

**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 – *21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs.*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities.*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program.*

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

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

## PART I

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

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

## PART II

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

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614	
Expiration Date: 07/31/2007	
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2005-2006 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2005-2006	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: New Jersey	
Address: 100 River View Plaza Trenton, NJ 08611	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Diane Schonyers Telephone: (609) 777-1653 Fax: (609) 984-5901 e-mail: diane.schonyers@doe.state.nj.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Lucille E. Davy	
_____ Signature	<u>Thursday, March 01, 2007, 5:30:28 PM</u> Date

Please note that the data contained in section 1.4.3.1 has been verified and is correct.

## **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 New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards for Science were first adopted in 1996 and revised and readopted in 2002. The next review and revision of the science standards will commence in 2008-2009.

**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**

The state introduced assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics at grades 5-7 in the spring of 2006. Assessment now occurs at grades 3-8 and 11.

The Alternate Proficiency Assessment (APA) was administered in grades 3, 4, 8 and 11 for all core content areas tested in the general assessment programs.

Science assessments were given in grades 4 and 8 in 2006, as had previously been done. Science at the high school level will be tested in 2007.

**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 Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards for mathematics, language arts literacy, and science were first adopted in 1996 and revised and readopted in 2002 with minor revisions to language arts approved in 2004.

As of June 2006, achievement standards have been established for language arts literacy and math in grades 3-8 and 11. Achievement standards for science are established in grades 4 and 8. Achievement standards for the APA in all tested areas have been established.

**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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	724728	99.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	852	99.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	54018	99.40
Black, non-Hispanic	125024	98.50
Hispanic	126169	99.00
White, non-Hispanic	412958	99.40
Students with Disabilities	114853	98.00
Limited English Proficient	23325	99.30
Economically Disadvantaged	198738	98.80
Migrant	311	99.40
Male	370935	99.00
Female	353086	99.30

**Comments:**

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

**1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	723955	99.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	849	98.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	51925	98.90
Black, non-Hispanic	125437	98.80
Hispanic	124972	98.00
White, non-Hispanic	413033	99.40
Students with Disabilities	116079	96.90
Limited English Proficient	21186	97.60
Economically Disadvantaged	198127	98.50
Migrant	298	95.20
Male	370596	98.90
Female	352767	99.20

**Comments:**

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

### 1.2.2 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	110679	96.80
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4174	100.00

**Comments:** These figures have been verified and are correct.

##### 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	111905	97.90
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4174	100.00

**Comments:** These figures have been verified and are correct.

### **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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	101742	86.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	111	81.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	8092	95.50
Black, non-Hispanic	17569	72.40
Hispanic	19093	79.00
White, non-Hispanic	56103	92.80
Students with Disabilities	15258	72.20
Limited English Proficient	4538	66.00
Economically Disadvantaged	30821	75.40
Migrant	71	74.60
Male	52146	86.90
Female	49573	86.90

**Comments:** The figures provided are accurate. The counts are so small that a ten percent variation is easily random.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	101713	82.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	107	81.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	8077	92.00
Black, non-Hispanic	17599	66.40
Hispanic	19058	70.40
White, non-Hispanic	56107	90.10
Students with Disabilities	15270	55.50
Limited English Proficient	4483	48.20
Economically Disadvantaged	30829	66.70
Migrant	71	61.20
Male	52126	78.60
Female	49574	86.50

**Comments:** The figures provided are accurate. The counts are so small that a ten percent variation is easily random.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	101901	82.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	77.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	8028	93.70
Black, non-Hispanic	17409	63.40
Hispanic	18359	72.30
White, non-Hispanic	57289	89.80
Students with Disabilities	16787	61.40
Limited English Proficient	3735	55.40
Economically Disadvantaged	30021	67.50
Migrant	52	76.90
Male	52026	82.50
Female	49862	82.20

**Comments:** The figures provided are accurate. The counts are so small that a ten percent variation is easily random.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	101839	80.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	72.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	8020	91.20
Black, non-Hispanic	17415	62.90
Hispanic	18318	66.70
White, non-Hispanic	57272	87.80
Students with Disabilities	16778	51.60
Limited English Proficient	3675	44.40
Economically Disadvantaged	29994	62.70
Migrant	52	64.70
Male	51973	75.80
Female	49850	84.40

**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.

**1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	103946	81.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	107	75.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	8092	93.30
Black, non-Hispanic	18070	62.10
Hispanic	18772	70.50
White, non-Hispanic	58198	89.90
Students with Disabilities	16254	53.90
Limited English Proficient	3289	45.30
Economically Disadvantaged	30833	65.70
Migrant	36	64.70
Male	53535	80.70
Female	50564	82.90

