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:
New Hampshire

Address:
101 Pleasant St.
Concord, NH 03301

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Virginia Clifford
Telephone: 603-271-3769
Fax: 603-271-2760
e-mail: vclifford@ed.state.nh.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Lyonel B. Tracy

_____ __Thursday, March 01, 2007, 8:27:11 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

The History of the NH Science Frameworks The state of New Hampshire adopted the NH Science Frameworks in January 1996. These frameworks, based on the draft National Science Education Standards[1] and Benchmarks for Science Literacy[2], provided guidance for what we would assess in our state science assessment. We tested all students in NH in science at the ends of grades 6 and 10 to determine how well districts were developing science curricula which would improve what all students should know and be able to do in science. Due to budgetary constraints, NH suspended the Science Assessment in school year 2003-2004.

Realizing that NCLB required a science assessment by 2008, in March 2004 we began a thorough review of the NH Science Frameworks and relative research and literature. The goal of this process was to revise our science frameworks to reflect changes in our understanding of how children learn science in the classroom and to guide the development of a rigorous science assessment that will drive change in instructional practice.

As we began our internal review, we joined with Rhode Island and Vermont to develop guidance for a common assessment that would look at specific content covered in all three states' frameworks (standards). We spent a great deal of time analyzing the research about how students learn and looked at how to focus our assessment on those things that would improve classroom practice and expose more students, across all three states, to challenging science curricula. The NECAP Tri-State Science Assessment will be given at the end of Grades 4, 8, and 11 and will consist of three test sessions (one session will be performance).

To date more than one hundred and fifty NH educators and community members have been involved with the revision process and the development of the Tri-State Science Assessment. The revised frameworks (standards), now referred to as the "NH Framework for Science Literacy K-12" were approved by the NH State Board of Education in June 2006.

The new "NH Frameworks for Science Literacy K-12" includes Grade Span Expectations (GSEs) which clearly delineate expected content for 2 or 3 year grade spans. Tri-State Targets are highlighted but they are not the only things included in the framework. In order to provide guidance but allow for some local flexibility, grade spans include: K to 4 (K-2, 3-4); 5 to 8 (5-6, 7-8); and 9 to 12 (9-11 basic, 11 -12 advanced level).

[1] National Science Education Standards, Â© 1995, National Academy of Science

[2] Benchmarks for Science Literacy, Â© 1993, American Association for the Advancement of Science

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

Status Of State's Compliance With NCLB Assessments 1111(b)(3). New Hampshire has reading, writing and mathematics grade level expectations (GLEs) for grades 3-8. In addition New Hampshire has developed grade span expectations (GSEs) for high school. These GLEs and GSEs are the basis for the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) test specifications. The NECAP test was first administered to students in grades 3-8 during October, 2005. The assessment based upon the high school grade-span expectations was field tested in November 2006. The NECAP High School Test will become operational in the fall of 2007, when it will be administered to beginning grade 11 students.

In May, 2006, the NHEIAP grade 10 assessment was administered for the last time as it will be replaced by the NECAP high school beginning of grade 11 assessment in the fall of 2007.

Process for Developing Assessments

NH has state-wide English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science Curriculum Committees, Test Item Review Committees, a Bias and Sensitivity Review Committee, and Standard Setting Panels. The Curriculum, Test Item Review, and Bias Committees have been meeting at regular intervals since January 2003 to provide input into the design of both the GLEs and the statewide tests. The committees are made up of K-12 public and non-public school teachers and administrators, community members, informal educators and representatives from Higher Education. In January, 2006, Standard Setting Panels, composed of certified educators from several of the state's LEAs, for each grade (3-8) and each content area assessed (Reading, Mathematics and Writing) met to review state testing results and to set cut scores for the achievement levels on the newly operational NECAP tests. An alignment study is being conducted in December 2006.

