

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



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

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

The Science Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Standards were adopted by the State Board of Education on August 28, 2003.

The Science Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Standards revision process began in October 2002. Writing teams consisting of educators and scientists developed draft standards, which were reviewed by teachers, scientists, parents, and other community members; over 200 responses were received during the review process.

The Science Standards are organized into three strands:

• Scientific thinking and practice

• Content of science

• Science and society

The scientific thinking and practice strand prepares students to design a testable scientific question and conduct an investigation to find solutions. Critical thinking is central in this strand. Students are prepared to question existing results and to generate and weigh new options as a result of scientific inquiry. They understand that science is not absolute and that theories should, and are, questioned and challenged.

The content of science strand provides the essential concepts and principles in the life sciences, physical sciences, and earth and space sciences. The knowledge and skills in this strand provide the foundation that students need for critical thinking and problem solving. The strand reflects an articulated core of accepted scientific knowledge; important topics are developed over time and are connected with one another to form a cohesive whole.

The science and society strand prepares students to understand ways in which science and society influence each other and how scientific understanding impacts decisions at multiple levels. Students combine their critical thinking skills and understanding of science content to examine implications for individuals and societies.

Throughout the standards the integrity of science and its underlying scientific principles are completely sound as students are encouraged to apply their critical thinking skills to examine data and observations, ask questions, investigate, explore alternatives, and seek solutions. The very nature of science is inquiry - the challenge of testing new hypotheses and asking new questions.

The Fordham Institute has given the New Mexico Science Standards an "A" and they were praised in Quality Counts 2006.

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

As an initial step New Mexico provided standards-based assessments in reading and mathematics for the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 school years at the 4th and 8th grade, and in 2003-2004 the 11th grade assessment in reading and mathematics.

Beginning in February of the 2004-2005 school year, New Mexico assessed students in grades 3-9 and 11 with standards-based assessments. The assessments in grades 3-9 replaced the 4th and 8th grades assessments. The 11th grade assessment has been revised to fully cover New Mexico's standards. A variety of diverse New Mexico educators participated at each major step in the development of both assessments by participating in item selection for field tests, review of data from field tests, and review of the assessment forms prior to final approval.

The Secretary's Assessment and Accountability Advisory Council - made up of diverse representatives from LEAs across New Mexico, including representation from general, special, and ELL populations - are consulted on an ongoing basis regarding the best procedures for implementing the assessments at the local level including, shipping, scoring rubrics and formatting of test booklets.

New Mexico has completed the item development process for the New Mexico Alternate Performance Assessment (NMAPA). The NMAPA is currently being printed for shipment. The NMPED is currently conducting 14 statewide trainings for approximately 1400 test administrators and raters for the NMAPA. The assessment is composed of language arts (reading/writing), math, and science subtests in grades 3-9 and 11. The assessment are organized into separate grade bands (3-4, 5-6, 7-8 in all content areas; 9-10, and 11-12 in language arts, with 9-12 in math and science). The assessment is built from the new Expanded Grade Band Expectations, which are linked to grade level expectations. The entire test development process included expert panels which are reflective of our state's diversity. The NMAPA will be administered between April 2-30, 2007. An alignment study using the Browder/Flowers model with some important adjustments, is scheduled for March 28-30, 2007. Data review is scheduled for June 24-26, 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

Achievement standards were set on the previous assessments in grades 4, 8 and 11. These achievement standards were revised for the new assessments in grades 3-9 and 11. This process took place in February and March 2005, and applied the modified Angoff Method. Educators from the grades tested plus the adjoining grades participated in the process. For example, the 5th grade work group included teachers from both the 4th and 6th grade. In the 11th grade there were teachers from the 9th grade, 10th grade, 11th grade and 12th grade. New Mexico's previous standard setting work guided the work of the standard setting committees.