**Comments:**

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

**1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	103550	85.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	107	83.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	7860	94.40
Black, non-Hispanic	18103	69.60
Hispanic	18354	75.10
White, non-Hispanic	58131	93.20
Students with Disabilities	16283	58.30
Limited English Proficient	2621	42.70
Economically Disadvantaged	30521	71.00
Migrant	29	64.30
Male	53251	83.70
Female	50286	88.30

**Comments:**

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

**1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	104737	70.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	121	62.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	7527	88.80
Black, non-Hispanic	18526	44.80
Hispanic	18352	56.40
White, non-Hispanic	58968	81.20
Students with Disabilities	16267	33.50
Limited English Proficient	2903	32.40
Economically Disadvantaged	30408	50.10
Migrant	42	38.10
Male	53660	70.20
Female	50918	71.40

**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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	104229	75.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	120	71.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	7640	89.10
Black, non-Hispanic	18526	44.80
Hispanic	18352	56.40
White, non-Hispanic	58968	81.20
Students with Disabilities	16330	37.50
Limited English Proficient	2253	24.40
Economically Disadvantaged	30164	53.50
Migrant	37	37.80
Male	53446	72.00
Female	50695	78.10

**Comments:**

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

**1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	107362	64.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	141	63.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	7336	85.20
Black, non-Hispanic	246	37.20
Hispanic	18988	49.00
White, non-Hispanic	18776	74.70
Students with Disabilities	16749	26.90
Limited English Proficient	3117	30.20
Economically Disadvantaged	29769	42.30
Migrant	28	32.10
Male	55200	64.70
Female	52191	63.90

**Comments:**

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

**1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	107209	80.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	142	75.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	7474	85.50
Black, non-Hispanic	19112	58.80
Hispanic	18363	66.30
White, non-Hispanic	61154	89.80
Students with Disabilities	16850	44.90
Limited English Proficient	2422	30.10
Economically Disadvantaged	29570	60.50
Migrant	26	50.00
Male	55047	75.70
Female	52025	85.00

**Comments:**

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

**1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	107709	64.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	120	53.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	7566	85.20
Black, non-Hispanic	19180	31.70
Hispanic	18626	45.50
White, non-Hispanic	61855	77.90
Students with Disabilities	18506	28.70
Limited English Proficient	3155	22.60
Economically Disadvantaged	29445	38.40
Migrant	38	34.20
Male	55485	64.80
Female	52190	64.10

**Comments:** The figures provided are accurate. The counts are so small that a ten percent variation is easily random, with the exception of the category for

economically disadvantaged students.

A discrepancy has been identified in the CSPR-Part I, for reporting on school year 2004-2005, which indicates that at grade 8, there were 26.8% economically disadvantaged students proficient and advanced proficient in math. That percentage should have been 37.8%.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	107798	74.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	120	61.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	7556	85.50
Black, non-Hispanic	19221	50.10
Hispanic	18638	57.30
White, non-Hispanic	61903	85.40
Students with Disabilities	18522	36.40
Limited English Proficient	3138	15.80
Economically Disadvantaged	29486	50.60
Migrant	38	33.30
Male	55533	68.70
Female	52231	80.30

**Comments:** The figures provided are accurate. The counts are so small that a ten percent variation is easily random.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	97331	75.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	135	68.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	7251	90.70
Black, non-Hispanic	15282	46.30
Hispanic	14191	58.00
White, non-Hispanic	59474	86.10
Students with Disabilities	15032	31.60
Limited English Proficient	2588	35.20
Economically Disadvantaged	17486	51.60
Migrant	44	29.50
Male	49097	75.70
Female	48011	76.10

**Comments:** The figures provided are accurate. The counts are so small that a ten percent variation is easily random or the result of demographic changes at grade 11, with the exception of the category for Limited English Proficient.

A discrepancy has been identified in last year's CSPR-Part I, for reporting on school year 2004-2005, which indicates that at grade 11, there were 7696 LEP students tested in math. That number should have been 2932.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	97547	83.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	136	72.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	7250	90.40
Black, non-Hispanic	15386	64.30
Hispanic	14248	68.20
White, non-Hispanic	59517	91.50
Students with Disabilities	16026	47.80
Limited English Proficient	2594	22.10
Economically Disadvantaged	17563	63.10
Migrant	45	37.80
Male	49220	80.50
Female	48106	86.60

**Comments:** The figures provided are accurate. The counts are so small that a ten percent variation is easily random or the result of demographic changes at grade 11.

- 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	2209	1567	70.90

**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	617	534	86.50

**Comments:** The total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) represents the number of schools receiving an AYP designation.

**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	1256	786	62.50

**Comments:** The total number of Title I schools in the state represents the number of schools receiving an AYP designation.