Role of Public Comment

During the pilot of the NECAP assessment and again during the first operational administration of the NECAP, written feedback was collected from all students taking the tests, from all test coordinators, and from all test administrators. The NH Department of Education also held a number of focus group sessions to receive feedback from stakeholders after the NECAP pilot and again after the first operational test. Feedback received from the pilot was used to improve the design of the operational test and supporting materials.

Process for Developing Science Assessments

New Hampshire in collaboration with RI and VT has developed a blueprint for science assessment and is developing science assessments to be administered at the end of grades 4, 8 and 11 in the spring of 2008, using the same procedure as English Language Arts and Mathematics. The NECAP Science Assessment includes multiple choice, short answer, constructed response, and performance items. The Science test items will be piloted in May 2007.

Process for Developing Alternate Assessments:

In the 2004-2005 school year, in parallel with the development of the NECAP general assessment, New Hampshire implemented an expanded Alternate Assessment based upon alternate achievement standards for students completing grades 2,3,4,5,6,7and 10. The NH alternate assessment is based upon alternate achievement standards linked to essential concepts in math, reading and writing that are described in the NH state curriculum frameworks, The expansion of this alternate assessment from 3 grades to 7 grades was mediated by a statewide Alternate Assessment Advisory Group which is composed of teachers, parents of students with disabilities, school administrative personnel, university representatives, and specialists with in-depth knowledge of various subgroups of students with disabilities. In January, 2006, alternate assessment standard setting panels were created for the reading and mathematics content areas at 2 grade spans: gr. 2-4 and gr. 5-7. These standard setting panels were composed of teachers of alternately assessed students in these grade and content areas. Proficiency level cut

scores were determined for the newly expanded NH alternate assessment at this time. Currently, in response to the USED Peer Review of the New Hampshire assessment system New Hampshire is completing a three stage process that establishes and documents clear linkage between the states grade level achievement standards in reading and mathematics alternate achievement standards.

composed of teachers of alternately assessed students in these grade and content areas. Proficiency level cut scores were determined for the newly expanded NH alternate assessment at this time. Currently, in response to the USED Peer Review of the New Hampshire assessment system New Hampshire is completing a three stage process that establishes and documents clear linkage between the states grade level achievement standards in reading and mathematics alternate achievement standards.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

The New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) assessment was piloted in the fall of 2004 in reading and mathematics for grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. The writing test in grades 5 and 8 was also piloted. The tests are based on the NECAP mathematics, reading, and writing Grade-Level Expectations (GLE's) adopted on June 8, 2005 by the NH State Board of Education. These achievement standards were developed by New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont over a three year period with input from the field. Surveys were posted on-line where input could be collected on an on-going basis. Additionally, there were technical reviews and the Department of Education staff traveled to many schools to receive feedback. At the high school level, the Grade-Span Expectations (GSE's in mathematics and reading) were similarly developed. Again, there have been many field reviews and surveys posted for feedback. The GSE's were developed with Rhode Island and Vermont. These NECAP standards were used to develop a test for high school, piloted this fall (November 2006). The first operational test will be in the fall of 2007. Just like the GLEs, the GSEs also contain local expectations. These new standards were widely distributed and posted on the New Hampshire Department of Education website (www.ed.state.nh.us) and formal public input sessions were held on March 8 and 9, 2006.

Note: the GLEs and GSEs came together to become the revised New Hampshire Mathematics and English Language Arts Curriculum Frameworks approved by the State Board of Education in June 2006. The final versions and information about the review sessions are available through a link from the main Department of Education home page.

In January 2005, New Hampshire conducted, for the first time, a formal standard setting process to determine proficiency level cut scores for our alternate assessment across 2 grade spans on our existing alternate achievement standards. These alternate achievement standards were broadly linked to the general content curriculum across the k-12 grade span. New Hampshire is now developing more finely grained (across smaller grade spans) alternate achievement standards.

