

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614	
Expiration Date: 07/31/2007	
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2005-2006	<input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2005-2006
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Michigan	
Address: PO Box 30008 Lansing MI 48909	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: MaryAlice Galloway	
Telephone: 517-241-4185	
Fax: 517-335-4565	
e-mail: gallowaym@michigan.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Jeremy M. Hughes	
_____	_____
PM	Wednesday, February 28, 2007, 4:27:03
Signature	Date

In the data verification process questions were asked about section 1.4.3.1. We verified the list of schools and districts in need of improvement and the phases of improvement. The data were correct as submitted. Responses to all other data verification questions appear in the comments box in each section.

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 response to data verification request on 1.1: Science standards have been part of the Michigan Curriculum Framework since its publication in 1997. Science standards were updated in 2000. Michigan published approved high school content expectations for biology, chemistry, physics and earth science in August 2006, but the high school science assessment in 2005-06 was still based on the 2000 standards. The elementary and middle school science assessments were also based on the 2000 standards in the Michigan Curriculum Framework.

The Michigan Curriculum Framework Content Standards and Draft Benchmarks were adopted in 1995 and represent rigorous academic standards for student performance in all core subject areas. The science standards were revised in 2000. Since their adoption, the science standards and benchmarks have been the basis for science assessment development. The No Child Left Behind Act called for the implementation of assessments based on rigorous academic standards in science by the year 2005-06. The content expectations are Michigan's response to this mandate. While the Michigan Curriculum Framework is the full scope of the science curriculum, the content expectations are specific and clarify what it is that students are expected to know and do on assessments. They will directly correlate to items on the science assessments. High School Content Expectations were developed and disseminated for English language arts and mathematics in April 2006. The Office of School Improvement, which houses the curriculum unit in the Michigan Department of Education, recently finished high school science content expectations that were approved by the State Board of Education on October 10, 2006. The high school expectations are organized by four disciplines: chemistry, physics, biology, and earth science. A formal statewide dissemination program, described below, followed the approval and continues until January, 2007. Currently, content expectations for elementary and middle school are being developed. Once developed, the elementary and middle school expectations will be reviewed by a group of scholars and presented to the State Board of Education in spring, 2007. Following this presentation, a national review, legislative review, as well as public review across the state will be held. Revisions will be made, and presented for State Board of Education approval in November 2007. Statewide dissemination will follow. The Office of School Improvement has a formal consistent dissemination plan for all content expectation rollouts as follows: 3 regional presentations for ISD personnel, professional organizations, higher education; 10 smaller regional presentations for district staff; break-out sessions for major conferences sponsored by educational organizations; and personal appearances by the science consultant. All documents, presentation times and dates are posted on the MDE website as soon as is practical after Board approval.

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 with the 2005-2006 school year, all public schools and districts in Michigan are required to assess students in grades 3-9, and at least once prior to the end of grade 11. (Grade 9 was added for social studies in order to avoid having four content area assessments together in any elementary and middle school grades.) The administration window for grades 3-9 is

October 3-21, 2005; the high school assessment window is March 20-April 14, 2006.

MI-Access assessments at these grades are under revision and will be given in the Spring of 2007 for this school year, but were given during the same test window as the MEAP assessment for school year 2005-06. Unique to Michigan's assessment system is the major commitment it has made over the years and makes today to involvement by front line educators at all stages of the program. Teachers and curriculum coordinators develop and review standards, develop and review items, score writing responses, set cut scores, and participate in training sessions.

Grade level content expectations and extended GLCEs have been developed for both English language arts and mathematics to identify grade-specific topics and skills that are the basis for the MEAP and MI-Access assessments at grades 3-8. These content expectations also guide the development of field-test items for new assessments, which are embedded in multiple operational forms of the assessments. The embedding of field-test items enables the release of all operational assessment items for grades 3-8 and eliminates the need for stand-alone pilot testing.