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	463	385	83.10

**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.

New Jersey districts and schools apply for their federal entitlement funds using the NCLB Consolidated Subgrant Application. To assist them in this effort, the NJDOE issues annual updates to the NCLB Reference Manual and provides county-based technical assistance trainings. The consolidated application consists of two components: an electronic system, the Entitlement Web-Enabled Grant (EWEG), and the Title I Unified Plan, a paper application that includes an annual program plan, a school improvement plan for designated Title I schools and a district improvement plan for Title I districts in need of improvement. The district also submits a plan describing how they will support their low-performing schools.

<http://www.nj.gov/njded/grants/entitlement/nclb/titleunifiedplanfinal.doc> .

A governance plan must be completed for schools identified in Year 5 (planning to restructure).

<http://www.nj.gov/njded/title1/accountability/restructure.doc>. In New Jersey, 65 school restructuring plans were completed and submitted to the NJDOE in May 2006.

The NCLB application, with the Title I Unified Plan, is completed by the district and schools that are in need of improvement and submitted to the field office for review and approval. As part of this process, field and central office staff are available to provide technical assistance as needed to districts and schools.

Technical assistance is provided to schools and districts in need of improvement to aid them in the parental notification process, public school choice option and supplemental educational services (SES) requirements. This technical assistance is provided directly by NJDOE staff. The Title I Office staff provides guidance to the field offices as well as directly to schools, districts and SES providers.

The Title I office provides on-going formal and informal assistance to districts and schools. The Title I office has developed five training modules that are available to districts and schools. These modules can be presented live by the field offices or accessed on-line. The five modules cover the following topics: Title I Program Manager, School Improvement, Accountability, Parental Involvement, and Teacher Training. <http://www.nj.gov/njded/title1/tech/>

Additionally, the Title I office issues policy letters, sample parental notification letters, a Supplemental Educational Services Toolkit, and maintains a comprehensive Title I Web site. <http://www.nj.gov/njded/title1/>

Since February 2004, the Title I office has met bimonthly with its committee of practitioners, the NCLB School Improvement Committee, to inform the development of policy relating to the NCLB provisions for Title I schools and districts in need of improvement. The committee is composed of representatives from districts in need of improvement and high-performing districts, members of the state's education associations and bargaining units, representatives from institutions of higher education and staff from the various divisions within the NJDOE.

The NJDOE School Support Teams, as required under NCLB, work with Title I schools that have been identified as in need of improvement. The school support team process in New Jersey is called Collaborative Assessment and Planning for Achievement (CAPA). <http://www.nj.gov/njded/capa/>. With the input of the NCLB School Improvement Committee and the approval of the NCLB Advisory Council, the Title I office devoted a percentage of its program improvement allocation to fund NJDOE's school support teams. This enabled CAPA teams to service a greater number of Title I schools in need of improvement. In the past two years (2004-2005 and 2005-2006) 177 CAPA visits were conducted in these schools.

The CAPA process is designed to assist schools by conducting a comprehensive review and needs assessment of all facets of a school's operation. District functioning is also evaluated. At the conclusion of a week-long on-site visit, the CAPA team issues a report that identifies findings and recommendations. The school and district are provided support from NJDOE staff to review, analyze and prioritize the findings and recommendations. The school/district then updates the NCLB Consolidated Application and the Title I Unified Plan, incorporating its prioritized recommendations to address the identified issues. The prioritized issues are specified and an action plan is developed that includes student achievement data, benchmarks and targets, as well as a plan of action using scientifically based research models.

The NJDOE continues to support districts and schools that have undergone CAPA reviews to assist in the process of CAPA recommendation implementation. Each school/district participates in three meetings to discuss the implementation of its school improvement plan that includes the CAPA prioritized recommendations. This process is called the CAPA Benchmark Assessment. DOE staff are responsible for scheduling and conducting the follow-up technical assistance meetings. Collaboration and capacity building in all phases related to the implementation of the CAPA recommendations are the primary principles guiding this support.

To assist districts with schools entering Year 5 (planning for restructuring), the NJDOE sponsored a series of technical assistance sessions. On September 27, 2005, districts were invited to participate in an information session on the legislative requirements for Year 5 schools and the planning process to identify an appropriate restructuring option for affected schools. The session included a presentation on the implementation of restructuring efforts across the nation by a representative from the Education Commission for the States. To support the February 2006 release of the template for the restructuring plan for Year 5 schools, NJDOE held a technical assistance session to guide districts through components of the plan, respond to questions and concerns and assess districts' need for individualized follow-up. This session was presented in partnership with the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center (MACC) which is one of the 21 federally-funded centers that are charged to provide technical assistance to states in supporting the implementation of the NCLB. Additionally, the NJDOE is providing on-site technical assistance to the state's lowest-performing districts with schools in Year 5. This session also serves as an evaluation of the district's support to its schools that received a CAPA visit in the previous year.