The NECAP Science Assessment and Achievement Standards

The process for Science began with the Big Ideas or Unifying Themes of Science and then looked at how those concepts intersected with the content domains of Earth Space, Life, and Physical Sciences. The content was divided into the content domains, to ensure all of the significant topics were converted into statements of "Enduring Knowledge". The intersections (between each unifying theme and each enduring knowledge statement) were crafted into specific content and performance rich "targets" (achievement standards) that would guide the development of questions for the assessment. During the process, each state brought in grade level and content experts to review and refine wording and techniques. Documents on student understanding of science and misconceptions of science were consulted and the National Science Education Standard, Benchmarks for Science Literacy, and the Atlas for Science Literacy were heavily relied upon. Originally, achievement standards were developed for almost all of the intersections between big ideas and domain knowledge statements. It became obvious that grade or level specific targets needed to be refined so that they better fit the content and grade level of the students involved, and that could be assessed on an on-demand assessment. In New Hampshire, the NECAP assessment targets (achievement standards) have been included in the revised New Hampshire Science Framework and are highlighted by a bold box. These targets can be viewed along with other proficiencies which will be assessed at the local level on the Department of New Hampshire website.

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	112221	98.43
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	98.77
Asian or Pacific Islander	2444	97.25
Black, non-Hispanic	1866	97.54
Hispanic	2972	97.83
White, non-Hispanic	104485	98.49
Students with Disabilities	16514	94.12
Limited English Proficient	2265	98.87
Economically Disadvantaged	21082	97.54
Migrant	17	89.47
Male	57792	98.17
Female	54424	98.70

Comments: 133 students had no prime race/ethnicity reported

- 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	112181	98.39
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	98.77
Asian or Pacific Islander	2399	95.46
Black, non-Hispanic	1845	96.45
Hispanic	2917	96.02
White, non-Hispanic	104566	98.57
Students with Disabilities	16543	94.29
Limited English Proficient	2131	93.02
Economically Disadvantaged	21042	97.36
Migrant	17	89.47
Male	57772	98.13
Female	54404	98.67

Comments: 133 students had no prime race/ethnicity reported

- 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	14737	88.10
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	952	5.70
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	14766	88.30
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	952	5.70
Comments:		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	15006	66.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	41	46.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	378	73.00
Black, non-Hispanic	297	40.30
Hispanic	425	44.90
White, non-Hispanic	13840	67.50
Students with Disabilities	1898	34.80
Limited English Proficient	430	38.60
Economically Disadvantaged	3105	47.70
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	7732	67.80
Female	7274	64.70

Comments: missing data: small cell size

- 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	14992	69.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	40	51.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	373	71.00
Black, non-Hispanic	292	46.50
Hispanic	416	45.30
White, non-Hispanic	13844	70.80
Students with Disabilities	1900	28.90
Limited English Proficient	408	37.20
Economically Disadvantaged	3105	51.40
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	7722	66.10
Female	7270	73.20

Comments: Missing data: small cell size

- 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	15207	63.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	58	50.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	373	66.30
Black, non-Hispanic	308	39.80
Hispanic	410	37.90
White, non-Hispanic	14046	64.90
Students with Disabilities	2132	29.30
Limited English Proficient	416	31.70
Economically Disadvantaged	3135	42.70
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	7882	63.50
Female	7324	63.70

Comments: Missing data: cell size too small

- 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	15198	68.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	58	60.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	369	62.40
Black, non-Hispanic	297	41.70
Hispanic	405	40.70
White, non-Hispanic	14057	69.60
Students with Disabilities	2134	26.40
Limited English Proficient	389	27.10
Economically Disadvantaged	3126	47.50
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	7875	62.80
Female	7322	73.60

Comments: Missing data: cell size too small

- 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	15698	62.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	51	43.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	375	68.90
Black, non-Hispanic	272	37.00
Hispanic	416	37.80
White, non-Hispanic	14568	63.50
Students with Disabilities	2403	27.70
Limited English Proficient	357	31.50
Economically Disadvantaged	3282	40.70
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	8102	63.10
Female	7596	61.30

