CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on

School Year 2005-2006

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 07/31/2007

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
__X__Part I, 2005-2006 ___Part II, 2005-2006

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Massachusetts

Address:
350 Main St.
Malden, MA 02148

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Robert Curtin
Telephone: 781-338-3582
Fax: 781-338-6850
e-mail: rcurtin@doe.mass.edu

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): David P. Driscoll

_____ __Thursday, March 01, 2007, 3:35:40 PM__
Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2005-2006

PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

In December 2000, the Massachusetts Board of Education adopted the Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework. The Framework was based on a previous Science and Technology Curriculum Framework, adopted by the Massachusetts Board of Education in February 1995. Revisions to the 1995 document were released for public comment in June 2000. Public comment continued until October 2000 and was considered in a special meeting of the Board in November 2000.

The current Framework was distributed in May 2001.The current Framework divides grade spans for science standards into PreK-2, 6-8, and 9-11. Science content strands at the PreK-8 level include Earth and Space Science, Life Science, Physical Science, and Technology/Engineering.

In February 2006, the Board of Education voted to adopt revised high school science and technology/engineering standards. The standards (located online at http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/current.html) replace the high school standards in the 2001 Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework.

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

Starting in 2006, the Department administered operational tests in reading at grades 3, 5, 6, and 8; English language arts at grades 4, 7, and 10; and mathematics at grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10. Standards were set in summer 2006 for reading grades 3, 5, 6, and 8 and mathematics grades 3, 5, and 7 to provide for reporting student performance at four levels, including two levels at proficient and higher. Resulting scaled scores and performance level results at the student, school, district and state level were reported for all tests in fall 2006.

The Department has had operational science tests at grades 5 and 8 in place since 2004. Tests in biology, chemistry, physics and technology/engineering were administered for the second time in 2006; however, these tests were aligned to the 2001 high school Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework standards. As described in Section 1.1.1., these standards were revised in 2006. Accordingly, the high school science tests that will be administered in spring 2007 will be based on the recently revised standards. Following standard setting in the summer of 2007, we will report scaled scores and performance level results at the student, school, district and state level for new high school end of course science tests in fall 2007.

Alternate Assessments

The state has conducted alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, and alternate assessments based on grade level achievement standards since the 2000-2001 school year. (Prior to this, in school years 1997-1998 through 1999-2000, districts were instructed to conduct locally-developed alternate assessments based on the state's curriculum frameworks for each student who was unable to take a standard MCAS test, even with accommodations.) The MCAS Alternate Assessment (MCAS-Alt) is administered in each grade and subject for which a standard MCAS test is given. New alternate assessments were developed in 2006 to meet the requirements for testing in reading and mathematics in each of the grades 3-8 and 10, and science and technology/engineering in high school.

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

MCAS standard setting was carried out in 1998 for the tests in grades 4, 8, and 10 for English language arts, mathematics, and science and technology. A grade 7 English language arts test was introduced in 2001; the grade 8 English language arts test was eliminated in 2002. In 2001, standard setting was conducted for tests introduced that year - grade 3 reading, grade 7 English language arts, and grade 6 mathematics. Also that year, performance standards for the grade 4 English language arts test were reset.

Science tests at grades 5 and 8 that were introduced in 1998 were discontinued in 2001 in response to revisions to the Massachusetts Science and Technology Curriculum Framework. Performance standards were set in 2003 for the new grade 5 and 8 tests that were introduced that year.

Massachusetts conducted standard setting for new tests introduced in 2006: English language arts, grades 5, 6, and 8; and mathematics, grades 3, 5, and 7. Student, school, district, and state level results were reported in fall 2006.

MCAS-Alternate Assessment

Cut scores for each existing MCAS Alternate Assessment were established in 2000. Student performance on MCAS-Alt is judged and reported according to the standard MCAS performance levels: Advanced, Proficient, and Needs Improvement, with performance at the lowest MCAS performance level - Failing/Warning - subdivided into three discrete levels: Progressing, Emerging, and Awareness.