In 2005-2006 there were 65 Title I schools in Year 5. The NJDOE conducted individual planning meetings with district and school personnel. The focus of the meetings was the current functioning of the schools, plans for alternate governance and the role of the district.

Restructuring plans were submitted to the NJDOE for review and approval. For certain schools, additional meetings were held to further articulate the plan for alternate governance. Based upon the assessment results for 2006, 17 schools made AYP and did not go into Year 6 (restructuring implementation). Despite this progress, most of these schools are implementing their plans anyway in an effort to sustain success.

For schools in Year 6 and Year 5-Hold, more intensive follow-up is planned. One of the three CAPA Benchmarking Assessment activities will consist of an on-site visit by a state school support team. These visits will be individually designed to focus on the fidelity of implementation of their restructuring plan and to determine next steps. These on-site school visits are scheduled to begin in January 2007. During the visits, the team will interview staff, observe classrooms and review documentation.

---

**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.

Districts in need of improvement were identified in August 2005 using the 2005 assessment results. These districts were notified of their status and the NCLB requirements of parental notification, fiscal reallocation of Title I funds and the submission of a district improvement plan.

Submission of a district improvement plan is included as part of the NCLB Consolidated Application. This plan is due for submission and review by NJDOE staff who provide guidance to districts as they complete their improvement plans.

Districts were required to implement their improvement plans for the 2005-2006 school year. NJDOE staff meet with districts on a quarterly basis to continue to provide assistance and support.

Districts that have Title I schools in need of improvement that have undergone CAPA visits are required to work with the schools and incorporate the district level CAPA recommendations. These recommendations are incorporated into the Consolidated Application.

During the 2005-2006 school year, a site visit was conducted at 55 districts that had a CAPA visit scheduled for a district school. This process is called the Title I Addendum visit. The purpose of the visit was to assess the level of Title I implementation - programmatically and fiscally. During the visit, NJDOE staff worked with the district to determine common and individual areas that the NJDOE could address through technical assistance.

The NJDOE is conducting an analysis of the data from the Title I Addendum visits to determine the areas of need and is taking action to provide support and technical assistance. For example, one area of need was parent involvement. In response to this need, 53 of the 55 districts were invited to participate in a technical assistance session conducted by the NJDOE in collaboration with National Network of Partnership Schools. Follow-up activities will continue on this and other identified needs.

Using the 2006 assessment results, New Jersey has identified 13 districts in federal corrective action. In partnership with the NCLB School Improvement Committee, the NJDOE has established policy and procedures to address districts in corrective action. These districts will undergo, beginning in January 2007, a comprehensive review of their operations: curriculum and instruction, personnel, operations, fiscal and governance. This review will be conducted by a team of highly skilled professionals.

**1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services**

<b>1.4.5.1 Public School Choice</b>	<b>Number</b>
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.	
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
How many of these schools were charter schools?	
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
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.	
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
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.	
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.	
<b>Comments:</b> The information for this section is currently unavailable and will be sent under separate cover.	

<b>1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services</b>	
	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.	
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
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.	
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
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.	
<b>Comments:</b> The information for this section is currently unavailable and will be sent under separate cover.	

**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.

<b>School Type</b>	<b>Total Number of Core Academic Classes</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>
<b>All Schools in State</b>	354542	340154	95.90
<b>Elementary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	62826	57115	90.90
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	47886	46480	97.10
<b>All Elementary Schools</b>	218791	209169	95.60
<b>Secondary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	23856	22348	93.70
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	39085	38463	98.40
<b>All Secondary Schools</b>	135751	130985	96.50
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Definitions and Instructions**

*What are the core academic subjects?*

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

***How is a teacher defined?***

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

***How is a class defined?***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
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	37.20
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	32.60
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	30.20
<b>SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
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)	31.10
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	49.90
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	19.00

**Comments:** The category of Other represents the percentage of classes in: 1) Arts, 2) World Languages, 3) Bilingual/Bicultural (B/B), 4) English as a Second Language (ESL), 5) English Basic Skills, 6) Math Basic Skills, and 7) Unspecified Content Areas that are being taught by teachers that are not highly qualified.

New Jersey is in the process of developing a more consistent data/analysis collection system.

**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 %)
<b>Elementary Schools</b>	49.16	5.82
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Percentage of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch.	
<b>Secondary Schools</b>	36.91	4.67
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Percentage of students who qualify for free and reduced 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	

**Comments:** The information for this section is not available and will be sent under a separate cover.

**1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**

**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	<u>Yes</u>
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	<u>Yes</u>
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	<u>Yes</u>

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

**STATE RESPONSE**

In 2005, New Jersey became a member of the WIDA consortium of states. As a member of WIDA, New Jersey has established the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners in Kindergarten through Grade 12 and its corresponding assessment, ACCESS for ELLs, as the state's ELP standards and assessment system. The WIDA ELP standards center on the language needed and used by English language learners to succeed in school:

English language learners communicate in English for SOCIAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES within the school setting.