Science assessments, both MEAP and MI-Access, are provided at grades 5, 8 and 11. The content is based on grade-span benchmarks. A science task force is meeting to consider revisions to the content standards and assessment design for grades 5 and 8. The State Board of Education adopted high school content expectations for Biology, Physics, Chemistry and Earth Science in September 2006.

Social studies, although it is not part of the NCLB legislation, is also based on grade-span benchmarks and is assessed in the MEAP program in grades 6, 9 and 11. MI-Access does not include a social studies component at this time, nor does it include a science component. At the high school level, the high school assessments are now based upon benchmarks that cover the high school grade spans of the Michigan Curriculum Framework. In late 2004, the Michigan legislature adopted state legislative bills (Senate Bills 1153-1157) that replace the MEAP High School Assessment (HSA) with the Michigan Merit Exam (MME), a college entrance and/or college readiness assessment augmented, if necessary, to fully assess Michigan standards and benchmarks.

The proposed high school assessment plan and design has been submitted to the United States Department of Education for approval. The MEAP high school assessment was used for school year 2005-06.

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

The Michigan State Board of Education adopted academic achievement standards on the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) for grades 3-8 and High School in January 2006. Academic achievement standards were set for English language arts, mathematics, science and social studies for the MEAP assessment. The MEAP is the current general assessment for Michigan students in grades 3-8 and High School. At the same time, the State Board also adopted standards on the grade 3-8 and High School MI-Access assessments for English language arts and mathematics. The MI-Access assessments are Michigan's alternate assessments for students with significant, moderate, and mild cognitive disabilities.

The Michigan Merit Examination will replace the High School MEAP in the spring of 2007. In preparation for that transition, the Michigan State Board of Education has adopted academic achievement standards on the MME as concurred from the High School MEAP. Michigan is also revising its high school content expectations, and new Merit examinations will be implemented for the new content standards. When the new examinations are put into place, new standards will be set for the new examinations.

The MI-Access assessments for students with significant and moderate cognitive disabilities are currently being redesigned for spring of 2007. Soon after the first administration of these new MI-Access assessments, achievement standards will again be set for those students.

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	871738	98.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	8438	96.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	20966	96.80
Black, non-Hispanic	173573	95.80
Hispanic	36782	96.80
White, non-Hispanic	627821	99.00
Students with Disabilities	110382	96.40
Limited English Proficient	24423	97.10
Economically Disadvantaged	306329	97.40
Migrant	3025	96.80
Male	445334	98.10
Female	426404	98.60

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.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	866581	97.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	8431	96.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	20390	96.10
Black, non-Hispanic	171987	94.90
Hispanic	36145	97.10
White, non-Hispanic	625496	98.60
Students with Disabilities	109999	96.40
Limited English Proficient	22998	91.50
Economically Disadvantaged	303953	96.60
Migrant	2973	95.10
Male	442311	97.40
Female	424270	98.10

Comments: Note that 1,425 Limited English Proficient students were exempt from the English language arts assessment because they were in the first year of school in the U.S.

- 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	91372	82.80
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	19010	17.20

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	89443	81.30
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	20556	18.70

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	120152	85.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1160	84.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	3322	92.90
Black, non-Hispanic	24261	70.40
Hispanic	5864	78.10
White, non-Hispanic	84782	90.70
Students with Disabilities	14775	68.30
Limited English Proficient	4704	75.70
Economically Disadvantaged	46872	77.00
Migrant	403	75.40
Male	61476	85.90
Female	58676	86.00

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.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	119605	77.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	1161	72.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	3224	85.60
Black, non-Hispanic	24135	61.70
Hispanic	5765	64.90
White, non-Hispanic	84563	82.60
Students with Disabilities	14734	51.40
Limited English Proficient	4443	55.30
Economically Disadvantaged	46557	64.80
Migrant	396	58.30
Male	61161	73.30
Female	58444	80.40

Comments:

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	120799	80.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	1134	80.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	3191	90.60
Black, non-Hispanic	24118	59.30
Hispanic	5672	70.20
White, non-Hispanic	86006	86.80
Students with Disabilities	16020	58.10
Limited English Proficient	4176	64.90
Economically Disadvantaged	46041	68.90
Migrant	351	69.50
Male	61704	85.60
Female	59095	85.50

Comments: Michigan uses demographics reported in the Single Record Student database to identify LEP and migrant students.