Cut scores for performance on the MCAS-Alt were established based upon a methodology developed specifically for the MCAS-Alt which uses a scoring rubric to evaluate student performance on four dimensions: completeness, complexity, accuracy, and independence. These scores are combined to yield an overall performance level in each content area, using a system of reasoned judgment of the expectations for a student's performance based on the performance level descriptors at each level. An "analytical matrix" was developed listing all possible score combinations, and the resulting performance level for each combination. This methodology has been applied to each alternate assessment for all grade levels and subjects, and was adapted by three stakeholder groups over a period of two years using the same methodology for the new NCLB alternate assessments as for existing alternate assessments. New cut scores were adopted and approved in summer 2006, prior to launching the new alternate assessments.

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	515670	99.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1581	99.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	25376	99.80
Black, non-Hispanic	42892	99.40
Hispanic	65538	99.40
White, non-Hispanic	372481	99.70
Students with Disabilities	89246	99.30
Limited English Proficient	25182	99.50
Economically Disadvantaged	152810	99.50
Migrant	531	99.40
Male	265065	99.70
Female	249981	99.70

Comments:

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

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	515682	99.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1578	99.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	25296	99.70
Black, non-Hispanic	42866	99.50
Hispanic	65494	99.50
White, non-Hispanic	372294	99.70
Students with Disabilities	89114	99.20
Limited English Proficient	24998	99.60
Economically Disadvantaged	152820	99.50
Migrant	527	99.50
Male	264807	99.60
Female	249889	99.70

Comments:

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

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

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

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment		
	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	**Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested**
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	82532	92.60
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	152	0.20
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	6458	7.20
Comments:		

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment		
	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	**Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested**
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	82736	92.90
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	116	0.10
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	6163	7.00
Comments:		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	70738	51.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	282	44.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	3618	62.70
Black, non-Hispanic	5920	29.10
Hispanic	8693	25.70
White, non-Hispanic	52035	58.20
Students with Disabilities	11825	23.20
Limited English Proficient	4635	23.80
Economically Disadvantaged	21665	30.90
Migrant	62	24.20
Male	36315	52.60
Female	34289	51.20

Comments:

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	70747	58.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	283	49.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	3611	61.70
Black, non-Hispanic	5920	35.80
Hispanic	8689	28.80
White, non-Hispanic	52022	65.70
Students with Disabilities	11818	28.20
Limited English Proficient	4627	20.00
Economically Disadvantaged	21669	34.90
Migrant	62	27.40
Male	36300	52.60
Female	34277	61.40

Comments: All of the data presented have been verified and are accurate.

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	71418	40.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	31.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	3682	56.80
Black, non-Hispanic	6127	18.20
Hispanic	8645	17.90
White, non-Hispanic	52633	45.30
Students with Disabilities	12729	15.00
Limited English Proficient	4070	15.40
Economically Disadvantaged	21765	20.90
Migrant	85	21.20
Male	36766	40.70
Female	34587	39.70

Comments: All of the data presented have been verified and are accurate.

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

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	71277	49.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	225	37.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	3675	57.70
Black, non-Hispanic	6115	27.20
Hispanic	8609	23.50
White, non-Hispanic	52515	55.90
Students with Disabilities	12697	16.00
Limited English Proficient	4051	14.10
Economically Disadvantaged	21707	27.00
Migrant	83	25.30
Male	36663	43.00
Female	34516	56.50

Comments: All of the data presented have been verified and are accurate.

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	72796	42.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	247	28.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	3608	60.50
Black, non-Hispanic	6616	16.30
Hispanic	8671	20.10
White, non-Hispanic	53548	47.80
Students with Disabilities	13529	13.60
Limited English Proficient	2969	13.50
Economically Disadvantaged	22244	21.40
Migrant	74	21.60
Male	37473	43.40
Female	35263	42.20

Comments:

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	72709	59.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	248	51.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	3605	65.30
Black, non-Hispanic	6594	35.00
Hispanic	8659	28.00
White, non-Hispanic	53467	67.90
Students with Disabilities	13497	24.20
Limited English Proficient	2966	12.90
Economically Disadvantaged	22213	34.20
Migrant	77	32.50
Male	37424	55.40
Female	35192	64.80

Comments:

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	73469	45.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	232	30.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	3469	62.70
Black, non-Hispanic	6604	20.00
Hispanic	8811	17.60
White, non-Hispanic	54253	52.10
Students with Disabilities	13175	12.80
Limited English Proficient	2829	10.40
Economically Disadvantaged	22481	21.90
Migrant	87	18.40
Male	38001	46.00
Female	35412	44.90

Comments: All of the data presented have been verified and are accurate.