English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of LANGUAGE ARTS.

English language learners communicate information, ideas and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of MATHEMATICS.

English language learners communicate information, ideas and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of SCIENCE.

English language learners communicate information, ideas and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of SOCIAL STUDIES.

Each of the five English language proficiency standards encompasses four language domains: listening, speaking, reading and writing. The language domains reflect the modality of the communication that is further delineated by the language proficiency levels and their model performance indicators. These are demonstrated within the context of five English language proficiency levels: 1. Entering; 2. Beginning; 3. Developing; 4. Expanding; 5. Bridging; and 6. Attaining.

The implementation process has consisted of the following:

Regional awareness and training sessions on the WIDA ELP standards, how they are organized, and how the standards-based framework for large scale state assessment and the framework for classroom assessment and instruction can be used to inform curriculum, instruction and assessment of English language learners.

Regional workshops during the summer, 2006, on developing and/or augmenting ESL curricula that are aligned to the WIDA standards and the Core Curriculum Content Standards.

This implementation effort will continue in 2007 with additional professional development on:

The WIDA standards to include additional workshops on curriculum development, alignment and augmentation; and

Operationalizing the standards through standards-based classroom instruction and assessments.



**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**

The WIDA Consortium conducted an alignment study between the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards in Language Arts, Mathematics and Science, and the WIDA ELP Standards.

## Purpose of the Alignment

The purpose of the alignment study was to find evidence of agreement between the New Jersey Language Arts Literacy (LAL), Mathematics, and Science K-12 Standards and the WIDA English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards for English Language Learners. This study was conducted by an evaluation of matches between the WIDA and the New Jersey Standards.

## Alignment Procedure

The consortium conducts a systematic review of the WIDA standards and each state content standard for alignment. The consortium judges alignment against specific sets of alignment criteria and decision rules. The following detail each each step we take in a three-phase streamlined process of alignment work.

## Phase I: Pre-alignment

## 1. Grade Level Collapsing/Merging of each participating state standard

Collapse grade level academic content standards into the WIDA grade level clusters(i.e., K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12).

## 2. Topic Extraction

Identify common topics across the grade levels within the academic achievement standards that constitute the WIDA grade level cluster (i.e., K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12). Topics are extracted from each strand of WIDA standards as nouns or a phrase to enhance topic coverage of content areas.

## Phase II: Alignment

## 1. Topic Alignment

Match topic to topic, from academic content standards of the state to WIDA strands of model performance indicators. Match WIDA topics with topics from performance indicators of each state.

## 2. Atomic Alignment

The consortium conducts the alignment as follows:

## 1) Becoming familiar with the WIDA standards.

Reads the WIDA standards carefully.

Figures out how the WIDA standards, domains, grade level clusters, proficiency levels are organized.

For the alignment task, uses the re-organized version of the WIDA standards, in which the standards are organized by grade level clusters (i.e., K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12) and by domains (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, writing).

Each domain has a strand of PIs (P1-P5).

Each strand contains at least one topic.

Identifies the topic on each strand.

Makes sure we understand what each PI is measuring. If it is not clear, we get information such materials as textbooks. For instance, if the WIDA PI is, Identify story elements, we make sure whether we understand what story elements are like. From relevant resources, we find that story elements include characters, plot, theme, setting, point of view and conflict. So we look for not only identifying story elements in the state standards, but also identifying characters, plot, theme, setting, point of view and/or conflict in a story.

2) Becoming familiar with each participating state standard.

Locates each state content standard on the web with the confirmation of each state department of education.

Confirms that obtained URLs are indeed the standards of each state.

Reviews each state standard carefully.

Makes sure we understand how the standards are organized.

3) Finding PIs to be matched

In order to do this, goes through the entire document containing each state standard.

Does this systematically.

Identifies a topic from the WIDA standards.

Goes through the entire state document (read through the first to the last course content).

Identifies which WIDA topics in P5 are aligned to the state standards.

Places the course content CODE (the one that is actually used on each state standard) in the whole alignment document.

Then proceeds to the next topic and repeat the same process until we align all the topics in P5 to the WIDA standards.

After finishing aligning all the WIDA topics in P5, copies and paste each state standard that is matched to the WIDA standards in a uniform way.

4) Justifying the alignment

If the alignment is not very clear, add comments on the particular alignment case.

These comments justify the alignment and provide suggestions on how to adapt or extend each state content standard.

