

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 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

Missouri currently does have academic content standards in science and has been administering grade-span science tests since 1999 to students in grades 3, 7 and 10. Achievement level score reports are provided to students and schools. Over the past two years new science assessments have been developed for students in grades 5, 8, and 11. These new grade-span tests were field tested in the spring of 2006 and eventually will replace the current grade-span tested being administered at grades 3, 7 and 10. A standard setting conference is scheduled for the fall of 2006. To be in compliance with the science test provision of NCLB, the newly developed science tests will be administered as operational assessments in the spring of 2008.

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

Mathematics and Communication Arts:

Missouri administered grade-level assessments (grades 3-8, 10 and 11) in math and communication arts beginning in the spring of 2006. A standard setting conference for these assessments was held in December 2005. Alternate assessments in math and communication arts for students with severe cognitive disabilities have also been developed. These alternate assessments were developed from the state's grade-level content standards or grade-level expectations and will be administered in the same grades as the regular state assessments. An achievement level setting conference was held in June 2006 to establish the cut points for the academic achievement standards.

Response - Yes, alternate assessments were administered in 2005-06 in reading and math at grades 3 - 8 and at grade 10 for mathematics and 11 for communication arts. Missouri's Assessment Program (MAP) was a grade span assessment prior to 2006; which tested students in grades 3, 7 and 11 for communication arts and 4, 8 and 10 in mathematics. A standard setting conference was held December 7-9, 2005 to establish academic achievement standards in math and communication arts for the state's new grade-level assessments; which were administered in the spring of 2006 at grades 3-8 and 10 in mathematics and 3-8 and 11 in communication arts.

Science:

The state response to item 1.1.1 documents the state's progress in the development and implementation of the state science assessment. As noted in 1.1.1, the grade-span science assessments will be administered to all students in grades 5, 8 and 11 in the spring of 2008. An alternate assessment is being developed that is aligned to the science content standards or science grade-level expectations. The alternate assessment will be implemented in the spring of 2008; and, a June 2008 standard setting conference to establish alternate achievement standards which are also aligned to the regular grade-span achievement standards is planned.

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

A standard setting conference was held December 7-9, 2005 to establish academic achievement standards in math and communication arts for the state's new grade-level assessments. Standard setting panelists were primarily classroom teachers. School administrators and non-school employees were also on the panels. A science standard setting conference is scheduled for the fall of 2006.

The Missouri alternate assessments in math and communication arts were administered and scored in the spring of 2006. Alternate academic achievement standards were established in June 2006. As noted in the State response to 1.1.2, the development of the alternate science assessment began in the summer of 2006 with the actual implementation scheduled for the spring of 2008. An achievement level setting conference for the science alternate assessment is set for June 2008.

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	480518	99.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	2079	99.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	7577	99.60
Black, non-Hispanic	86536	98.80
Hispanic	14822	99.50
White, non-Hispanic	365915	99.50
Students with Disabilities	71812	95.40
Limited English Proficient	10396	99.30
Economically Disadvantaged	192553	99.20
Migrant	965	99.60
Male	244266	99.30
Female	232052	99.50

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.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	472972	98.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	2007	98.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	7313	96.70
Black, non-Hispanic	83748	98.20
Hispanic	14025	96.80
White, non-Hispanic	359730	99.10
Students with Disabilities	68646	95.20
Limited English Proficient	9394	92.20
Economically Disadvantaged	186027	98.40
Migrant	958	97.20
Male	238377	98.60
Female	227882	99.10

Comments:

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

1.2.2 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	71812	95.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3468	4.60
Comments: Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards number is included in the Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations.		

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	68646	95.20
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3473	4.80
Comments: Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards number is included in the Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations.		

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	65211	10.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	252	13.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1153	16.60
Black, non-Hispanic	11868	3.50
Hispanic	2266	5.30
White, non-Hispanic	49590	12.00
Students with Disabilities	10602	6.50
Limited English Proficient	1969	5.30
Economically Disadvantaged	28851	5.10
Migrant	106	0.90
Male	33164	10.90
Female	31886	9.70

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.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	64777	17.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	247	19.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	1113	25.70
Black, non-Hispanic	11763	7.20
Hispanic	2194	8.40
White, non-Hispanic	49390	19.70
Students with Disabilities	10373	8.20
Limited English Proficient	1841	7.00
Economically Disadvantaged	28565	9.50
Migrant	107	3.70
Male	32872	14.10
Female	31748	20.30

Comments: The numbers are different from the previous year because we introduced new tests; grades 3 - 8 with 4 Achievement Levels instead of 5.