Comments: Missing data: cell size too small

- 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	15697	65.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	51	52.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	365	68.40
Black, non-Hispanic	271	46.40
Hispanic	414	40.40
White, non-Hispanic	14580	66.20
Students with Disabilities	2407	24.10
Limited English Proficient	340	29.60
Economically Disadvantaged	3288	44.10
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	8103	59.70
Female	7594	71.10

Comments: Missing data: cell size too small

- 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	16121	60.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	43	55.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	353	66.70
Black, non-Hispanic	276	38.80
Hispanic	493	37.10
White, non-Hispanic	14938	61.50
Students with Disabilities	2490	21.60
Limited English Proficient	273	30.80
Economically Disadvantaged	3271	38.80
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	8351	60.40
Female	7770	60.40

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.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	16108	64.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	43	55.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	348	66.40
Black, non-Hispanic	276	48.40
Hispanic	484	38.10
White, non-Hispanic	14940	65.50
Students with Disabilities	2490	22.40
Limited English Proficient	253	25.30
Economically Disadvantaged	3260	41.60
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	8345	59.70
Female	7763	69.40

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.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	16401	58.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	42	41.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	337	54.30
Black, non-Hispanic	264	33.00
Hispanic	437	32.10
White, non-Hispanic	15306	59.50
Students with Disabilities	2530	16.80
Limited English Proficient	290	26.10
Economically Disadvantaged	3122	34.40
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	8510	56.80
Female	7890	59.70

Comments: Missing data: cell size too small

- 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	16385	64.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	42	51.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	330	58.60
Black, non-Hispanic	261	41.50
Hispanic	426	38.50
White, non-Hispanic	15311	65.60
Students with Disabilities	2533	22.40
Limited English Proficient	261	24.10
Economically Disadvantaged	3108	40.40
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	8504	59.50
Female	7880	69.50

Comments: Missing data: cell size too small

- 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	17138	54.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	48	37.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	362	54.00
Black, non-Hispanic	238	42.00
Hispanic	406	29.70
White, non-Hispanic	16071	55.60
Students with Disabilities	2714	14.30
Limited English Proficient	259	20.40
Economically Disadvantaged	3006	31.60
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	8708	53.20
Female	8430	56.30

Comments: Missing data: cell size too small

- 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	17143	61.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	48	37.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	358	53.50
Black, non-Hispanic	237	43.30
Hispanic	397	36.70
White, non-Hispanic	16090	62.30
Students with Disabilities	2721	21.10
Limited English Proficient	240	19.60
Economically Disadvantaged	3003	38.00
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	8711	54.40
Female	8432	68.10

Comments: Missing data: cell size too small

- 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	16650	76.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	38	62.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	264	85.00
Black, non-Hispanic	211	53.00
Hispanic	385	53.00
White, non-Hispanic	15716	77.00
Students with Disabilities	2347	38.00
Limited English Proficient	227	40.00
Economically Disadvantaged	2161	57.00
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	8507	75.00
Female	8140	78.00

Comments: The definition of proficiency on the NHEIAP test included the category labeled "basic" in addition to those labeled "proficient" and "advanced".

Missing data: cell size too small

- 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	16658	83.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	39	72.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	256	83.00
Black, non-Hispanic	211	61.00
Hispanic	373	63.00
White, non-Hispanic	15744	84.00
Students with Disabilities	2358	48.00
Limited English Proficient	227	61.00
Economically Disadvantaged	2152	66.00
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	8512	77.00
Female	8143	88.00

Comments: The definition of proficiency on the NHEIAP test included the category labeled "basic" in addition to those labeled "proficient" and "advanced".