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

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	73401	64.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	227	50.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	3468	69.30
Black, non-Hispanic	6582	39.50
Hispanic	8789	32.70
White, non-Hispanic	54158	71.90
Students with Disabilities	13121	26.20
Limited English Proficient	2800	13.90
Economically Disadvantaged	22442	38.10
Migrant	85	20.00
Male	37910	59.90
Female	35358	68.70

Comments: All of the data presented have been verified and are accurate.

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	74646	39.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	27.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	3386	58.60
Black, non-Hispanic	6877	14.30
Hispanic	9100	13.50
White, non-Hispanic	54943	46.40
Students with Disabilities	13226	8.90
Limited English Proficient	2676	9.10
Economically Disadvantaged	22484	17.00
Migrant	82	7.30
Male	38642	40.20
Female	35988	39.60

Comments:

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

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	74508	64.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	243	58.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3363	70.00
Black, non-Hispanic	6857	42.30
Hispanic	9006	35.50
White, non-Hispanic	54838	72.30
Students with Disabilities	13160	24.80
Limited English Proficient	2655	15.00
Economically Disadvantaged	22433	41.30
Migrant	81	22.20
Male	38525	59.40
Female	35874	70.50

Comments: All of the data presented have been verified and are accurate.

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	76279	40.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	247	29.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	3432	58.40
Black, non-Hispanic	6947	16.10
Hispanic	9317	14.70
White, non-Hispanic	56213	46.10
Students with Disabilities	13141	7.90
Limited English Proficient	2602	9.00
Economically Disadvantaged	22748	17.60
Migrant	90	25.50
Male	39283	39.30
Female	36912	40.80

Comments: All of the data presented have been verified and are accurate.

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

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	76243	74.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	245	66.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	3423	75.90
Black, non-Hispanic	6935	53.40
Hispanic	9293	44.70
White, non-Hispanic	56139	81.40
Students with Disabilities	13090	34.50
Limited English Proficient	2578	17.90
Economically Disadvantaged	22680	51.40
Migrant	89	44.90
Male	39204	69.50
Female	36866	79.00

Comments:

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	72738	66.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	210	59.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	3325	79.70
Black, non-Hispanic	6330	40.70
Hispanic	7410	36.30
White, non-Hispanic	55337	72.80
Students with Disabilities	11517	30.00
Limited English Proficient	2078	26.90
Economically Disadvantaged	17107	43.50
Migrant	42	42.90
Male	36726	66.20
Female	35815	66.80

Comments: All of the data presented have been verified and are accurate.

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

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	73352	69.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	213	64.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	3338	73.00
Black, non-Hispanic	6408	46.90
Hispanic	7563	39.50
White, non-Hispanic	55630	75.50
Students with Disabilities	11632	29.00
Limited English Proficient	2108	13.40
Economically Disadvantaged	17421	45.50
Migrant	42	30.90
Male	37042	63.80
Female	36141	74.60

Comments: All of the data presented have been verified and are accurate.

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

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	1772	1039	58.60
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	379	136	35.90
Comments: The total number of schools and districts represent those that that had one or more 2006 AYP determination.			

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	1019	487	47.80
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	344	117	34.00
Comments: The total number of schools and districts represent those that that had one or more 2006 AYP determination.			

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.

Districts with schools in restructuring, corrective action and improvement receive priority for state assistance that varies according to districts' identified needs. Assistance takes various forms including: evaluating school performance, improvement planning assistance, grant funding to undertake improvement initiatives, professional development in core content areas, pedagogy, and/or leadership, networking, and providing direct assistance to monitor and support the implementation of planned improvement initiatives. This assistance is detailed below:

Evaluating school performance: Since 2000, the MADOE accountability system has conducted an intensive school review process. The current focus of these reviews is schools in corrective action and restructuring. These schools are visited by a MADOE review panel, which evaluates whether the school has a sound plan for improvement and whether the conditions are in place to implement the plan successfully. If the panel finds the school plan or conditions for implementation to be inadequate, the school is declared underperforming. Each under-performing school receives a diagnostic fact finding review to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the school's leadership, curriculum and instruction, school climate, and organizational structures and management.