- 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	65757	9.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	272	6.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	1152	20.10
Black, non-Hispanic	11680	2.80
Hispanic	2210	4.70
White, non-Hispanic	50369	10.80
Students with Disabilities	10664	4.80
Limited English Proficient	1794	3.90
Economically Disadvantaged	28529	4.70
Migrant	115	2.60
Male	33405	9.80
Female	32182	8.80

Comments: The numbers are different from the previous year because we introduced new tests; grades 3 - 8 with 4 Achievement Levels instead of 5.

- 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	65485	15.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	272	11.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1110	23.20
Black, non-Hispanic	11648	6.40
Hispanic	2148	7.70
White, non-Hispanic	50224	17.60
Students with Disabilities	10530	6.30
Limited English Proficient	1657	4.40
Economically Disadvantaged	28446	8.20
Migrant	114	1.80
Male	33252	12.00
Female	32080	18.70

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.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	66594	10.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	284	10.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1170	25.20
Black, non-Hispanic	12164	3.30
Hispanic	2278	6.70
White, non-Hispanic	50619	12.50
Students with Disabilities	10471	4.30
Limited English Proficient	1719	6.00
Economically Disadvantaged	28426	5.20
Migrant	189	7.40
Male	34351	11.60
Female	32086	10.00

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	66333	15.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	278	11.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	1137	29.00
Black, non-Hispanic	12124	6.00
Hispanic	2192	8.90
White, non-Hispanic	50524	18.10
Students with Disabilities	10315	4.90
Limited English Proficient	1571	5.70
Economically Disadvantaged	28296	7.70
Migrant	188	12.20
Male	34211	13.20
Female	31997	18.50

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.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	67459	9.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	2.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	1041	24.10
Black, non-Hispanic	12680	2.00
Hispanic	2106	4.00
White, non-Hispanic	51286	11.60
Students with Disabilities	9978	3.20
Limited English Proficient	1414	4.90
Economically Disadvantaged	28172	4.00
Migrant	198	6.60
Male	34660	10.20
Female	32671	9.20

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.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	67210	10.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	6.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1020	21.80
Black, non-Hispanic	12626	2.70
Hispanic	2053	4.70
White, non-Hispanic	51194	12.90
Students with Disabilities	9804	2.70
Limited English Proficient	1315	2.70
Economically Disadvantaged	27967	4.50
Migrant	193	11.40
Male	34467	8.30
Female	32607	13.50

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	71098	10.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	7.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1004	26.20
Black, non-Hispanic	13599	1.80
Hispanic	2126	3.90
White, non-Hispanic	53918	12.70
Students with Disabilities	10489	2.70
Limited English Proficient	1306	3.10
Economically Disadvantaged	29096	4.10
Migrant	198	11.60
Male	36665	10.90
Female	34205	10.10

Comments:

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	70500	12.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	322	8.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	976	22.40
Black, non-Hispanic	13453	3.20
Hispanic	2058	5.60
White, non-Hispanic	53607	15.10
Students with Disabilities	10186	2.80
Limited English Proficient	1185	2.80
Economically Disadvantaged	28731	5.40
Migrant	207	20.30
Male	36281	10.90
Female	34048	14.40

Comments: The numbers are different from the previous year because we introduced new tests; grades 3 - 8 with 4 Achievement Levels instead of 5.

- 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	73001	12.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	366	7.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1015	28.60
Black, non-Hispanic	13245	2.20
Hispanic	2090	6.30
White, non-Hispanic	56174	14.90
Students with Disabilities	10538	2.50
Limited English Proficient	1224	5.90
Economically Disadvantaged	28333	5.10
Migrant	94	5.30
Male	37478	13.20
Female	35330	11.70

Comments: The numbers are different from the previous year because we introduced new tests; grades 3 - 8 with 4 Achievement Levels instead of 5.