New Mexico has developed pre-achievement level descriptors (Pre-ALDs) with a series of expert stakeholders reflective of our state's diversity on October 17-19, 2006. Pre-ALDs were developed from newly revised Expanded Grade Band Expectations in grade bands 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, and 9-12 in math and science. In language arts (reading/writing), the 9-12 grade band was divided into 9-10, 11-12 to align with our general content standards and benchmarks. These Pre-ALDs will be revised and used during final standard setting on July 9-13, 2007, and combined with cut-scores to set our final alternate achievement standards. The process will meet NCLB technical adequacy requirements. An I.D. matching standard-setting process will be employed.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

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

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	196094	98.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	21883	98.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	2431	97.60
Black, non-Hispanic	4978	97.30
Hispanic	105480	98.30
White, non-Hispanic	61312	98.30
Students with Disabilities	28424	97.60
Limited English Proficient	50532	98.60
Economically Disadvantaged	123368	98.60
Migrant	798	99.40
Male	100081	98.10
Female	95992	98.40

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.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	196024	99.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	21883	98.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	2408	98.80
Black, non-Hispanic	4979	98.90
Hispanic	105425	99.00
White, non-Hispanic	61319	99.40
Students with Disabilities	28424	98.30
Limited English Proficient	50433	98.90
Economically Disadvantaged	123314	99.10
Migrant	797	99.30
Male	100025	98.90
Female	95978	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.

1.2.2 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	26808	94.31
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1616	5.69

Comments:

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	26808	94.31
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1616	5.69

Comments:

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	24105	45.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2303	28.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	351	70.70
Black, non-Hispanic	615	34.00
Hispanic	13600	40.20
White, non-Hispanic	7236	59.40
Students with Disabilities	3218	22.30
Limited English Proficient	7032	37.00
Economically Disadvantaged	16542	37.80
Migrant	91	36.30
Male	12296	44.90
Female	11809	45.40

Comments: Migrant was not collected last year

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	24090	54.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	2299	37.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	348	71.30
Black, non-Hispanic	615	48.80
Hispanic	13588	48.70
White, non-Hispanic	7240	70.70
Students with Disabilities	3216	25.40
Limited English Proficient	7012	39.00
Economically Disadvantaged	16524	46.30
Migrant	90	34.40
Male	12281	50.10
Female	11809	59.10

Comments: Migrant was not collected last year

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	23833	41.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2359	25.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	330	67.60
Black, non-Hispanic	633	32.20
Hispanic	13314	34.70
White, non-Hispanic	7197	57.40
Students with Disabilities	3244	16.40
Limited English Proficient	6968	28.40
Economically Disadvantaged	16327	33.00
Migrant	105	27.60
Male	12087	40.00
Female	11744	42.20

Comments: these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	23816	53.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	2360	35.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	322	75.20
Black, non-Hispanic	635	51.00
Hispanic	13307	47.30
White, non-Hispanic	7192	71.60
Students with Disabilities	3244	20.70
Limited English Proficient	6950	36.90
Economically Disadvantaged	16312	45.20
Migrant	105	39.00
Male	12071	48.50
Female	11743	59.40

Comments: these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	24199	34.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	2409	19.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	296	58.10
Black, non-Hispanic	631	26.80
Hispanic	13461	27.30
White, non-Hispanic	7401	51.40
Students with Disabilities	3507	11.40
Limited English Proficient	6984	19.70
Economically Disadvantaged	16349	25.10
Migrant	128	23.40
Male	12434	34.20
Female	11762	34.30

Comments: number is correct

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	24194	57.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	2412	39.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	293	73.70
Black, non-Hispanic	632	50.60
Hispanic	13455	51.10
White, non-Hispanic	7401	74.20
Students with Disabilities	3506	20.00
Limited English Proficient	6976	38.00
Economically Disadvantaged	16348	48.30
Migrant	129	44.20
Male	12428	52.30
Female	11763	62.50