Michigan set new performance standards for its assessments in grades 3-9 for the 2005-06 school year.

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	120308	75.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	1128	70.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	3094	84.30
Black, non-Hispanic	24015	58.50
Hispanic	5576	62.00
White, non-Hispanic	85815	80.40
Students with Disabilities	15970	44.70
Limited English Proficient	3922	51.10
Economically Disadvantaged	45939	61.10
Migrant	349	52.70
Male	61444	70.00
Female	58864	78.80

Comments: Michigan uses demographics reported in the Single Record Student database to identify LEP and migrant students.

Michigan set new performance standards for its assessments in grades 3-9 for the 2005-06 school year.

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	123713	72.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	1228	68.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	3163	85.30
Black, non-Hispanic	24670	47.50
Hispanic	5766	60.10
White, non-Hispanic	88257	79.60
Students with Disabilities	16399	47.80
Limited English Proficient	3975	55.30
Economically Disadvantaged	46822	57.20
Migrant	386	60.60
Male	63400	72.60
Female	60313	72.00

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.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	123304	74.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	1229	68.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	3071	84.40
Black, non-Hispanic	24603	55.90
Hispanic	5685	62.80
White, non-Hispanic	88088	79.90
Students with Disabilities	17026	42.10
Limited English Proficient	3763	50.90
Economically Disadvantaged	46583	59.60
Migrant	382	51.30
Male	63165	69.00
Female	60139	78.30

Comments:

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	127037	64.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1268	60.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	2908	83.00
Black, non-Hispanic	27104	35.60
Hispanic	5503	51.60
White, non-Hispanic	89674	73.40
Students with Disabilities	16608	34.40
Limited English Proficient	3477	43.00
Economically Disadvantaged	47462	46.70
Migrant	541	50.50
Male	65386	63.60
Female	61651	65.60

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.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	126418	76.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1263	73.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	2805	85.50
Black, non-Hispanic	26867	57.20
Hispanic	5408	64.90
White, non-Hispanic	86499	82.40
Students with Disabilities	16794	39.60
Limited English Proficient	3260	51.90
Economically Disadvantaged	47078	62.10
Migrant	529	61.60
Male	65034	70.30
Female	61384	81.50

Comments:

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	131968	58.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1282	52.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2871	77.50
Black, non-Hispanic	28180	28.30
Hispanic	5365	41.80
White, non-Hispanic	93646	68.50
Students with Disabilities	17281	26.00
Limited English Proficient	3297	33.60
Economically Disadvantaged	47539	39.30
Migrant	549	42.10
Male	67789	58.60
Female	64179	59.00

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.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	131343	72.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1279	65.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2810	83.30
Black, non-Hispanic	27914	51.60
Hispanic	5282	60.40
White, non-Hispanic	93442	79.00
Students with Disabilities	17173	34.80
Limited English Proficient	3078	44.60
Economically Disadvantaged	47125	56.00
Migrant	533	56.50
Male	67415	65.50
Female	63928	78.20

Comments: Michigan uses demographics reported in the Single Record Student database to identify LEP and migrant students.

Some Limited English Proficient students were exempt from the English language arts assessment because the students has been enrolled in school in the U.S. less than a year prior to the assessment window.

- 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	132809	62.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1308	53.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2818	80.00
Black, non-Hispanic	27455	33.80
Hispanic	5227	46.20
White, non-Hispanic	95437	70.90
Students with Disabilities	17347	26.90
Limited English Proficient	3035	35.60
Economically Disadvantaged	45562	43.60
Migrant	481	45.70
Male	68068	62.10
Female	64741	62.30

Comments: Michigan uses demographics reported in the Single Record Student database to identify LEP and migrant students.