- 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	72767	15.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	371	12.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	997	28.70
Black, non-Hispanic	13229	3.60
Hispanic	2043	8.40
White, non-Hispanic	56023	18.10
Students with Disabilities	10359	2.40
Limited English Proficient	1156	3.60
Economically Disadvantaged	28236	6.60
Migrant	92	7.60
Male	37346	11.40
Female	35250	19.40

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.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	68431	10.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	309	8.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1042	26.30
Black, non-Hispanic	11300	1.50
Hispanic	1746	4.40
White, non-Hispanic	53959	12.10
Students with Disabilities	9056	1.70
Limited English Proficient	970	2.90
Economically Disadvantaged	21146	3.60
Migrant	65	1.50
Male	34543	11.70
Female	33692	9.00

Comments: The numbers are different from the previous year because we introduced new tests; grades 3 - 8 with 4 Achievement Levels instead of 5.

- 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	60279	11.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	247	9.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	960	21.20
Black, non-Hispanic	8905	2.70
Hispanic	1337	5.10
White, non-Hispanic	48768	12.50
Students with Disabilities	7078	2.50
Limited English Proficient	669	2.20
Economically Disadvantaged	15786	4.60
Migrant	57	1.80
Male	29948	8.70
Female	30152	13.30

Comments: The numbers are different from the previous year because we introduced new tests; grades 3 - 8 with 4 Achievement Levels instead of 5.

- 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	2061	1458	70.70

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	527	324	61.50

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	1028	765	74.40

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	523	324	62.00

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.

Missouri has 11 Federal Instructional Improvement Supervisors who work directly in the schools with teachers and administrators to reform instructional practices in the buildings.

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.

We have no districts identified for school improvement.

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.	126
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.	99
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.	252
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.	22051
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.	273
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.	273
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.	74
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2844
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.	30519
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
Comments:	

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	164065	158063	96.30
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	15001	13681	91.20
Low-Poverty Schools	29136	28740	98.60
All Elementary Schools	83149	80138	96.40
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	9616	8568	89.10
Low-Poverty Schools	35335	34740	98.30
All Secondary Schools	80916	77925	96.30

Comments: In a letter dated June 26, 2006, from Henry Johnson, USDE, The Assistant Secretary, states that DESE has committed to submit complete and accurate HQT data for the 2005-06 school year by 11-01-06. All parties further acknowledge that Missouri will not submit complete, accurate data for the 2004-05 school year.

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	7.90
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	0.10
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	92.00
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)	6.40
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	2.80
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	90.80
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	65.80	33.10
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students who qualify for the free and reduced lunch program.	
Secondary Schools	56.40	28.40
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students who qualify for the free and reduced lunch program.	

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	61.80

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	<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

The State of Missouri, through the Missouri Migrant Education and English Language (MELL) program, integrated resources under the Title I-C and Title III programs of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) to better serve English Language Learners (ELL) and migrant students. The program prevents duplication of services and allows most Title I-C and Title III funds to reach districts with needy children. State's ELP standards are being implemented through this reorganization.

The MELL staff provides service delivery at nine strategic locations throughout the state. Each center is staffed with at least one instructional specialist. Regions with a high incidence of migrants are also staffed with a migrant recruiter. The MELL director coordinates the nine regional centers from an office in Jefferson City. This central MELL office processes the migrant data.

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), located in Jefferson City, funds the MELL centers and the MELL director's office through contracts with school districts or institutions of higher education. DESE also allocates Title I-C and Title III funding to school districts for direct services to the targeted students.

The main purpose of the MELL program is to provide quality services and build capacity in the school districts that implement the state's ELP standards as outlined in Title III of the NCLB Act. Specific goals include:

- â€¢ assisting with decisions on how Title I-C and Title III funds are to be appropriately expended.
- â€¢ providing professional development opportunities to build capacity in delivering sound, research based services to ELL and migrant students and their families.
- â€¢ providing information to school districts to help them comply with federal and state guidelines for ELL and migrant education.
- â€¢ providing information and assistance with ELL/migrant identification, recruitment and enrollment.
- â€¢ providing development opportunities to build capacity in educational programs and strategies that will empower parental involvement in the education of ELL and migrant students.
- â€¢ providing assistance to enhance English language proficiency, academic performance and achievement of the same student population.