Improvement planning assistance includes working with districts to evaluate the essential conditions and infrastructure to support improved student performance in their schools. Districts with schools recently identified as under-performing have used these criteria. The essential conditions include, but are not limited to, ensuring that:

- The core content curricula and related materials are aligned and enacted in schools,

- Students have sufficient time in core content instruction,

- Teachers have sufficient time to plan together and receive professional development to strengthen their instructional practices,

- Full time coaches in English language arts and mathematics are assigned to low performing schools

- Students who have not reached proficiency receive additional after school instruction

- Principals have authority to assign appropriate faculty and have sufficient resources to implement planned improvement initiatives.

Districts with schools in restructuring, corrective action and improvement also were targeted for training in the development of comprehensive data-driven, results-oriented, school improvement plans using the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process. PIM is a 10-step process that allows school leadership teams to set student performance goals aligned with state and federal performance targets, investigate the causes of low achievement in their student groups, and develop strategies and action plans that map how schools will provide students with the learning experiences that address their specific gaps in skills and knowledge.

Grant Funding for Improvement Initiatives includes prioritizing resources for districts with certain schools in restructuring, corrective action, and improvement to fund turnaround partners or consultant services, or grants in reading, mathematics, expanded learning time, etc. In addition, ten urban districts with the highest number of schools in restructuring, corrective action and improvement receive funds to pay the salary of at least one School Support Specialist whose role is to coordinate and implement the district's system of support to schools with an NCLB status. MADOE provides the School Support Specialists with monthly training on the facilitation of the PIM process and best practices in school improvement and inter-district networking opportunities.

Professional Development in core content areas, pedagogy, and/or leadership includes, but is not limited to, targeted training programs in mathematics content for teachers, teacher reading academies for early elementary teachers in identified schools, in depth, multi-level training on teaching English language learners, and a two year program for principals on instructional leadership in a standards based educational program.

Networking includes providing monthly opportunities for Superintendents from the state's 22 largest urban districts, all of which have multiple schools in NCLB status, to meet with Department of Education administrators to share

information and resources on practices and programs that will improve the performance of students in their districts. The network provides opportunities to address issues of common concern to urban school district leaders through partnering on policy and program development, analysis of data and barriers to improvement, as well as collaborating on shared solutions. In addition, the networking of the School Support Specialists (see grant funding above), the Department initiated a network for mathematics leaders in the state's districts with schools with significant performance concerns in mathematics.

Direct assistance to monitor and support the implementation of planned improvement initiatives is a collaborative process of "implementation support" in districts with schools declared Under-performing in the state's accountability system - most of which are in corrective action and/or restructuring. Implementation support cycles are intended to focus district, school, and DOE teams on evaluating the efficacy, impact, and progress of key school / district initiatives related to teaching and learning in a school. DOE staff initiate structured visits to observe classroom instruction, faculty planning and professional development, and/or leadership activities to oversee the implementation of the improvement plans, to identify barriers to implementation and collaborate with district and school leaders on solutions.

After under-performing schools implement their plans for two years, they receive follow-up reviews to determine whether the under-performing status should be removed. Those schools that fail to show improvement at the two-year review are declared chronically under-performing. These schools receive additional financial resources and are paired with a turnaround partner organization to accelerate their improvement efforts.

All districts with schools in corrective action and restructuring are required to submit documentation of the actions that they have taken in those schools to improve performance.

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.

Training, Tools, and Ongoing Planning and Implementation Support

One third of the districts identified for improvement participated in an NCLB District Consolidated Planning pilot using data-driven planning tools to address key district-wide performance issues. In addition, school district's identified for improvement with multiple schools in improvement status are offered training and support in Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM), an intensive, data-driven, results-oriented school improvement planning model developed by the state.

A state-funded School Support Specialist Network is maintained by MADOE to provide training and planning assistance to ten urban districts identified for improvement that together are comprised of almost half of the state's schools in improvement status. School support specialists assist with planning and support the implementation of improvements in schools within these districts.

MADOE considers effective planning and content knowledge to be key to addressing problems and prioritizes trainings and tools to assist with planning in low-performing districts.

Networking for Urban Superintendents and for math leaders engages leaders of districts in improvement in networking and sharing practices and solutions.

District Turnaround Partners

Three districts identified for improvement were declared under-performing after a state audit. The state linked each of these districts with an independent educational organization or consultant as a "Turnaround Partner" and provided funding.

Targeted Financial Assistance

Districts identified for improvement or corrective action are given priority consideration for competitive grants such as the Comprehensive School Reform grants, Title IIB and grants that provide school support specialists to low-performing districts.