- 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	132205	69.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1300	58.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2755	81.10
Black, non-Hispanic	27220	48.90
Hispanic	5148	54.40
White, non-Hispanic	95224	75.70
Students with Disabilities	16909	31.90
Limited English Proficient	2863	36.90
Economically Disadvantaged	45187	52.10
Migrant	470	50.60
Male	67771	62.20
Female	64434	75.00

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	115260	48.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1058	39.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	2693	66.70
Black, non-Hispanic	17785	17.90
Hispanic	3385	29.40
White, non-Hispanic	90019	54.50
Students with Disabilities	11752	19.40
Limited English Proficient	1759	18.70
Economically Disadvantaged	26031	27.70
Migrant	314	32.50
Male	57511	48.40
Female	57749	48.10

Comments: Michigan uses demographics reported in the Single Record Student database to identify LEP and migrant students.

- 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	113398	54.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1071	45.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2361	64.80
Black, non-Hispanic	17233	33.60
Hispanic	3281	37.30
White, non-Hispanic	88865	58.70
Students with Disabilities	11393	16.20
Limited English Proficient	1669	15.80
Economically Disadvantaged	25484	35.60
Migrant	314	39.50
Male	56321	47.70
Female	57077	60.80

Comments: Michigan uses demographics reported in the Single Record Student database to identify LEP and migrant students.

- 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	3746	3231	86.30

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	541	541	100.00

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	2013	1762	87.50

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	510	510	100.00

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.

In response to data verification question about section 1.4.3.2: Original formatting did not carry into the EDEN website. Formatting has been corrected for clarity.

During the 2005-06 school year, Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring were awarded Title I School Improvement grants to help schools obtain the technical assistance and professional development they need to effectively implement the school improvement or corrective action plans, engage in high-quality planning for restructuring, or implement their restructuring plans. Many of these schools used the funds to obtain the services of school coaches who were trained in a coaches' institute designed specifically for this purpose and supported with state-level Title II,

Part A funds.

A regional support system for schools identified for corrective action or restructuring was also in place during the 2005-06 school year. Regional assistance grants were awarded to intermediate school districts and local educational agencies with a portion of Michigan's 4% Title I School Improvement set-aside funds. This support system provided direct technical assistance to identified schools through intermediate school district school improvement specialists who were responsible for ensuring that all schools receive appropriate, coordinated assistance from the various providers available to the schools.

Michigan Department of Education consultant staff also partnered with the intermediate school districts in this effort, involving local school district staff, school coaches, Comprehensive School Reform providers, regional literacy and math/science center staff, and any other providers assigned to the identified schools.

In addition, the Michigan Department of Education regional consultants continue to utilize a diagnostic on-site review process with selected schools identified for corrective action. This process is designed to help district and school staff do an in-depth analysis of current programs and practices in a school and target appropriate areas for corrective action.

The Department focused assistance on Phase 5 and Phase 6 schools identified for restructuring by contracting with trained educators to conduct a Critical Schools Audit in each of the identified buildings. This review of educational and organizational practice was based on the research areas included in the Michigan School Improvement Framework. This approach helped strategically focus the intervention in the school. Schools were required to implement one of the recommended actions from the Critical Schools Audit when applying for the building level school improvement funding.

The Michigan Department of Education is in the process of escalating its statewide support system and accountability for High Priority Schools through increased partnerships with intermediate school districts, local educational agencies, and other educational organizations. The Department is building increased capacity to support and assist High Priority Schools through technical and regional assistance grants to intermediate school districts (ISDs), local educational agencies (LEAs) and other organizations representing ISD/ESAs.