Although MELL staff may model good service-delivery practices in districts that are new to providing services to ELL and migrant students, the MELL program does not include direct services to students. School districts implement State's ELP standards, which require providing services directly to migrant and ELL students. Districts are responsible for the implementation of policies and instruction, including program design. DESE conceptualizes the policies within federal requirements, and the MELL program bridges the delivery of policies to districts with technical support for compliance and instruction. The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) is the state body that ensures all districts are in compliance and all students, including migrant and ELL students, are receiving services appropriate to their needs as required by state and federal law. The MELL director ensures that MELL staff is

extending services to all school districts within the corresponding regions. DESE staff works collaboratively with the MELL office to discuss issues and to find solutions for any challenges. DESE is responsible for evaluating the MELL program and making appropriate changes.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

As indicated previously, Missouri existing ELP Standards are being revised to align them with Show Me Standards (State standards) and TESOL Standards. Appendix A, B, C, and D provide letters and committee members being conveyed to revise the first revised draft. In addition, discussions with MAC II test provider, TASA, are in progress to customize this adopted state testing tool for English language learners.

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 Response
- 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

Meeting of the working groups are already scheduled for November and December 2006. Appendix A, B, C, and D provide more details on the composition of the working groups and incentives.

Appendix A-Appendix: A ELP Standards Progress: June 30, 2006

Dear Craig and Shawn,

Attached to an email is the first draft of the English Language Proficiency Progress Indicators for the Communication Arts GLEs, and the English Language Proficiency Revised Standards with ESL Progress Indicators.

The Communication Arts Grade Level Expectations now have progress indicators on 5 language levels for each (Basic Beginner, Beginner, Low Intermediate, High Intermediate, Advanced/Proficient). By having such, the document will provide the modification and adaptation for ELLs that all districts can apply to their Communication Arts curriculum. Then, mainstream teachers in K-12 Communication Arts will have suggested modifications for ELLs to reach the grade level CA standard.

Secondly, we identified the appropriate GLEs for ESL classes and make them the benchmarks for the revised MO English Language Proficiency Standards. The revised ELP Standards are aligned completely with the Show-ME standards, the GLEs, and the new TESOL standards, thus allowing ESL teachers to formulate their own district ESL curriculum while addressing the GLEs.

However, our work is not quite through. Both drafts will require the following for project completion:

1) formatting of the Working Group's drafts;

2) a statewide meeting in August or September of ESL coordinators, Communication Arts teachers, and ESL teachers to edit and approve the submitted draft (approximately 40 people) of the Comm Arts document;

3) a statewide meeting in August or September of ESL coordinators and ESL teachers to edit and approve the submitted draft (approximately 30 people) of the ELP Standards document;

4) review and approval by IHE representatives from TESOL programs and DESE representatives;

5) submission of the ELP Standards to Office of English Language Acquisition;

6) integration of Comm Arts document with Communication Arts GLEs;

publication of integrated document on DESE website and to districts.

7)publication of the revised Missouri ELP Standards and Progress Indicators on the DESE website.

To address #1 above, I would recommend you hire someone who can further edit and revise the progress indicators for the ELP Standards before the statewide revision. In addition, this person (or another) will need to format the ELP Standards document.

To address #2 above, I would recommend the following people who wrote this first draft:

Working Group:

ESL Teachers:Lana Andrews-Cape Girardeau, Charlotte Daniel-Kansas City,Martha Epperson-Hancock Place,Melanie Fraga-Jefferson City, Catherine Frazier-Warrensburg, Sheila Phillips-St. Charles, Rita Sanders-St. Joseph, Courtney Siewert-Moniteau County R-I

MELL Instructional Specialists:

Jenifer Albright- Kansas City Region, Theresa Armentrout-NE Region, Susan Hanan-Mid-Missouri Region, Martha Tummons-South Central Region, Jennifer Shackles-Southwest Region, Becky Smith-West Central Region

In addition to the people above, I would add the remaining MELL Instructional Specialists (Sandra, Jesse, and the Northwest person) and the following teachers or coordinators who have requested to be part of the project:

Jennifer Morrison-Springfield R-12, Bob Headrick-Rockwood, Beckie Hocks-Columbia 93, Ellen Kubiak-Ritenour School District

I suggest asking Ron Long and Adelaide Parsons to help at the next stage before the review at the IHE level. You and Shawn can then add all the people you need to invite for political reasons; please just get us enough classroom-based knowledgeable teachers so that the progress indicators are truly useable.

Appendix B -Appendix: B ELP Standards Progress-October letter

On behalf of Missouri Migrant Education and English Language Learning in conjunction with the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Federal Discretionary Grants division, I am inviting you to serve on a statewide group of ESOL teachers and coordinators to write progress indicators for the new draft of the Missouri English Language Proficiency Standards.