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.	103
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.	98
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.	1671
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.	173424
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.	2032
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments:	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	126
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	6430
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.	75578
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.	7480
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	62264	58373	93.80
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	11500	10295	90.00
Low-Poverty Schools	10988	10610	96.60
All Elementary Schools	43484	41095	94.50
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	3409	2876	84.40
Low-Poverty Schools	4918	4678	95.10
All Secondary Schools	18781	17278	92.00
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 though 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: The Massachusetts Department of Education currently is not able to disaggregate its teacher data to provide this information. School districts report their highly qualified data to the MA DOE in the aggregate. The MA DOE is currently piloting an educator database, Educator Personnel Information Management Systems (EPIMS). EPIMS will be implemented statewide in the Fall of 2007. At that point, the Department will have augmented data including the exact reasons that teachers are not meeting the HQT requirements.

The MA DOE has discussed our current data collection system and future EPIMS system with Bob Stonehill and others at the U.S. Department of Education. They are aware of our system's current limitations including our inability to collect data at the individual level and the subsequent data analysis issues that arise including not having the data needed to complete the above section of this report.

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	52.30	6.30
Poverty Metric Used	Massachusetts used the percentage of students who qualified for free or reduced price lunch as the poverty metric for this section.	
Secondary Schools	36.50	6.10
Poverty Metric Used	Massachusetts used the percentage of students who qualified for free or reduced price lunch as the poverty metric for this section.	

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	77.80

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards	
Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?	
Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes
Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).	
STATE RESPONSE	
In 2001, the Massachusetts Department of Education established a statewide committee of ESL and Bilingual Education practitioners from across the Commonwealth to develop English Language Proficiency standards in speaking, listening, reading and writing. In June 2003 the State Board of Education approved these standards. The document containing these standards is entitled the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes (ELPBO) and is posted on the Department's website. Link: http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/benchmark.pdf The following initiatives were implemented to familiarize districts with the contents of the ELPBO document. They are briefly described below. 1. Approximately 20,000 copies of the ELPBO have been printed and distributed at no cost to teachers or districts. 2. Approximately 15,000 copies of a 2' x 3' glossy poster were printed and distributed to districts, often to be used as part of an introductory workshop in the ELPBO for ESL practitioners. This poster presents all four modalities, at four different grade spans and four performance levels. In each of these sections, representative standards are grouped as descriptors of student performance at the different grade levels, performance levels and grade spans. The poster was well received and is now posted in many offices and classrooms across the state. 3. Department staff developed an introductory workshop and delivered this workshop at meetings, conferences and by invitation. This workshop was delivered approximately 50 times to approximately 2,500 teachers and administrators. District ELL directors developed their own introductory workshop, based on the Department's workshop, which they delivered in their own district. In July 2005 the Department convened a statewide group of ELL educators to develop a document to be used to guide English Language Development curriculum development at the district level. The first phase of this project was a Scope and Sequence document, written at four grade spans and four performance levels and includes all standards in the English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes. The first draft of this document was released for public comment in spring 2006. A final draft of this document was completed during the summer and fall of 2006, and is currently undergoing final revisions. The final draft will be released in spring 2007.	

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

Linkage to ELA standards: During the development of the English Proficiency Standards 2001-2003, the English language arts standards were used as the backbone for all reading and writing standards. Many English proficiency standards in reading and writing are, in fact, parts of ELA standards, and notation in the ELPBO documents this as appropriate. An example appears below, and a brief description follows:

EXAMPLE R.3 Comprehension: Students will read English fluently and identify facts and evidence in order to interpret and analyze text.

TOPIC: THEME

BENCHMARKS

a. Compare examples of familiar themes and topics. (link to ELA 11.4)

b. Explain how a theme differs from a topic.

c. Explain how a stated theme refers to the main idea of a text. (link to ELA 11.3)

d. Provide evidence that an implied theme refers to the main idea of a text. (link to ELA 11.3)

e. Provide evidence that a theme is present in more than one text. (link to ELA 11.4)

STANDARD/OUTCOME

11. Analyze and provide evidence from a text to support understanding of theme. (link to ELA 11)

As you can see in the example above, each "ELA" notation directs the reader to a standard within the ELA Curriculum Framework. The phrase "link to" indicates that one aspect of the ELA standard has been addressed in the ELP standard, and not the ELA standard in its entirety. This "deconstruction" of an ELA standard to create more than one ELP standard was done to encourage explicit attention to each skill or concept required to meet an ELA standard.