A significant portion of the Title I set-side funds will be used to provide technical and regional assistance grants to support initiatives in schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring to improve academic achievement, as well as increase accountability. These funds will be used to:

1. Provide an expert evaluation team for the highest needs schools to determine the reasons for the school's persistent lack of adequate yearly progress.
2. Provide intensive, year long assistance to address each school's identified focus area needs.
3. Provide professional staff who will work collaboratively with Michigan Department of Education to directly serve high priority schools.
4. Provide staff and systems for data information management, professional learning, and increased accountability.

5.Hire school coaches to provide technical assistance and professional development needed to effectively implement school improvement or corrective action plans, engage in high-quality planning for restructuring, or implement restructuring plans.

In addition to the increased statewide system of support and technical assistance, Title I schools identified for corrective action or restructuring have been awarded Title I School Improvement Grants for the 2006-07 school year. These funds will be used to support professional development in the area where the school is not making AYP.

Title I schools that have been identified for improvement or continuing improvement have also been provided with a "MI-MAP" toolkit which contains practical strategies for assessing a school's current program and developing a high-yield school improvement plan. The toolkit was developed by a group of "Partner Educators" who worked intensively with a set of low performing

schools under a state-funded initiative to improve achievement in the state's highest-need schools. Training on the use of the toolkit has been provided to district and school staff, as well as Michigan Department of Education consultants, and intermediate school district school improvement specialists.

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.

All of Michigan's identified districts have been notified regarding the requirement to develop or revise district improvement plans and to reserve at least 10% of their Title I, Part A allocations for professional development that is specifically designed to improve classroom teaching. All except four of the identified districts also have Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring. The measures, described in Section 1.4.3.2 that are being taken to address the problems of the identified schools, should directly impact the reasons why the districts are identified.

Michigan Department of Education consultants from the Office of School Improvement are working individually with the identified districts to ensure that each district has a coherent improvement plan that coordinates improvement efforts at the individual schools and addresses district-wide problems. MDE consultants are also working with intermediate school district staff and other partners to ensure that the identified districts have access to high quality technical assistance to support their improvement plans.

All of the districts identified for improvement in 2006-07 are in a delay status due to making Adequate Yearly Progress based on 2005-06 assessment data. If these districts continue to make progress, they will no longer be identified in 2007-08.

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.	14
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. How many of these schools were charter schools?	
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.	599
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.	126921
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.	993
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.	993
Comments: We do not have the data for question 2.	

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.	36
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	13316
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.	113919
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.	26020
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	187500	182610	97.40
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	7726	7679	99.40
Low-Poverty Schools	10701	10671	99.70
All Elementary Schools	36696	36509	99.50
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	20582	19805	96.20
Low-Poverty Schools	69447	67670	97.40
All Secondary Schools	150187	145519	96.90

Comments: In response to data verification question about section 1.5.1: In the data submission for 2005-06 some schools were listed as ungraded, neither elementary nor secondary. So, the number of core academic classes in the total picks up the 617 core academic classes taught even though that number cannot be added in to either the elementary or secondary classes. The discrepancy in the total of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers (582) is the result of the same issue. For the current cycle of data collection, schools will all report at the classroom level instead of the school level to eliminate the discrepancy.

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	10.00
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	20.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	70.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	60.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	10.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	30.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments: The Michigan Department of Education has submitted to the USDE a revised plan to ensure that all teachers will be highly qualified by June, 2007 and an equity plan to ensure equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers.	

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	47.20	14.40
Poverty Metric Used	See comments	
Secondary Schools	50.20	15.20
Poverty Metric Used	See comments	

Comments: To calculate high and low poverty quartiles we rank ordered all schools by the percent of students eligible for free meals. In Michigan we use an electronic match between school district enrollment and food stamp eligibles to increase the accuracy of free meal eligible students in secondary schools.