Missing data: cell size too small

- 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	467	283	60.00

Comments: Due to the transfer in the spring 2005 from the NHEIAP assessment for grades 3 & 6 to the NECAP assessment for grades 3 - 8 (approved by US DOE Secretary Margaret Spelling 7/19/05) elementary and middle school's AYP was based on attendance rate only, resulting in 92% of the schools making AYP for the 2004-05 school year. New AYP results for 2005-06 school year include testing in reading and mathematics, therefore resulting in a lower percentage.

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	162	110	68.00

Comments:

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	240	143	60.00

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	134	86	64.00

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.

Title I School Improvement funds were provided to Title I schools newly identified "In Need Of Improvement" for planning. Committees were organized to establish goals and develop an action plan. Once the plan is submitted, implementation funds are available for schools to implement their plan.

Title I schools who were previously identified "In Need Of Improvement" complete a School Improvement Plan Progress Report and request for additional funding to help to continue the implementation of their plan.

Common areas in which many schools are focusing:

- align curriculum with Grade Level and Grade Span Expectations;

- data analysis;

- instructional models that incorporate research-based practices that have

been proven to be effective in improving student achievement;

- professional development aligned with school improvement goals;

- external support and resources baed on their effectiveness and alignment

with the school improvement plan; and

- extended learning opportunities for students.

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.

A two phase district improvement planning process, designed by the Title I and Accountability offices, was implemented to support districts as they develop their improvement plans for the 2006-07 and 2007-08 school years. Each district was eligible for funding to obtain services of a facilitator for the duration of the process.

Phase I - Root Cause Analysis

District data teams participated in an eight-week series of structured activities to identify and prioritize the core issues, or possible root causes, of low student achievement. This course (both on-line and face-to-face) was designed and provided in cooperation with the New England Comprehensive Center as part of its technical assistance agreement with New Hampshire.

Phase II - Designing the Plan

This phase is divided into two parts. The first part consists of teams identifying research-based practices and strategies most likely to impact their needs. The second part involves finalizing the implementation plan for Title I review and approval. Once the plan is reviewed and approved implementation funds are available.

Title I Districts who were previously identified "In Need Of Improvement" complete a District Improvement Plan Progress Report and request for additional funding to help to continue the implementation of their plan.

In all cases districts are required by the Department to identify a district improvement coordinator to monitor the district improvement plan. Monthly meetings for district improvement coordinators are held to share best practices and connect districts with resources to support their work.

Common areas in which districts are focusing:

- curriculum alignment;

- data analysis;

- instructional models that incorporate research-based practices that have

been proven to be effective in improving student achievement;

- professional development aligned with district improvement goals;

- external support and resourced based on their effectiveness and alignment

with the district's improvement plan; and

- shared leadership structures.

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.	4
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.	2
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.	22
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.	3793
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.	22
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.	22
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.	3
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	97
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.	459
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.	66
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	35591	34848	97.90
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	1830	1800	98.40
Low-Poverty Schools	3442	3404	98.90
All Elementary Schools	10086	9940	98.60
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	3934	3820	97.10
Low-Poverty Schools	9768	9603	98.30
All Secondary Schools	25505	24908	97.70
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	52.70
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	29.40
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	17.90
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)	48.50
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	40.40
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.10
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	33.10	10.40
Poverty Metric Used	Eligible for Free and Reduced Priced Meals	
Secondary Schools	26.80	9.90
Poverty Metric Used	Eligible for Free and Reduced Priced Meals	
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	88.00

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 state has established, implemented, and operationalized the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessments (WIDA) English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards in order to raise the level of English proficiency among ELL students in New Hampshire. After working with several other states and the District of Columbia in the WIDA Consortium, these Standards were completed in early 2004. The WIDA Standards derive from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, as well as reading and listening comprehension. The WIDA Standards focus on academic content language for language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. On August 18, 2004, the New Hampshire State Board of Education voted unanimously to adopt the WIDA Standards as New Hampshire's official ELP Standards. New Hampshire's state academic achievement standards were developed with Rhode Island and Vermont within the New England Compact funded by a federal Enhanced Assessment grant. These academic standards for all students include Elementary School Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) and High School Grade Span Expectations (GSEs) Standards. The chief designer of the WIDA Standards, Dr. Margot Gottlieb, had all WIDA member states (including New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont) submit their academic standards as part of the process of developing the WIDA Standards. She then based the sample content performance indicators of the WIDA Standards on these academic content standards and those of other WIDA member states in order to facilitate alignment.	