Comments: number is correct

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	24608	23.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	2647	13.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	286	47.60
Black, non-Hispanic	639	14.90
Hispanic	13501	17.10
White, non-Hispanic	7535	39.10
Students with Disabilities	3585	6.20
Limited English Proficient	6882	11.60
Economically Disadvantaged	16420	15.80
Migrant	114	12.30
Male	12564	23.00
Female	12043	24.50

Comments: number is correct

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

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	24598	40.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	2648	24.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	281	59.40
Black, non-Hispanic	639	38.00
Hispanic	13495	33.40
White, non-Hispanic	7535	58.10
Students with Disabilities	3584	11.50
Limited English Proficient	6868	25.10
Economically Disadvantaged	16412	31.10
Migrant	114	31.60
Male	12559	34.90
Female	12038	46.20

Comments: number is correct

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	25180	23.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	2916	12.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	289	50.50
Black, non-Hispanic	608	16.30
Hispanic	13602	16.00
White, non-Hispanic	7765	39.70
Students with Disabilities	3731	5.60
Limited English Proficient	6583	10.90
Economically Disadvantaged	16317	14.70
Migrant	111	8.10
Male	12905	23.20
Female	12274	23.40

Comments: number is correct

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	25165	50.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	2916	32.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	287	67.60
Black, non-Hispanic	607	42.80
Hispanic	13590	44.80
White, non-Hispanic	7765	66.70
Students with Disabilities	3729	13.30
Limited English Proficient	6569	34.40
Economically Disadvantaged	16309	40.90
Migrant	111	43.20
Male	12892	44.30
Female	12272	56.70

Comments: number is correct

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	25659	26.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	2984	14.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	268	53.70
Black, non-Hispanic	604	19.70
Hispanic	13713	19.00
White, non-Hispanic	8090	42.80
Students with Disabilities	3790	6.50
Limited English Proficient	6078	12.70
Economically Disadvantaged	16126	17.60
Migrant	95	5.30
Male	13082	26.00
Female	12574	26.50

Comments: number is correct

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	25652	50.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	2984	31.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	266	65.80
Black, non-Hispanic	604	44.50
Hispanic	13700	44.80
White, non-Hispanic	8098	68.20
Students with Disabilities	3793	16.80
Limited English Proficient	6066	33.90
Economically Disadvantaged	16119	41.40
Migrant	95	46.30
Male	13080	43.60
Female	12569	58.40

Comments: number is correct

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	20470	30.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	2587	16.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	314	51.00
Black, non-Hispanic	523	19.70
Hispanic	9663	19.60
White, non-Hispanic	7376	49.60
Students with Disabilities	2904	7.10
Limited English Proficient	3589	11.80
Economically Disadvantaged	9511	18.80
Migrant	51	19.60
Male	10163	31.20
Female	10301	29.80

Comments: numbers are correct

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

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	20449	58.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	2589	48.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	314	64.30
Black, non-Hispanic	521	50.10
Hispanic	9649	49.00
White, non-Hispanic	7371	73.40
Students with Disabilities	2901	18.60
Limited English Proficient	3579	34.50
Economically Disadvantaged	9502	47.90
Migrant	50	34.00
Male	10148	51.90
Female	10295	64.00

Comments: numbers are correct

- 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	805	372	46.20

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	89	21	23.60

Comments: District AYP is based on grade span (elem, mid, HS). Because 2004-05 was the first year that NM administered a fully NCLB compliant assessment, districts are only now beginning to enter the School Improvement cycle.

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	577	263	45.60

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	88	20	22.70

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

In 2005-2006 School Year, the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) under the coordination of the Priority Schools Bureau initiated on site reviews of the schools In Need Of Improvement (SINOI). The NMPED in collaboration with Baldrige in Education /Jim Shipley and Associates (JSA) provided personalized consultations based on the NM PED Diagnostic Assessment Report.

Administrators and all school staff from priority schools were provided with six (6) days of training and coaching in the systems approach to continuous improvement and the implementation of the Baldrige criteria to enhance the educational process.