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	79.60

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	<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

Michigan developed its draft English Language Proficiency Standards in 1993. After public review and comment, the Michigan State Board of Education adopted the Standards in April 1994. The English Language Proficiency Standards address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing.. A copy of the Michigan English Language Proficiency Standards can be found here:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/English_Language_Proficiency_K-12_Standards_103705_7.pdf.

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

In the 2005-06 school year, the Michigan Department of Education produced documents to link the English Language Proficiency Standards to the basic core subjects (Mathematics, English Language Arts, Science, and Social Studies). These "Bridge Documents" addressed the academic language used in core subjects to English language proficiency. The Title III Advisory Committee reviewed the draft of these documents and suggested an alternative way of representing the data. The alternative method focused on breaking up the core content in each area by grade level or range and English proficiency level so that teachers know what to expect of students as well as what to teach to students. To date, the mathematics and social studies linking documents has been completed, and the English language arts and science are under way. They are expected to be completed by the end of the 2006-07 school year.

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

Michigan has implemented the first annual administration of the statewide English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA) on April 3-28, 2006. ALL LEP students who are enrolled in grades K-12 at Michigan public schools, including charter schools, are to be assessed with ELPA this spring (2007). Also, all LEP students who are enrolled in private schools, receiving Title III funding, are to be assessed according to agreements with their local districts. A number of accommodations will be available to students with disabilities, including enlarged print and Braille for grades 3-12. Actual accommodations used, as well as languages spoken and other demographic designations are collected for reporting and research purposes. MDE will provide training using a combination of teleconference and live audience format for the administration of the ELPA, especially the speaking section, which is individually administered to students and scored by the assessment administrator.

Michigan's ELPA is a customized assessment. It is aligned with the Michigan English language proficiency standards, which were approved by the State Board of Education in April 2004. Michigan had participated in multi-state consortia to develop an English language proficiency assessment. Based on an independent alignment study, conducted by Norm Webb's research center, it was determined that plans to improve the alignment from a 70 percent match would involve a lengthier, less efficient instrument.

The current ELPA design includes the development of items by Michigan LEP educators under the leadership of a nationally known test developer, use of embedded field test items and multiple forms, as well as the use of a continuous scale to link the assessment results from one grade-span instrument to another. By customizing items, the alignment of the assessment to standards can improve and provide flexibility, when the ELP standards are updated. In addition to analyzing alignment, a Content Advisory Committee and Bias Sensitivity Committee review items that are developed for ELPA. A technical report providing information regarding validity and reliability as well as other statistical measures will be produced after each annual cycle and be used to improve the development of the ELPA assessment for the following year.

ELPA will assess both academic and social language. It is divided into four grade-level spans: K-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12, which correspond to grade spans in Michigan's English Language Proficiency standards. Since LEP students take the assessments that match their grades of enrollment, assessment items have been selected to represent a broad range of difficulty, making it more likely that LEP students who are new to the United States are able to answer some assessment items with some confidence. Areas to be tested and reported include English speaking, listening, reading, writing and comprehension. An item analysis will link each item to ELP standards for classroom instructional use. Proficiency levels, including a basic, intermediate and proficient level for each grade level assessed, will be reported to schools, districts and parents, along with descriptions of each level and actual scale scores received. The results for ELPA will be used annually for the Title III federal reporting of LEP student progress in acquiring English language skills.

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	30439	46.00
2. Arabic	13430	21.00
3. Chaldean/Assyrian	4271	7.00
4. Albanian	3617	5.00
5. Hmong	2508	4.00
6. Bengali	2444	4.00
7. Chinese	2414	4.00
8. Japanese	2312	3.00
9. Vietnamese	2140	3.00
10. Serbo-Croatian	1844	3.00
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
11515	0	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.)

Michigan experienced a decline in the population of immigrant students identified by school districts. In 2004-05, school districts identified 34,575.