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 noted above, the State's English Language Proficiency Standards are the WIDA ELP Standards. They were aligned with the State's academic content and student academic achievement standards (the GLEs and GSEs) in English language arts and mathematics as part of the process of compiling the ELP Standards. The lead psychometric experts, Drs. Timothy Boals (WIDA), James Bauman (CAL) and Margot Gottlieb(Illinois Resource Center), in consultation with state Title III directors, analyzed the components of the GLEs and GSEs and the state standards of other WIDA member states, incorporating them in the five strands of the WIDA ELP Standards (Social/Instructional. Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies). In order to more fully facilitate practical, everyday alignment, on August 10 and 11, 2004, New Hampshire ESOL coordinators, teachers, and Title III staff met as a task force at the NH Department of Education to discuss how to align the WIDA Standards with the GLEs and GSEs, as well as with local curriculum frameworks and Title III ELP Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives. Two alignment forms were devised by this task force to provide guidance to ESOL and classroom teachers in aligning all the Standards and Objectives. The alignment forms are now included in the 2006 edition of the NH ESOL Toolkit. Thus, state academic standards in reading/language arts and mathematics can be aligned with the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards as teachers create lesson plans for improving the instruction of ELL students.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

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

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

1. The State's enhanced ELP assessment, ACCESS for ELLs (Assessing Comprehension Communication in English from State to State for English Language Learners) is based directly on the WIDA ELP Standards adopted by New Hampshire in 2004; therefore, an independent alignment study was not necessary. Alignment was conducted by Dr. Margot Gottlieb of the Illinois Resource Center.

2. The State's progress in implementing ACCESS for grades K-12 has culminated in the first administration of this test February 1 through March 24, 2006. In Fall and Winter of 2005-06, state-certified ESOL teachers were initially trained for two days as ACCESS administrators by Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) staff, with an additional 6-8 hours of WIDA's CD and online training, delivered through the University of Wisconsin's D2L distance learning system. ACCESS replaces the assessment tool previously employed by the State, the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT). An additional one-day training for new test administrators was offered in November, 2006.

The State has ensured full participation through the implementation of a new and robust data collection tool, the Educational Statistical System (ESS), which is aligned with the Student Identifier Number System (SASID). Every New Hampshire school was contacted and required to enter data on ELLs into the system in Fall, 2006. Additionally, the state office ensures participation through letters and phone calls to districts; emails to administrators and ESOL teachers via the NH ESOL Listserv; and electronic "Key Messages to Superintendents".

ACCESS addresses the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and listening, as well as listening and reading comprehension. The ELP assessment, ACCESS, is based on the WIDA ELP Standards. The validity and reliability of ACCESS has been assured by the work of psychometric experts Dr. Timothy Boals (WIDA), James Bauman (CAL), and Margot Gottlieb (Illinois Resource Center).

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)	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ACCESS	4179	4179											

Comments: New Hampshire must complete the development of AMAO's and cut scores for the ACCESS test before this table can be completed.

(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	1570	37.60
2. Bosnian	228	5.50
3. Portuguese	172	4.10
4. Vietnamese	156	3.70
5. Arabic	133	3.20
6. Chinese	132	3.20
7. Russian	129	3.10
8. Indonesian	124	3.00
9. English Non-US	105	2.50
10. Maay	81	1.90
Comments:		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

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

Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency										Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (8)	
			Number and Percentage at Basic or **Level 1** (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or **Level 2** (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or **Level 3** (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 4** (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 5** (7)			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ACCESS	3532													

Comments: New Hampshire must complete the development of AMAO's and cut scores for the ACCESS test before this table can be completed.