The following is a list of requirements/recommendations for SINOI schools:

1. All School In Need Of Improvement (SINOI) are required to send representative teams to the PED Regional Leadership Trainings and the PED Professional Institute for Educators.
2. Short Cycle Assessment - Implementation of short cycle assessments that are aligned to New Mexico State Standards in addition to any other methods of evaluating student progress, such as rubrics, teacher made tests, etc.
3. Graph and Communicate Student Data to community - District administrators will direct teachers to graph their Students' Academic Progress Data on a continuous periodic basis and communicate that information with students and parents.

4. Interventions for Students not meeting proficiency:

â€¢ Students in Restructuring-2 schools who are not proficient in reading and mathematics need to be supported with intensive interventions such as an additional class at the middle and high school, after school tutoring, Saturday sessions, and/or summer school provided by the district/school. The plans developed need to specifically address the interventions the school is using, when they are planned, who is responsible for the interventions, and the number of students identified for participation. Parents need to be involved in the process by informing them that in order to address the student's needs the specific intervention will be provided. If parents choose to refuse services, they must so inform the principal in writing.

5. Budget Alignment for PED Requirements - It is expected that the district align all budgets to accommodate the PED mandates imposed to support student success.

6. Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS)-The school EPSS must be revised to emphasize priorities that address student learning needs. A single, comprehensive EPSS that synthesizes information from the several existing plans reflective of the school's instructional priorities (the current EPSS, the corrective action plan, the five year action plan, school wide Title I plan, etc.) and includes the major goals and/or references to the documents that deal with non-instructional school priorities (such as the safety plan, parent and community involvement plan, and others) is the desired result of the revision. Alignment, clarity, and simplicity should be the aims of this complex undertaking. Input from stakeholders is a necessary aspect of the revision process. The school EPSS goals must be aligned to the District EPSS focus areas and the PED focus areas as well as to focus areas determined by individual school assessments.

7. Level 2 or 3 Licensure for Teachers at same as District Average. District wide, administrators must pursue the hiring of highly qualified teachers in level 2 and 3 licensure. SI-II through R-II schools must have the same or exceed the percentage of highly qualified teachers staffed at their schools compared to the district average of other schools.

8. Recommended that Reading or Mathematics core instruction has the following class size recommendation limits for RI Schools:

- a. Grades 1-3 not to exceed 16; averages should not be used

b. Grades 4-6 not to exceed 18; averages should not be used

c. Grades 7-12 instructional class size not to exceed 18

9. Alternative Governance Contingency Plan. The purpose of the "Contingency Planning Year" is to allow the LEA Administration time to develop an Alternative Governance Contingency Plan (AGCP) that specifies how the school will be reorganized and educational services provided to students impacted by Alternative Governance. Education services for the students impacted will continue to be provided by the school under PED supervision. Actions that must occur during the planning year include:

a. The AGCP must address the prescribed areas of:

â€¢ Implementation of the New Mexico Content Standards;

â€¢ Budget;

â€¢ Transportation;

â€¢ Supplemental Educational Services;

â€¢ Staffing; and

â€¢ Facilities.

b. Development of the AGCP must involve the parent and school community in both the planning and implementation. The AGCP must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary of Quality Assurance & Systems Integration Division for action by the Secretary of Education.

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.

The following list describes measures being taken to address the achievement problems of priority districts in New Mexico:

1. PED targeted assistance for districts identified as having the highest concentration of CA, R-I, R-II schools that are not located in a designated Regional Quality Center.
2. District participation with and support of the Accomplished Education Administrator who is assigned to Priority District:
 - a. Advise district leadership,
 - b. Facilitate "Turn Around Teams,"
 - c. Provide expertise in specific designated fields,
 - d. Train school and district leadership in data-driven decision making, and "Systems Thinking" to address district needs.
3. Complete Semester District Progress Reports for SINOI sites.
4. Leadership and instructional teams are required to attend the PED Regional Leadership Trainings and Professional Development Institute for Educators.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	68
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.	135
How many of these schools were charter schools?	11
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.	1841
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.	64164
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
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.	
Comments:	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	105
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	4656
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.	38785
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	63577	56970	89.60
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	4779	4453	93.20
Low-Poverty Schools	3789	3577	94.40
All Elementary Schools	17486	16397	93.80
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	4709	3947	83.80
Low-Poverty Schools	21965	19529	88.90
All Secondary Schools	46091	40573	88.00
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

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

How is a teacher defined?

