evaluations	1
Staff professional development and awareness	5
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	6
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	4
Assistance with participation in school programs	7
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	5
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	4
Coordination between schools and agencies	7
Counseling	6
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	5
School supplies	7
Referral to other programs and services	6
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
Other (optional)	1

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	0
Transportation	3
School records	0
Immunizations or other medical records	0
Other enrollment issues	0

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

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

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

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

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	54	28
Grade 4	Yes	53	35
Grade 5	Yes	49	22
Grade 6	Yes	41	18
Grade 7	Yes	43	27
Grade 8	Yes	35	13
Grade 9	Yes	46	19
Grade 10	Yes	56	31
Grade 11	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 12	Yes	11	11

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	53	30
Grade 4	Yes	55	34
Grade 5	Yes	49	20
Grade 6	Yes	41	22
Grade 7	Yes	43	18
Grade 8	Yes	35	<n
Grade 9	Yes	46	<n
Grade 10	Yes	55	23
Grade 11	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 12	Yes	11	11

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.