Each state standard is matched to the WIDA topics, not the reverse.

5) Getting feedback

After finishing writing the alignment documents, re-checks the whole document to ensure the alignment work is clear.

Gives this document to other members of the FLAG.

The reviewer evaluates whether the alignment of other colleagues is clear.

If the alignment work is not clear, makes sure that we also provide a particular comment justifying the alignment.

Revises the alignment document as needed.

#### Adopted Format

Domains are underlined, bold-faced and capitalized.

WIDA topics are written in blue and capitalized.

WIDA P5s are bold-faced.

Each state contents standard is in normal font.

Comments are written in blue and in brackets.

#### Phase III: Post Alignment (Database Development)

By grade level cluster, by standard, by domain, enters the alignment into a searchable database. Our deliverable to each state is a document that reports on its alignment, and our ongoing deliverable to the entire WIDA project is the multi-state database.

#### Results

The following characteristics of the New Jersey Standards facilitated the alignment study:

1. New Jersey standards stipulate their own set of CPIs depending on grade level distinctions. The organization of the New Jersey standards and strands facilitated the alignment process, making it possible to directly launch on the Phase II, Alignment. Bearing the WIDA topics in mind, the alignment process was conducted through a systematic comparison of the grade level clusters in the WIDA Standards with the grade level CPIs in New Jersey.
2. Many of the New Jersey standards provided examples illustrating the CPIs of each strand. This helps the reader have a better understanding of what the CPIs are, thus, we were able to match the New Jersey standards against the WIDA Standards.
3. The New Jersey standards define learning expectations that students have to demonstrate. These expectations are fundamental and specific enough to be matched with the WIDA PIs.

In this study, the consortium found the WIDA model PIs were well represented in the New Jersey Core Curriculum Standards for LAL, Math and Science. In most of the cases, we found a strong match between the PIs in the WIDA standards and in the New Jersey content standards. We defined a strong match when there was a clear agreement between the topic(s) in the WIDA standards and CPIs in the New Jersey standards.

The consortium also found that there were weak associations between some of the WIDA and the New Jersey standards. The consortium defined a weak match when there was a less clear agreement between the topic in the WIDA standards and the CPIs in the New Jersey standards. Whenever this occurred, comments were added justifying alignments, indicating the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards could be adapted or extended to match the WIDA PIs.

<b>1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments</b>
<b>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:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An independent alignment study <u>Yes</u></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other evidence of alignment <u>No Response</u></li> </ul>
<b>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:</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;</li> <li>2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;</li> <li>3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;</li> <li>4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)</li> </ol>
<b>STATE RESPONSE</b>
<p>The requirement that districts annually assess English language learners is mandated in New Jersey law and code. As part of the WIDA consortium, New Jersey used the ACCESS for ELLs test, which is aligned to the WIDA standards. New Jersey administered the ACCESS for ELLs test for the first time during the Spring, 2006 to all Title III districts. Beginning in the Spring, 2007, all districts will be required to administer the ACCESS for ELLs test to determine English language growth on an annual basis. Because the majority of ELLs are enrolled in Title III districts, the majority of ELLs in New Jersey (over 52,000 students) were tested with the ACCESS for ELLs test in 2006.</p> <p>ACCESS for ELLs measures the five domains of language proficiency. The WIDA consortium conducts field testing and routinely calculates reliability on operational forms to assure that the tests are valid and reliable. Language testing experts from the Center for Applied Linguistics designed and constructed the test; teachers of ELL students are involved in the item writing and review, and special studies are conducted by the consortium to study validity and reliability issues. All of these activities together ensure a fair, valid and reliable test.</p>



<b>1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State</b>		
<b>2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs</b>		
<b>Language</b>	<b>Number of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>	<b>Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>
1. Spanish	39605	81.00
2. Portuguese	1478	3.00
3. Korean	1408	3.00
4. Arabic	1220	3.00
5. Haitian Creole	1004	2.00
6. Gujarati	972	2.00
7. Mandarin	923	2.00
8. Polish	892	2.00
9. Urdu	617	1.00
10. Tagalog	515	1.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

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



**1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data**

**Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth**

**Definitions:**

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

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students  
2005-2006**

<b># Immigrants enrolled in the State</b>	<b># Immigrants served by Title III</b>	<b># Immigrant subgrants</b>
39086	9445	44

**Comments:**

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

There has been no substantial change in the number of immigrant children and youth enrolled in New Jersey schools. However, fewer districts are eligible for immigrant funds each year. This is because of the formula used for district eligibility for Title III immigrant funds, which requires districts to show a minimum of 2% increase in immigrant student enrollment as compared with the average of the two previous years. Because districts with substantial immigrant student enrollments cannot always meet the 2% minimum increase, even though they may have continual large immigrant populations, they become ineligible. As a result, the districts that can meet the eligibility criteria have low immigrant populations.

