CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on

School Year 2005-2006

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Mississippi Department of Education

Address:
P. O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Quentin Ransburg
Telephone: 601-359-3499
Fax: 601-359-2587
e-mail: qransburg@mde.k12.ms.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Hank Bounds

_____ __Thursday, March 01, 2007, 5:20:22 PM__
Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2005-2006

PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).
State Response
Mississippi's Science Curriculum Framework was revised in 2001 and serves as the state's content standards for the purpose of meeting the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). The curriculum frameworks are revised based on the input of teachers, administrators, university faculty and others. In addition, the National Science Standards, current literature and research, and other state frameworks were used to assist in the revision of the framework. The curriculum frameworks are currently in the process of being reviewed and revised in light of national/professional standards and developments in the area of science. The revision will be completed in 2007 and the revised curriculum fully implemented in 2009-10.

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

Mississippi has had assessments for reading/language arts and mathematics since 2000-2001 for grades 2-8 and grade 10 (Algebra I and English II). Science assessment for grade 10 (Biology) has been in place since 2000-2001.

Development of science assessments for grade 5 and grade 8 was begun in 2003-04. During 2003-04 the test blueprint, test specifications, item specifications,

and test items were developed for the grade 5 and grade 8 assessment. An item tryout occurred on March 8, 2005. A field test of test forms for grades 5 and 8 was scheduled to be administered in March 2006 but was delayed until March 2007 due to the impact of Hurricane Katrina. The first operational administration will occur in March 2008.

Based on the regulations issued on December 9, 2003, the Mississippi Department of Education has begun work to revise alternate assessments for students with disabilities based on alternate achievement standards. A pilot of the revised alternate assessment for language arts/reading and mathematics occurred in the spring of 2005. The revised alternate assessment, called the Mississippi Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks, was implemented

statewide for the 2005-06 school year. The alternate assessment for science will be developed and piloted in 2006-07 and administered statewide in 2007-08.

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

Mississippi has had academic achievement standards for reading/language arts and mathematics since 2000-2001 for grades 2-8. Academic achievement standards for grade 10 reading/language arts (English II) were set in 2001. Academic achievement standards for grade 10 mathematics (Algebra I) were set in 2002. Academic achievement standards for grade 10 science (Biology) were set in November 2004. Academic achievement standards for grade 5 and grade 8 science will occur following the spring 2008 administration.

Academic achievement standards on the alternate assessment for students with disabilities based on alternate achievement standards were set in 2001. These standards were revised in June 2006 based on the revised alternate

assessment pursuant to the regulations issued on December 9, 2003.

In addition, Mississippi has recently completed a revision of the language arts and mathematics curriculum frameworks that increases the academic expectations across grades kindergarten through twelve. Based on these revisions Mississippi is revising the language arts and mathematics assessments to match the expectations of the revised curricula. The revised assessments will be field tested in the spring of 2007 and first administered in the 2007-08 school year. Revised academic achievement standards will be set following this test administration.

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	252875	93.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	421	96.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1882	99.00
Black, non-Hispanic	128630	97.00
Hispanic	3183	97.00
White, non-Hispanic	118759	98.00
Students with Disabilities	23029	86.00
Limited English Proficient	1493	97.00
Economically Disadvantaged	152468	97.00
Migrant	570	95.00
Male	127002	97.00
Female	125873	98.00

Comments:

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

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	254027	94.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	420	96.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1909	99.00
Black, non-Hispanic	129080	97.00
Hispanic	3159	97.00
White, non-Hispanic	119459	98.00
Students with Disabilities	23012	86.00
Limited English Proficient	1490	97.00
Economically Disadvantaged	152768	97.00
Migrant	554	95.00
Male	127258	97.00
Female	126769	98.00

Comments:

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

1.2.2.1 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	25120	92.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	<n	<n
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2189	8.00
Comments:		

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment		
	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	**Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested**
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	25559	91.90
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	<n	<n
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2240	8.10
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	36461	92.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	87	92.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	293	98.60
Black, non-Hispanic	18424	88.40
Hispanic	526	92.20
White, non-Hispanic	17131	96.00
Students with Disabilities	4032	74.60
Limited English Proficient	301	90.70
Economically Disadvantaged	22079	89.70
Migrant	96	92.70
Male	18578	91.10
Female	17883	93.20