Linkage to mathematics standards: Throughout the English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes document there is reference to language associated with subject matter content.

EXAMPLES (question and page numbers are references to the ELPBO):

25. (p. 15) Demonstrate comprehension in a variety of settings of specific, technical and/or abstract words and phrases of grade-level, academic content in various Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.

7. (p. 29) Give formal oral presentations that focus on specified academic content, using appropriate vocabulary and syntax, recognizable organization, clears pronunciation, eye contact, and appropriate volume and intonation.

17e. (pg. 38) Identify structures used in academic content areas, such as: Math, passive voice, comparative forms.

15b. (pg. 86) Identify and use vocabulary words and phrases in ways specific to academic content (such as table, sense, compound in science).

There is not explicit linkage to mathematics standards in the ELPBO document, such as that described above for ELA standards.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

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

- An independent alignment study __No__
- Other evidence of alignment __Yes__

2. **Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:**

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

Statewide Assessment of K-2 LEP Students

K-2: Speaking and Listening Assessment

Massachusetts mandates that the speaking and listening skills of all K-2 LEP students be tested by the Massachusetts English Language Assessment-Oral (MELA-O). Districts are required to submit MELA-O scores (for speaking and listening) for each enrolled K-2 LEP student via the Department's online security portal. Scores for all other students were submitted via answer booklets used for the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) reading and writing test.

K-2 Reading and Writing Assessments

Massachusetts will administer the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT) published by Ballard & Tighe to all LEP students in grades K-2 on March 12-16, 2007.

Grades 3-12

The Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) program annually tests all LEP students in grades 3-12 in reading, writing, speaking and listening. These tests are based on the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes for English Language Learners. This document identifies English proficiency content standards in reading comprehension, writing, listening comprehension and speaking. For more information about the MEPA program, including test design, test administration guidelines and reports of results, see http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/mepa/. A technical report for the MEPA program will be released during the 2006-07 school year.

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2005-2006** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information. The information following the chart is meant to explain what is being requested under each column.

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2005-2006 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State

Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP (3)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency: Number and Percentage at Basic or **Level 1** (4)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or **Level 2** (5)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or **Level 3** (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 4** (7)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 5** (8)	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MEPA	31482	29890	93.90	4880	16.30	3490	11.70	9228	30.90	12292	41.10		
MELA-O Listening	17554	17508	99.70	1036	5.90	2154	12.30	4779	27.30	9539	54.50		
MELA-O Speaking	17554	17506	99.70	1393	8.00	2614	15.00	5339	30.50	8160	46.50		
		47397											

Comments: The MEPA is a G.3-12 assessment only, but it does encompass all elements of the MELA-O which is administered for grades K-2 (Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening). More information is available at: www.doe.mass.edu/ell/assess.html.

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

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	**Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**	**Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State**
1. Spanish	28506	55.20
2. Portuguese	4587	9.40
3. Khmer	2320	4.50
4. Creole	2086	4.00
5. Vietnamese	1833	3.60
6. Chinese	1676	3.30
7. Cape Verdean	1532	3.00
8. Russian	831	1.60
9. Arabic	698	1.40
10. Canton Dialect	576	1.10
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.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2005-2006 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III

Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency										Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (8)	
			Number and Percentage at Basic or **Level 1** (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or **Level 2** (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or **Level 3** (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 4** (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 5** (7)			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MEPA (3-12)	27537	94.80	4639	16.80	3249	11.80	8531	31.00	11118	40.40			18137	35.10
MELA-O Speaking	16284	99.70	999	6.20	2037	12.50	4433	27.20	8815	54.20				
MELA-O Listening	16282	99.70	1346	8.20	2476	15.10	4949	30.30	7511	46.40				
	43820													

Comments: The MEPA is a G.3-12 assessment only, but it does encompass all elements of the MELA-O which is administered for grades K-2 (Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening). More information is available at: www.doe.mass.edu/ell/assess.html.