History: When TESOL published its first set of Standards in 1997, four teachers from Missouri provided examples and background for the vignettes included in ESL Standards for Pre-K-12 Students. In 2003, Missouri published its English Language Proficiency Standards in compliance with NCLB. Now, TESOL has published new standards in 2006 that focus on teaching language through the core-content areas and teaching English through content-based activities. Because of this shift in focus, the Missouri English Language Proficiency Standards (2003) needed revision.

At this point, DESE and MELL are bringing together a statewide group of ESOL teachers, ESOL coordinators and MELL Instructional Specialists to edit and write progress indicators for the revised ELP Standards. Using the national TESOL standards and selected Communication Arts GLEs, this group will compose progress indicators on five language-proficiency levels so that districts can write standards-based ESOL curriculum aligned with the Show-Me Standards, Curricular Frameworks, and Grade Level Equivalents.

The group will meet for two days November 28 and 29, 2006 at the Capitol Plaza Hotel in Jefferson City, Missouri. We will meet on Tuesday, November 28 from 8:30 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. (registration will be from 8-8:30 a.m.) and on Wednesday, November 29 from 8:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m. Participants' hotel rooms for the nights of Nov. 27 and 28 will be provided as will continental breakfast and lunch both days. Substitutes, mileage and dinners (Nov. 27 and 28) will be reimbursed. Please RSVP to Cassie Williams (cslevin@mo-mell.org or 573-893-8931) by November 10, 2006 to let us know if you will or will not be able to attend.

If your district supervisor has questions concerning the nature of the project, please contact Craig Rector craig.rector@dese.mo.gov or me shawn@mo-mell.org. I hope you can join us for this very important and necessary meeting.

Appendix: C ELP Standards Progress-Revision Committee-November 28-29

Suggested Participants for ELP Standards

*Served on Working Group

Lana Andrews*-Cape Girardeau, Melanie Fraga*-Jefferson City, Beckie Hocks-Columbia, Courtney Siewert*-Moniteau Co. R-I, Chris Renault-Lee Summit, Julie Hammonds-Milan C-2, Michael Gregory-Joplin, Mary Littlefield-McDonald Co. R-I, Jennifer Morrison-Springfield R-XII, Ellen Kubiak-Ritenour, Sheila Phillips*-St. Charles, Catherine Frazier*-Warrensburg, Winney Gill-Belton, Karen Sanders-Sedalia, Adelaide Parsons-SEMO, Rita Sanders*-Chillicothe, Susan Schindler-ESL Consultant, Robert Headrick-Rockwood, Nahed Chapman-St. Louis, Janet Nease-Park Hill, Charlotte Daniel*-Kansas City, Linda Innes-Center, Judy Truillo-Columbia

Appendix D - ELP Standards Progress-Revision Committee-DEC 4-5

Nancy Amelunke-Columbia, Catherine Frazier*-Warrensburg, Amy Stephens-Kirkwood, Courtney Siewert*-Moniteau Co. R-I, Coral Russell-Carthage, Becky Smith-West Central, Sheila Phillips*-St. Charles, Barb Raines-Pettis County R-V, Carol Tooley-Francis-Howell, Tracey Walter-Park Hill, Cheri Erdel-Mexico 59, Charlotte Daniel-Kansas City, Sara Rutter-Columbia, Rita Sanders*-Chillicothe, Phyllis Chancellor-Neosho, Barbara Oxford-Hayti R-II, Jennifer Shackles-Southwest Region, Rick Edwards-California, Lois Hahn-St. Joseph, Cindy Cardin-Monett, Sandra Gaddy-Rogersville, Radonna Fox-Hornersville, Linda Leonard-Ritenour, Jenifer Albright-Kansas City, JoAnn Reese-Waynesville, Mary Ann Wamhoff-Wentzville, Lana Andrews*-Cape Girardeau, Jesse DeLeon-Southeast Region, Melanie Fraga*-Jefferson City, Aida Greenberg-Pattonville, Kathy Pfeifer-Carthage, Sheila Robertson-Ferguson-Florissant, Vicky McLain-Waynesville

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	10339	54.00
2. Bosnian/Serbo/Croatian	1987	10.00
3. Vietnamese	959	5.00
4. Arabic	646	5.00
5. Somali	625	3.00
6. Korean	502	3.00
7. Chinese	465	2.00
8. Russian	453	2.00
9. Farsi	273	1.00
10. Bengali	227	1.00
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 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
7195	4770	34

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.)