Funding for the Immigrant subgrant is based on having at least 20 eligible students and having an increase of immigrant students greater than the State average for one of the two preceding years. Each Immigrant program, receives a base allocation of \$10,000 plus a per pupil amount. In November 2003, the State Board of Education revised the rules for Immigrant subgrant to read: One hundred percent (100%) of the Title III funds will be used for the LEP subgrant if the immigrant portion of the formula excludes more than 50% of the eligible students. For 2005-06, only 1,629 eligible immigrant students would have been in funded districts. That is about 14% of the eligible students. In September 2006, MDE received a memorandum from the Office of English Language Acquisition stating that at least one Immigrant subgrant must be funded. The Michigan Department of Education is revising its funding criteria to comply with this ruling by funding the largest eligible program.

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 Michigan English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA) established a new scale of performance based on the State English Language Proficiency Standards in the five domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Comprehension. The first four domains are tested individually on ELPA, but the Comprehension score is derived from Listening and Reading. ELPA reports a child's performance in each domain as a 2-digit scale score, and the Overall Performance Level as a 3-digit scale score. The Performance Level Descriptors for ELPA are:

Proficient - This student's performance indicates sufficient or well-developed English language acquisition in the areas of reading, writing, listening and speaking as defined for Michigan students at a particular grade level.

High Intermediate - This student's performance indicates near-sufficient or mostly developed English language acquisition in the areas of reading, writing, listening and speaking as defined for Michigan students at a particular grade level.

Low Intermediate - This student's performance indicates partial or developing English language acquisition in the areas of reading, writing, listening and speaking as defined for Michigan students at a particular grade level.

Basic - This student's performance indicates minimal or no English language acquisition in the areas of reading, writing, listening and speaking as defined for Michigan students at a particular grade level.

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

Michigan administered its newly completed English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA) in the 2005-06 school. This replaced the previous six approved tests from which districts can select. The new ELPA test is based on the Michigan English Language Proficiency Standards. It has four performance levels:

1. Basic
2. Low Intermediate
3. High Intermediate, and
4. Proficient.

Standard setting was carried out by panels of educators and other Michigan stakeholders working under the direction of the contractors for ELPA and staff of the Office of Educational Assessment & Accountability at the Michigan Department of Education. Results of the standard setting process with recommended cut scores were presented to the State Board of Education for approval at its September 2006 meeting. The State Board of Education approved the following ELPA raw cut scores by grade and performance level:

Grade Low Intermed High Intermed Proficient Anchor

K 31 42 49 Spring 2006 K-2 Base Form

1 43 54 68 Spring 2006 K-2 Base Form

2 47 60 74 Spring 2006 K-2 Base Form

3 32 52 71 Spring 2006 3-5 Base Form

4 34 55 73 Spring 2006 3-5 Base Form

5 38 58 75 Spring 2006 3-5 Base Form

6 37 61 76 Spring 2006 6-8 Base Form

7 39 65 78 Spring 2006 6-8 Base Form

8 43 66 80 Spring 2006 6-8 Base Form

9 49 69 85 Spring 2006 9-12 Base Form

10 51 70 86 Spring 2006 9-12 Base Form

11 52 75 87 Spring 2006 9-12 Base Form

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

A cohort is composed of all the students who score at a particular English proficiency level on the Michigan English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA) by grade or grade-span. There are four performance levels on ELPA. These are:

1. Basic
2. Low Intermediate
3. High Intermediate, and
4. Proficient

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.

To determine AMAOs, the State needs two years of individual student data. Michigan only has one year of student level data because the State English Language Proficiency Assessment was administered for the first time in 2005-06. Prior to that, LEAs used one of 6 approved English language proficiency assessments and only submitted aggregate results to the State. Under an agreement (Attachment T) with the U.S. Dept. of Education, Michigan is going to the LEAs to retrieve student level data from 2003-04 and 2004-05. The State will use the data to calculate AMAOs at the LEA and State levels. The State will also conduct a study to equate results from various tests to the new State assessment.