**1.6.5 Definition of Proficient**

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

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

There has been no change.

**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**

With the phase-in of the new, standards-based ACCESS for ELLs English language proficiency test the definition of making progress has been redefined as a result of data analyses and reviews by the State Advisory Committee on Bilingual/ESL Education. The process used to redefine progress took the following points into consideration:

1) Description of English language proficiency levels: The scores on ACCESS range from 100 to 600 and have been vertically scaled - this means that a score of 300 in grade 1 is as comparable as possible to a score of 300 in grade 3 - even though the grade 3 students are taking a different form of the test than the students in grade 1. The fact that the scores are comparable from year to year should result in accurate and reliable measurement of improvement. Proficiency levels on the test range from 1.0 to 6.0, with a decimal point that indicates how close the student is to the next proficiency level. A score of 1.5 would indicate that the student is half way between proficiency levels 1 and 2. Proficiency levels were determined by judges separately for grades K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Unlike the scaled scores, proficiency levels were not vertically scaled so that they do NOT have the same meaning from grade to grade. Data analysis by the WIDA Consortia showed that in fact there were big differences in the meaning of a proficiency level between grades 2 and 3, 5 and 6 and 8 and 9 - transition points between one level of the assessment and the next. In these transition years, WIDA found that students who took ACCESS in 2005 and 2006, showed an average decrease in proficiency levels, despite an average INCREASE in standard score.

In NJ, we converted the 2005 scores on our old assessments to the ACCESS scale using the Bridge Study conducted by the WIDA Consortium, and calculated the difference in proficiency and performance levels. We recognize that the bridging between the old and new tests is based on small numbers and that the tests aren't comparable. Nevertheless, the results were similar to the WIDA results - proficiency levels were not comparable across the different grade levels and as a result did not show improvement even when such improvement was evidenced in the scaled scores. For this reason the WIDA consortium has determined to revise the proficiency levels in 2007. Since the WIDA consortium has determined to revise the proficiency levels in 2007, and since the proficiency levels underrepresented the improvement of students in New Jersey learning English, the improvement AMAO was defined based on scaled score rather than proficiency level. Data on improvement in scaled scores was analyzed and reviewed by the advisory committee. The advisory committee identified that the improvement levels decreased by grade. We reviewed the data to see if it supported one of two hypotheses: the difference in growth by grade level was developmental (older students learn languages more slowly and the cognitive level of the language needed is higher at higher grades) or students at higher grade levels may have been in the program longer and be at higher proficiency levels to begin with (growth at higher proficiency levels may be slower than at lower proficiency levels).

Although we cannot rule out the decreased growth at higher proficiency levels, there appeared to be a decrease in level of improvement beyond what would be expected by years in program. For this reason, the Advisory Committee determined to set the improvement AMAO by grade level. The Advisory Committee used a consensus procedure similar to the procedures typically used in standard setting:

- a. The meeting began by reviewing the ACCESS test and the score scales. Participants were provided data on the improvement results in NJ.
- b. Participants independently determined what they would recommend as for improvement by grade.
- c. Individual judgments were posted and discussed. Individuals with higher standards were asked to explain why they selected the higher standards. Individuals with lower standards were asked to explain their reasoning.

d. Participants individually estimated their AMAO again and posted it by grade level.

e. These results were averaged and discussed again.

f. The final recommendation was determined.

Committee members recommended that we review these decisions in 2007 after we have two years worth of data on the new assessment, ACCESS for ELLs.

Finally these results were discussed with the Assistant Commissioner and approved.

2). A description of the AMAO for Making Progress:

As a result of these discussions, the following AMAO was determined:

Students are expected to exhibit significant improvement on the total composite score. Significant improvement is defined as follows by grade level:

1. Grades K -2, 19 points

2. Grades 3-5, 14 points

3. Grades 6-8, 12 points

4. Grades 9-10, 7 points

5. Grades 11-12, 4 points

---

**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 definition of cohort for the AMAO on attainment of English language proficiency has not changed. However; the definition of cohort for the AMAO on making progress in learning English has changed to grade spans. These grade spans are as follows: K-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? Yes

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 60.00	# 15658	% 66.00	# 17170	% 60.00	# 32300	% 94.00	# 50596

**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.

<b>1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants</b>			
	<b>2005-2006</b>		
	<b>AMAO TARGET</b>	<b>ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS</b>	
	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>MAKING PROGRESS</b>	60.00	16769	66.00
<b>DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS</b>		8728	
<b>ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>	60.00	49362	93.90
<b>TOTAL</b>		74859	

**Explanation of data for Table**

**Check the answer to the following question.**

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

\* 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**

	<b>2005-2006</b>
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	205
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>making progress</b>	119
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>attaining</b> English proficiency	205
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>AYP</b>	188
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	113
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	194
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	11
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet <b>any</b> AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	17
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	14
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the <b>State</b> meet <b>all</b> three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

**Comments:** Please note the following clarification for the question regarding whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs:

The State made the AMAO for AYP for the LEP subgroup for the NJ Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK) Test for grades 3 & 4 and the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment (GEPA) in Language Arts and Math.