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	36421	86.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	87	86.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	294	95.20
Black, non-Hispanic	18396	80.80
Hispanic	525	82.30
White, non-Hispanic	17119	93.00
Students with Disabilities	3958	58.00
Limited English Proficient	300	75.30
Economically Disadvantaged	22045	82.60
Migrant	95	76.80
Male	18531	84.10
Female	17890	89.30

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	36211	82.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	53	84.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	287	96.50
Black, non-Hispanic	18145	73.30
Hispanic	534	85.20
White, non-Hispanic	17192	91.00
Students with Disabilities	3879	53.10
Limited English Proficient	306	82.70
Economically Disadvantaged	22038	76.50
Migrant	102	77.50
Male	18449	81.40
Female	17762	82.80

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	36153	87.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	50	90.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	287	96.20
Black, non-Hispanic	18109	82.40
Hispanic	530	84.00
White, non-Hispanic	17177	93.50
Students with Disabilities	3799	53.70
Limited English Proficient	305	79.30
Economically Disadvantaged	21979	83.90
Migrant	102	78.40
Male	18398	84.70
Female	17755	91.10

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	37304	70.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	63	68.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	271	93.70
Black, non-Hispanic	19306	59.00
Hispanic	482	70.30
White, non-Hispanic	17182	83.50
Students with Disabilities	3798	32.80
Limited English Proficient	245	64.10
Economically Disadvantaged	22935	62.90
Migrant	109	67.90
Male	18712	69.70
Female	18592	71.60

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	37291	83.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	64	79.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	270	93.00
Black, non-Hispanic	19274	76.70
Hispanic	482	77.60
White, non-Hispanic	17201	91.60
Students with Disabilities	3758	42.70
Limited English Proficient	244	68.00
Economically Disadvantaged	22918	78.70
Migrant	110	78.20
Male	18686	80.70
Female	18605	86.70

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	37650	72.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	69.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	251	94.80
Black, non-Hispanic	19680	62.20
Hispanic	501	78.00
White, non-Hispanic	17159	84.00
Students with Disabilities	3722	27.70
Limited English Proficient	223	69.10
Economically Disadvantaged	23816	65.90
Migrant	92	64.10
Male	19225	71.20
Female	18425	74.10

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	37690	74.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	59	72.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	250	89.20
Black, non-Hispanic	19682	64.90
Hispanic	503	72.20
White, non-Hispanic	17196	86.00
Students with Disabilities	3722	26.80
Limited English Proficient	224	58.00
Economically Disadvantaged	23834	68.40
Migrant	92	66.30
Male	19234	72.70
Female	18456	77.00

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	39111	57.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	56	58.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	284	87.30
Black, non-Hispanic	20540	42.50
Hispanic	428	57.70
White, non-Hispanic	17803	74.00
Students with Disabilities	3521	14.70
Limited English Proficient	173	50.90
Economically Disadvantaged	24435	48.70
Migrant	73	49.30
Male	19880	57.40
Female	19231	57.30

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	39181	59.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	57	52.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	284	80.30
Black, non-Hispanic	20579	43.60
Hispanic	425	51.30
White, non-Hispanic	17836	77.00
Students with Disabilities	3526	15.90
Limited English Proficient	172	42.40
Economically Disadvantaged	24484	49.90
Migrant	73	35.60
Male	19906	57.70
Female	19275	60.70

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	37232	59.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	52	51.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	249	87.60
Black, non-Hispanic	18792	43.90
Hispanic	414	64.00
White, non-Hispanic	17725	74.80
Students with Disabilities	3132	14.30
Limited English Proficient	152	50.00
Economically Disadvantaged	22080	50.00
Migrant	54	63.00
Male	18635	58.40
Female	18597	59.90

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	37352	55.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	53	50.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	247	81.00
Black, non-Hispanic	18837	38.40
Hispanic	415	58.10
White, non-Hispanic	17800	73.00
Students with Disabilities	3175	13.50
Limited English Proficient	151	40.40
Economically Disadvantaged	22157	45.30
Migrant	54	53.70
Male	18692	53.70
Female	18660	57.10