(1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
(2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year.
(3-7) In columns three-seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2005-2006 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
(8) In column eight, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

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

Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
22217	19686	0

Comments:

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

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

The Massachusetts Department of Education has not made changes to its definition of "proficient" in English since our last submission of the 2004-05 Consolidated State Performance Report.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

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

1. **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;**
2. **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).**

STATE RESPONSE

The Massachusetts Department of Education has not made changes to its definition of "making progress" in learning English since our last submission of the 2004-05 Consolidated State Performance Report.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort
If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.
STATE RESPONSE
The Massachusetts Department of Education has not made changes to its definition of "cohort" since our last submission of the 2004-05 Consolidated State Performance Report.

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

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

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

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

English Language Proficiency	**Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English**				**Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency**			
2005-2006 School Year	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
	% 55.00	# 15425	% 64.00	# 17858	% 45.00	# 10680	% 49.00	# 11480

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

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

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

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

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

Definitions:

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

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

	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	**ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS**	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	55.00	16070	64.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		9140	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	45.00	10264	48.00
TOTAL			

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

*** Monitored LEP students are those who**

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

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards
[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information	
	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	53
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **making progress**	49
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **attaining** English proficiency	43
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **AYP**	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	43
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	49
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet **any** AMAO	4
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	47
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the **State** meet **all** three Title III AMAOs? *	No
Comments: Seven Title III districts did not receive AYP determinations for the LEP subgroup due to a small N size. Therefore, these districts were not eligible to meet all three AMAOs.	
* 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	440	46.10
4	501	40.30
5	246	30.80
6	241	34.40
7	205	33.80
8	235	47.10
H.S.	187	40.60

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	361	45.60
4	434	40.90
5	194	31.00
6	196	33.90
7	158	31.80
8	189	44.80
H.S.	157	40.80

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	
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: The Massachusetts Department of Education did not calculate a graduation rate for the 2004-05 school year due to the lack of the required number of years of data. The Department is in the process of developing the methodology to calculate a cohort graduation rate for the 2005-06 school year. These data will be available in February 2007.	

In the interim, the Department has been approved to use a transitional measure for accountability purposes, the Competency Determination (CD) rate. This rate measures the percentage of 12th graders who have met or exceeded the Needs Improvement threshold on both the 10th grade English Language Arts and Mathematics MCAS tests. It is important to note that the Department does not consider the CD rate to be a graduation rate, and its results should not be considered as such.

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	3.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.60
Black, non-Hispanic	6.30
Hispanic	9.10
White, non-Hispanic	2.80
Students with Disabilities	5.60
Limited English Proficient	9.30
Economically Disadvantaged	6.40
Migrant	10.60
Male	4.40
Female	3.20
Comments: The data presented have been verified and are accurate.	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

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

STATE RESPONSE

State Regulation 603 CMR 27.03 (3): Every school committee shall operate the schools within its district at least 180 school days in a school year.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	368	313
LEAs with Subgrants	20	20

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	226	1041
1	186	729
2	179	701
3	201	664
4	193	619
5	158	533
6	199	520
7	224	519
8	255	495
9	315	595
10	227	407
11	198	326
12	213	230

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	1206	3741
Doubled-up	1270	3381
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	62	132
Hotels/Motels	150	225
Unknown	86	0

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 *served* by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	751
1	718
2	695
3	660
4	619
5	526
6	525
7	530
8	486
9	601
10	416
11	324
12	324
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
334
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
441
Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

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

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)
0
Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

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

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	993
English Language Learners (ELL)	1105
Gifted and Talented	11
Vocational Education	116
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	19
Expedited evaluations	17
Staff professional development and awareness	17
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	19
Transportation	19
Early childhood programs	19
Assistance with participation in school programs	19
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	18
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	18
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	19
Coordination between schools and agencies	18
Counseling	20
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	15
Clothing to meet a school requirement	14
School supplies	19
Referral to other programs and services	19
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	16
Other (optional)	5

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	5
School selection	7
Transportation	9
School records	3
Immunizations or other medical records	3
Other enrollment issues	5

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
Preschool Transportation	1
Availability of Transportation	1
Identification - Hidden Homeless	1

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	402	167
Grade 4	Yes	373	208
Grade 5	DNA		
Grade 6	DNA		
Grade 7	Yes	209	131
Grade 8	DNA		
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	198	124
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:

Mathematics Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	DNA		
Grade 4	Yes	380	192
Grade 5	DNA		
Grade 6	Yes	281	112
Grade 7	DNA		
Grade 8	Yes	258	110
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	191	104
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:

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