The State did not make the AMAO for AYP for the LEP subgroup for the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) Test for Grades 11 and 12 in Language Arts and Math.

\* 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	1615	75.40
4	1315	67.60
5	1130	76.90
6	624	54.80
7	483	63.50
8	505	47.30
H.S.	300	64.00

**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	1815	84.50
4	1467	75.50
5	1111	75.70
6	641	56.40
7	404	50.50
8	352	45.70
H.S.	265	57.60

**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	2

**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	91.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	64.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	98.80
Black, non-Hispanic	83.90
Hispanic	83.20
White, non-Hispanic	95.00
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	90.10
Female	92.70

**Comments:** Graduation rate is not currently collected for the following student subgroups: 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.

### 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	1.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.70
Black, non-Hispanic	3.40
Hispanic	3.80
White, non-Hispanic	1.20
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	2.20
Female	1.60

**Comments:** Dropout rate is not currently collected for the following student subgroups: 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**

New Jersey's academic year is defined as being from July 1st through June 30th, with districts required to have 180 student contact days to be eligible for state aid.

**1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:**

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	642	430
LEAs with Subgrants	10	8

**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	241	104
1	235	148
2	622	126
3	291	140
4	242	191
5	117	126
6	221	171
7	207	154
8	230	162
9	203	138
10	166	92
11	108	69
12	113	33

**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 <b>without</b> subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>with</b> subgrants
Shelters	457	689
Doubled-up	1207	656
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	37	0
Hotels/Motels	676	196
Unknown	619	113

**Comments:** The category of Unknown for the number of homeless children/youth excluding preschoolers, LEAs without subgrants includes 596 unreported primary nighttime residences.

\* 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

<b>Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006</b>	<b>Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level</b>
K	104
1	148
2	126
3	140
4	191
5	126
6	171
7	154
8	162
9	138
10	92
11	69
12	33

**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**

**Comments: The data for this section was not collected for the 2005-2006 school year, but will be collected for the 2006-2007 school year.**

**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**

**Comments:** The data for this section was not collected for the 2005-2006 school year, but will be collected for the 2006-2007 school year.

**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)**

**Comments:** The data for this section was not collected for the 2005-2006 school year, but will be collected for the 2006-2007 school year.

**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)	
English Language Learners (ELL)	
Gifted and Talented	
Vocational Education	

**Comments:** The data for this section was not collected for the 2005-2006 school year, but will be collected for the 2006-2007 school year.

**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	10
Expedited evaluations	10
Staff professional development and awareness	10
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	10
Transportation	10
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	10
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	10
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	10
Coordination between schools and agencies	10
Counseling	10
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	10
Clothing to meet a school requirement	10
School supplies	10
Referral to other programs and services	10
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	10
Other (optional)	

**Comments:** The figures provided reflects data from all 10 subgrantees.

**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	0
School selection	3
Transportation	3
School records	0
Immunizations or other medical records	0
Other enrollment issues	0

**Comments:** The figures provided reflects data from all 10 subgrantees.

**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:** None

**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		
Grade 4	Yes		
Grade 5	N/A		
Grade 6	N/A		
Grade 7	N/A		
Grade 8	Yes		
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes		
Grade 12	N/A		

**Comments:** Please note the following explanations for b and c:

b) Number of homeless children/youth taking the reading assessment test and c, the number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency at:

Grade 3 DNA

Grade 4 DNA

Grade 5 NA

Grade 6 NA

Grade 7 NA

Grade 8 DNA

Grade 9 NA

Grade 10 NA

Grade 11 DNA

Grade 12 NA

**Mathematics Assessment:**

School	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or
--------	---	---	--

Grade Levels *	not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	mathematics assessment test.	exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes		
Grade 4	Yes		
Grade 5	N/A		
Grade 6	N/A		
Grade 7	N/A		
Grade 8	Yes		
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes		
Grade 12	N/A		

**Comments:** Please note the following explanations for b and c:

b) Number of homeless children/youth taking the mathematics assessment test and c, the number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency at:

Grade 3 DNA

Grade 4 DNA

Grade 5 NA

Grade 6 NA

Grade 7 NA

Grade 8 DNA

Grade 9 NA

Grade 10 NA

Grade 11 DNA

Grade 12 NA

\* 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.