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	28902	53.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	51	56.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	247	81.00
Black, non-Hispanic	13739	39.20
Hispanic	298	67.10
White, non-Hispanic	14567	66.40
Students with Disabilities	944	27.70
Limited English Proficient	93	61.30
Economically Disadvantaged	15081	46.00
Migrant	44	72.70
Male	13521	54.10
Female	15381	53.20

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	29934	37.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	50	32.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	277	54.50
Black, non-Hispanic	14199	20.70
Hispanic	279	37.30
White, non-Hispanic	15129	52.10
Students with Disabilities	1072	7.70
Limited English Proficient	94	23.40
Economically Disadvantaged	15346	26.60
Migrant	28	17.90
Male	13808	33.90
Female	16126	39.70

Comments: (1) Small N-counts are subject to variation from year to year.

(2) More students with disabilities were tested on grade level in 2005-2006.

- 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	850	712	84.00
Comments:			
District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	141	73	52.00
Comments: Decreased percentage was primarily due to a change in calculations performed to calculate test participation rates in 2006.			

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	668	562	84.00
Comments:			
Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	141	73	52.00
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.

1. The school forms a committee of teachers, parents, administrators, prinicpals, community leaders and some students (if the High School is identified for school improvement) to analyze student performance and school practice. The data analyzed includes MCT, SATP, and other student performance data such as graduation rate, attendance and participation. The committee analyzes academic achievement, school environment and efficient use of all resources. The committee considers how the results relate to the school mission, school and district goals, and the state's goal of proficiency for all students.

2. The committee identify interventions/strategies to address areas of need, and deficiencies not currently addressed. The committee identifies strategies to directly influence targets that meet NCLB requirements. The committee also identifies intervention to address areas of need by problem solving in groups.

3.The committee develops/revises school plan to reflect targeted deficiencies and NCLB requirements. The committee seeks input and feedback from the entire faculty. The School Improvement Plan is submitted to the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE).

4. The school implements/monitors the plan by forming schoo-based team meetings and documenting ongoing planning and monitoring of progress toward goals. the school also conducts formative assessments. The MDE monitors the schools using the monitoring instrument developed by the MDE and the approved School Improvement Plan to verify implementation of the plan as written. The MDE also gathers data on the number of student served, number of students receiving supplemental educational services and the number of students offered choice. Site contacts are assigned districts/schools identified for school improvement and/or corrective actions. The Division Director is assigned schoosl identified for restructuring.

5. The MDE provides technical assistance to address the academic problem(s) that caused the school to be identified for school improvement, specific assistance in analyzing assessment data; improving professional development; and improving resource allocation. Technical assistance is an on-going process.

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.
1. The LEA develops or revises improvement plan within three months after identification of improvement to address deficiencies that prevent students from achieving proficiency; improve centralized leadership structure and address LEA insufficiencies relative to leadership for schools, governance and fiscal infrastructures and curriculum and instruction. The LEA forms and consults with a committee of teachers, parents, administrators and community leaders on the following: determination of why LEA's previous efforts to improve were ineffective; framework of detailed action steps to improve on those efforts and identify actions that have greatest likelihood of increasing student achievement. 2. The LEA provides technical assistance that include high-quality professional development for instructional staff that focuses primarily on improving instruction, and include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the schools served by the LEA. The MDE provides technical assistance on development and implementation of required plan, working more effectively with schools identified for improvement, and addressing problems the LEA may have with implementation such as parental involvement measures and providing high-quality professional development.

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.	6
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.	7
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.	60
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.	26327
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.	48
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.	45
Comments: During the 2005-06 school year, there were 80 schools identified for school improvement and for the 2006-07 school year there were 57 schools identified for improvement.	

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.	24
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	3573
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.	10601
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.	362
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	127327	119147	93.60
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	20876	19079	91.40
Low-Poverty Schools	28149	27086	96.20
All Elementary Schools	91662	86605	94.50
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	7057	6036	85.50
Low-Poverty Schools	9450	8967	94.90
All Secondary Schools	35665	32542	91.20
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 though 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	4.10
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	19.60
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	60.30
d) Other (please explain)	16.00
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)	2.70
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	8.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	64.50
d) Other (please explain)	24.80
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	88.00	49.00
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students with National School Lunch Program (NSLP) flag in MSIS set to "F" (free lunch).	
Secondary Schools	80.00	44.00
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students with National School Lunch Program (NSLP) flag in MSIS set to "F" (free lunch).	