(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
1830	1495	0

Comments:

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

Manchester, New Hampshire is a refugee re-settlement center. Area schools continue to enroll increasing numbers of refugee families, many of whom are from Somalia, Sudan, and Liberia.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

The Title III state office is currently developing a definition of "proficient" and identifying appropriate cut scores to align with the ACCESS assessment tool.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

The state Title III office is currently developing a definition of "making progress" and identifying criteria that a student must meet in order to progress from one proficiency level to the next. These criteria and definition will be aligned with the ACCESS assessment tool.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort
If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.
STATE RESPONSE
The State Title III office is developing a more specific definition of "cohort" that will align with the ACCESS assessment tool. The State is currently using grade clusters that correspond with those tested by ACCESS; namely, K, 1-2, 3-5, 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	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#

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

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

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

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

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

Definitions:

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

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

	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	**ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS**	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS			
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS			
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY			
TOTAL			

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

*** Monitored LEP students are those who**

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information	
	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	7
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **making progress**	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **attaining** English proficiency	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for **AYP**	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet **any** AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the **State** meet **all** three Title III AMAOs? *	No Response

Comments: New Hampshire must complete the development of AMAO's and cut scores for the ACCESS test before this table can be completed.

* 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	6	67.00
4	10	72.00
5	8	50.00
6	8	38.00
7	6	50.00
8	6	29.00
H.S.	8	89.00

Comments:

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	7	78.00
4	7	50.00
5	9	57.00
6	7	34.00
7	6	50.00
8	4	19.00
H.S.	7	78.00

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	**Graduation Rate**
Student Group	**2004-2005 School Year**
All Students	86.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	81.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.90
Black, non-Hispanic	78.10
Hispanic	77.80
White, non-Hispanic	86.90
Students with Disabilities	0.00
Limited English Proficient	0.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	84.00
Female	89.40
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.	

1.8.2 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	3.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00
Black, non-Hispanic	0.00
Hispanic	0.00
White, non-Hispanic	0.00
Students with Disabilities	0.00
Limited English Proficient	0.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	4.10
Female	2.70
Comments: Our dropout rate declined.	
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
School year: A total of 180 days is required for instruction (RSA 189:1 and ED 306.02)

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	176	146
LEAs with Subgrants	2	2
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	59	40
1	75	43
2	60	28
3	68	44
4	48	30
5	62	32
6	45	30
7	38	25
8	41	38
9	23	22
10	26	14
11	17	27
12	47	31
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	101	70
Doubled-up	363	266
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	<n	<n
Hotels/Motels	39	22
Unknown	98	41

Comments:

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

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

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

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth *served* by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	40
1	43
2	28
3	44
4	30
5	32
6	30
7	25
8	38
9	22
10	14
11	27
12	31
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
24
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
53
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)	79
English Language Learners (ELL)	46
Gifted and Talented	0
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	2
Expedited evaluations	0
Staff professional development and awareness	2
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	2
Transportation	0
Early childhood programs	0
Assistance with participation in school programs	2
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	1
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	2
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	2
Coordination between schools and agencies	2
Counseling	0
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	0
Clothing to meet a school requirement	2
School supplies	2
Referral to other programs and services	2
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	2
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	1
School selection	1
Transportation	1
School records	1
Immunizations or other medical records	1
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
language	1
guardianship	1
resistance to ident self as homeless/knowledge of rights	2

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	29	<n
Grade 4	Yes	17	<n
Grade 5	Yes	20	<n
Grade 6	Yes	23	<n
Grade 7	Yes	12	<n
Grade 8	Yes	25	<n
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	0	0
Grade 11	N/A	0	0
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	Yes	29	<n
Grade 4	Yes	17	<n
Grade 5	Yes	20	<n
Grade 6	Yes	23	<n
Grade 7	Yes	12	<n
Grade 8	Yes	25	<n
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	0	0
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.