There is no change.

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

There is no change

To be considered as "proficient", a student must score at "Advanced" level for each domain at his/her 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

(There is no change)

Missouri's ELP standards identify three levels - beginning, intermediate, and advanced. In analyzing data from the MACII, basic and beginner correlate to beginning in the standards, low intermediate and high intermediate correlate to intermediate and advanced is advanced. Students must progress in all domains in order to be considered to have moved to the next level of English language Proficiency,

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

(There is no change)

Background:

MACII is the statewide assessment tool that assesses the English Language Proficiency. Grade levels group testing: K-1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12.

MAP is the statewide assessment tool that assesses the students' academic achievement in two content areas: Communication Arts for grades 3, 7, and 11; Mathematics for grades 4, 8, and 10.

Definition:

To conduct a meaningful analysis of the student progress in English proficiency and academic achievement, the state of Missouri defines a cohort as - a grouping of grade levels that fit both the MAC II and the MAP testing spans specified as Grade levels K-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12.

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

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

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

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 77.00	# 0	% 0.00	# 0	% 14.00	# 0	% 21.30	# 3670

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.

We did not have a student information system in place at the time the test was given and therefore could not track the progress on individual children.

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	0.00	0	0.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		0	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	0.00	3274	21.00
TOTAL		3274	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	70
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	35
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	36
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	18
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	4
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	24
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	29
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	13
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments: We did not have a student information system in place at the time the test was given and therefore could not track the progress on individual children.

* 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	177	34.00
4	150	34.70
5	174	41.30
6	93	25.60
7	90	26.50
8	68	20.10
H.S.	50	23.10

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	214	40.90
4	174	40.70
5	179	42.80
6	111	30.20
7	86	25.00
8	97	28.70
H.S.	70	27.30

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	85.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	83.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	94.50
Black, non-Hispanic	77.10
Hispanic	81.50
White, non-Hispanic	87.50
Students with Disabilities	83.50
Limited English Proficient	82.30
Economically Disadvantaged	79.70
Migrant	0.00
Male	83.70
Female	88.00

Comments: We do not collect graduation rates for 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.

1.8.2 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	3.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.60
Black, non-Hispanic	6.30
Hispanic	5.10
White, non-Hispanic	3.10
Students with Disabilities	4.40
Limited English Proficient	0.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	4.20
Female	3.20

Comments: We do not have the data to calculate the corresponding dropout rates for Economically Disadvantaged, LEP and Migrant.

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

The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	507	418
LEAs with Subgrants	7	7

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	1116	231
1	1058	163
2	1087	178
3	997	173
4	1066	127
5	1041	156
6	841	148
7	1008	144
8	802	129
9	849	177
10	704	153
11	694	167
12	691	171

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	1914	315
Doubled-up	8461	1505
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	549	91
Hotels/Motels	630	167
Unknown	400	39

Comments:

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	194
1	136
2	154
3	152
4	123
5	150
6	126
7	112
8	103
9	134
10	116
11	108
12	108

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

69

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

158

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)

<n

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)	298
English Language Learners (ELL)	74
Gifted and Talented	<n
Vocational Education	<n

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

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

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	7
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	7
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	6
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	4
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	6
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	6
Coordination between schools and agencies	6
Counseling	7
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	4
Clothing to meet a school requirement	6
School supplies	6
Referral to other programs and services	6
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	5
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	4
School selection	2
Transportation	3
School records	5
Immunizations or other medical records	3
Other enrollment issues	1

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

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

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Absenteeism	1
Locating parent/guardian	1
Other*	3

Comments: *Follow up on medical/dental needs - 1

***Coordination of services with family court- 1**

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	96	36
Grade 4	N/A	0	0
Grade 5	N/A	0	0
Grade 6	N/A	0	0
Grade 7	Yes	81	<n
Grade 8	N/A	0	0
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	N/A	0	0
Grade 11	Yes	83	<n
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	N/A	0	0
Grade 4	Yes	78	33
Grade 5	N/A	0	0
Grade 6	N/A	0	0
Grade 7	N/A	0	0
Grade 8	Yes	69	<n
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	77	<n
Grade 11	N/A	0	0
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

Comments:

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