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	71.00

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards	
Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?	
Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes
Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).	
STATE RESPONSE	
The English language proficiency (ELP) standards and objectives for reading/language arts were developed for students limited in English proficiency (LEP) as part of the requirements of Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The language proficiency standards were approved by the State Board of Education as a part of the Guidelines for English Language Learners available at http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/docs/ell_guidelines_2005.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

To ensure that limited English proficient (LEP) students, including immigrant children and youth, develop English proficiency and meet the same academic content and achievement standards required of all children, the Mississippi

Department of Education, through the Office of Reading, Early Childhood and Language Arts, established an English Language Acquisition Practitioners Committee. The Committee was charged with

Â· establishing annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs);

Â· evaluating assessment tools for identifying and assessing students' English proficiency levels; and

Â· identifying language instruction programs based on scientific research (on-going since October 2003).

The Committee reviewed the language arts and mathematics curriculum and their alignment language proficiency standards. Based on the review adjustments to the language proficiency standards were made in 2003.

The State's curriculum frameworks for reading/language arts and mathematics have been revised; therefore, the Practitioners committee will review the existing ELP standards and objectives to ensure their alignment and linkage to

the academic content. Due to the revision of the curriculum frameworks, the standards and objectives may have to be revised as well. Mississippi continues to develop suggested teaching strategies and informal, observational

assessments to correlate with the ELP standards and objectives.

The revision process for the science curriculum framework began in January 2005. Members of the Practitioners committee will attend the scheduled curriculum revision meetings to begin establishing ELP standards and objectives

for science, ensuring that they are aligned and linked to the academic content and achievement standards being developed. ELP standards will address grades K-12 and the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

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

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in grades K-12 is required as a part of the state policy. Also, the required student reports submitted by each district are compared to the file in MSIS for month six (6) to verify that the LEP students were assessed.

2. The use of the uniform assessment for Mississippi, the Stanford English Language Proficiency (ELP) Test , is required to assess all LEP students. The Stanford ELP Test assesses the students in the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension.

3. The state ensured the ELP assessment is based on the ELP standards through the vendor supplied alignment.

4. The technical quality, specifically the validity and reliability, of the Stanford English Language Proficiency (ELP) tests is addressed in the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test Technical Manual. (Reference: Technical Report/Manual for Stanford English Language Proficiency Tests (ELPT), Harcourt Assessment Inc., San Antonio, TX)

The test validity is primarily based on test content (relationship between test content and the construct it measures), internal structure (relationships of test items and test components to the construct), and the relationships to other variables (relationship of test scores to variables external to the test).

The reliability is determined by the extent to which it yields consistent results from year to year and form to form. The reliability coefficients for all levels of the Stanford ELP tests are 0.93 or higher.

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

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

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

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2005-2006 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State

Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP (3)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency									
				Number and Percentage at Basic or **Level 1** (4)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or **Level 2** (5)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or **Level 3** (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 4** (7)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 5** (8)	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		4866											

Comments: MS uses the Stanford English Language Proficiency (ELP) Test to assess all LEP students. The test yields 6 proficiency levels (Pre-Production, Early Production, Emergent, Intermediate, High-Intermediate, and Transitional). The table above allows for only 5 levels of proficiency. Therefore, we cannot report our data using this online format. Please use the following

URL to download the data for 1.6.3.1. (ftp://research.mde.k12.ms.us/pub/lep/CSPR 2005-2006 ELP 1_6_3_1.doc)

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

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	**Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**	**Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State**
1. Spanish	4065	0.90
2. Vietnamese	225	0.10
3. Arabic	83	0.00
4. Cantonese	51	0.00
5. Russain	36	0.00
6. Tagalog	25	0.00
7. Portugese	25	0.00
8. Korean	18	0.00
9. Japanese	14	0.00
10. Creole	<n	<n
Comments:		