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

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

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

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

Definitions:

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

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

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information	
	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	95
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No Response</u>

Comments: Tables 1.6.9 and 1.6.10

To determine AMAOs, the State needs two years of individual student data. Michigan only has one year of student level data because the State English Language Proficiency Assessment was administered for the first time in 2005-06. Prior to that, LEAs used one of 6 approved English language proficiency assessment and only submitted aggregate results to the State. Under an agreement (Attachment T) with the U.S. Dept. of Education, Michigan is going to the LEAs to retrieve student level data from 2003-04 and 2004-05. The State will use the data to calculate AMAOs at the LEA and State levels. The State will also conduct a study to equate results from various tests to the new State assessment.

* 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	839	83.00
4	863	80.70
5	828	79.30
6	595	74.60
7	572	75.30
8	377	65.60
H.S.	0	0.00

Comments:

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	936	92.20
4	937	86.90
5	821	78.20
6	555	69.10
7	469	61.10
8	354	61.10
H.S.	0	0.00

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: We have no schools identified as persistently dangerous at this time.

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	87.70
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 methodology utilized for the 04-05 graduation and dropout rates was the same as used to determine the 03-04 rates; however, migrant and alternative education students (reported in grade-levels 9-12) were included pursuant to changes in the State School Aid Act. We are unable to calculate disaggregated rates at this time. We are in transition to implementing a cohort methodology at which time we will be able to determine disaggregated rates. 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	3.30
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 methodology utilized for the 04-05 graduation and dropout rates was the same as used to determine the 03-04 rates; however, migrant and alternative education students (reported in grade-levels 9-12) were included pursuant to changes in the State School Aid Act. We are unable to calculate disaggregated rates at this time. We are in transition to implementing a cohort methodology at which time we will be able to determine disaggregated rates. 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

Michigan has two semi-annual student count days as provided in the state school aid act. Students must have been enrolled in the school district for the two most recent semi-annual official count days in order to be counted on the state assessment test. Additionally, LEAs must provide 1,098 hours of instruction to each child annually.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	804	455
LEAs with Subgrants	31	30

Comments: The number of districts reporting without a subgrant (455) is exclusive to those districts that receive services from the 31 funded grants.

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		954
1		933
2		891
3		1134
4		1030
5		1128
6		1065
7		1041
8		972
9		1108
10		1028
11		938
12		1012

Comments: LEAs that did not have subgrants did not report any data.

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		4560
Doubled-up		5247
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)		181
Hotels/Motels		507
Unknown		2739

Comments: LEAs without subgrants did not report any data.

* 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	954
1	933
2	891
3	1134
4	1031
5	1128
6	1065
7	1041
8	972
9	1108
10	1028
11	938
12	1012

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

561

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

2492

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)

314

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)	1056
English Language Learners (ELL)	143
Gifted and Talented	53
Vocational Education	114

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	24
Expedited evaluations	12
Staff professional development and awareness	28
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	26
Transportation	27
Early childhood programs	9
Assistance with participation in school programs	25
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	17
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	20
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	28
Coordination between schools and agencies	28
Counseling	16
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	21
Clothing to meet a school requirement	21
School supplies	27
Referral to other programs and services	29
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	20
Other (optional)	0

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	8
School selection	10
Transportation	21
School records	11
Immunizations or other medical records	12
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
None	0
None	0
None	0

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	300	189
Grade 4	Yes	300	198
Grade 5	Yes	301	187
Grade 6	Yes	288	189
Grade 7	Yes	290	139
Grade 8	Yes	260	142
Grade 9	Yes	39	13
Grade 10	Yes	17	<n
Grade 11	Yes	129	117
Grade 12	Yes	86	34

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	307	185
Grade 4	Yes	307	192
Grade 5	Yes	302	164
Grade 6	Yes	289	124
Grade 7	Yes	273	88
Grade 8	Yes	261	125
Grade 9	Yes	32	<n
Grade 10	Yes	15	<n
Grade 11	Yes	113	95
Grade 12	Yes	92	37

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.