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

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

Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency										Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (8)	
			Number and Percentage at Basic or **Level 1** (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or **Level 2** (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or **Level 3** (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 4** (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 5** (7)			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	3611													

Comments: MS uses the Stanford English Language Proficiency (ELP) Test to assess all LEP students. The test yields 6 proficiency levels (Pre-Production, Early Production, Emergent, Intermediate, High-Intermediate, and Transitional). The table above allows for only 5 levels of proficiency. Therefore, we cannot report our data using this online format. Please use the following

URL to download the data for 1.6.3.3. (ftp://research.mde.k12.ms.us/pub/lep/CSPR 2005-2006 ELP 1_6_3_3.doc)

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

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

Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
1961	777	18

Comments:

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

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have been made since 2004-2005.

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

No changes have been made since 2004-2005.

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
No changes have been made since 2004-2005.

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	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#

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.

MS defined AMAO targets for students "making progress in learning English" and "attaining English Proficiency" by cohort. The cohorts were defined as Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3 LEP students. The table above does not allow the data to be entered by cohort. Please use the following URL to download the data for 1.6.8 (ftp://research.mde.k12.ms.us/pub/lep/CSPR 2005-2006 ELP 1_6_8.doc).

The above problem is also true for Table 1.6.9. Please use the following URL to download the data for 1.6.9 (ftp://research.mde.k12.ms.us/pub/lep/CSPR 2005-2006 ELP 1_6_9.doc).

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	70.50	615	90.70
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		63	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	39.30	1076	45.50
TOTAL			

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

*** Monitored LEP students are those who**

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information	
	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	26
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **making progress**	26
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **attaining** English proficiency	20
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **AYP**	26
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	20
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	6
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet **any** AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the **State** meet **all** three Title III AMAOs? *	Yes
Comments:	
* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.	

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	57	89.10
4	76	97.40
5	52	85.20
6	34	73.90
7	29	65.90
8	25	69.40
H.S.	10	35.70

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	60	93.80
4	74	94.90
5	47	77.00
6	36	78.30
7	33	75.00
8	29	80.60
H.S.	19	82.60

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	85.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	
Comments: Formal procedures for calculation official aggregate and disaggregated graduation rates are currently out for public comment under the State's Administrative Procedures Act.	
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	1.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.60
Black, non-Hispanic	1.20
Hispanic	0.60
White, non-Hispanic	0.80
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	1.30
Female	0.70
Comments: Dropout data not available for Students with Disabilities, Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged 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	135	0
LEAs with Subgrants	17	17
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		445
1		568
2		746
3		473
4		574
5		516
6		625
7		494
8		471
9		460
10		599
11		287
12		297
Comments: Data not collected for LEAs without subgrants		

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		
Doubled-up		
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)		
Hotels/Motels		
Unknown		

Comments: Data not collected.

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

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

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

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth *served* by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	445
1	568
2	746
3	473
4	574
5	516
6	625
7	494
8	471
9	460
10	599
11	287
12	297
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
142
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
473
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)
170
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)	220
English Language Learners (ELL)	151
Gifted and Talented	177
Vocational Education	601
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	2706
Expedited evaluations	52
Staff professional development and awareness	250
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	180
Transportation	2702
Early childhood programs	155
Assistance with participation in school programs	518
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	2605
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	489
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	1407
Coordination between schools and agencies	1255
Counseling	881
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	78
Clothing to meet a school requirement	1623
School supplies	4081
Referral to other programs and services	1106
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	104
Other (optional)	3

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	143
School selection	17
Transportation	316
School records	219
Immunizations or other medical records	183
Other enrollment issues	6

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

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

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

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

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	294	218
Grade 4	Yes	277	200
Grade 5	Yes	262	193
Grade 6	Yes	272	162
Grade 7	Yes	261	103
Grade 8	Yes	247	116
Grade 9	No		
Grade 10	No		
Grade 11	No		
Grade 12	No		

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	295	235
Grade 4	Yes	277	173
Grade 5	Yes	263	164
Grade 6	Yes	276	164
Grade 7	Yes	263	114
Grade 8	Yes	252	105
Grade 9	No		
Grade 10	Yes	22	18
Grade 11	No		
Grade 12	No		

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.