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

How is a class defined?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	70.00
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	20.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	60.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	20.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	20.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	82.90	54.10
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Price lunch	
Secondary Schools	83.00	54.50
Poverty Metric Used	Free and reduced Price 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	93.00

Comments: On the 120th day of the 2005-06 School Year, 2,473 of 2,656 Title I Paraprofessionals with Instructional Duties were reported as holding the appropriate Level III license. We know that many educational assistants were currently in the portfolio process during this reporting period, and many others were either taking or re-taking the licensure test. While we do not yet have our first reports for the 2006-07 School year, we anticipate 100% compliance with this requirement without losing many of our Title I paraprofessionals statewide.

In addition, many of our districts have required all educational assistants to attain Level III paraprofessional licensure regardless of classroom assignment.

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

The New Mexico English Language Development Standards (NMELDS) were written, approved and published in 2003. Statewide workshops have been regularly provided for teachers on the implementation of these standards. For details, see previous CSPR reports (January 2005, March 2006).

Since March 2006, New Mexico has further implemented the integration of the New Mexico English Language Development Standards by:

â€¢ August 2006: Re-naming and replacing the NMELDS on the NMPED webpage
<http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/learn.serv/Bilingual/dl/eld.is/eld.standards.final.version.doc>

â€¢ April and July 2006: Regular provision of workshops at statewide conferences on the development and implementation of the NMELDS (New Mexico Association for Bilingual Education Annual Conference, New Mexico Coalition of School Administrators' Annual Conference).

â€¢ Ongoing, 2005-2006: Promotion of NMELDS as part of the regular Technical Assistance/Focused Monitoring visits to districts and schools.

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

~~â€~~ July-November 2006: Establishment of a state Task Force, composed of experts from the field and from higher education, has been planned to align the NMELDS with the New Mexico Content Standards and Benchmarks, etc. for Math and for Science. To enable teachers to provide more effective instruction to their English Language Learners, the Task Force will also develop a guide for teachers of Math and Science. (See timeline below re the plan for this Task Force.)

TIMELINE:

January 2007(1): Establishment of a state task force:

- to review the alignment between the sets of standards, and
- to produce a guide for teachers to use in adapting Math instruction for English Language Learners.

This state task force will be composed of elementary and secondary teachers of ESL/ELD, elementary and secondary teachers of Math, higher education and possibly other experts from these two fields, and task force facilitators from the Bilingual Multicultural Education Bureau and Math & Science Education Bureau of NMPED.

January 2007(2): Meeting of the task force to review need and method to align the sets of standards. Distribution to all task force members of the following:

- ~~â€~~ Timeline for completion of task
- ~~â€~~ The two sets of standards
- ~~â€~~ An alignment matrix form
- ~~â€~~ Sample model alignments

February 2007: Meeting of the task force to review and determine alignment or need for alignment between the sets of standards, and to develop statements for any areas that are incomplete.

March 2007 (1): Rough Alignment Report of the task force sent to NMPED - Bilingual Multicultural Education Bureau and Math & Science Education Bureau for review, revision and publication.

March 2007 (2): Meeting of the task force to review need and method to produce a guide for teachers to use in adapting Math instruction for English Language Learners. Distribution to all task force members of the following:

- ~~â€~~ Timeline for completion of task
- ~~â€~~ Sample guides
- ~~â€~~ Format for guide production

April 2007: Meeting of the task force to develop (write or adapt) components of a guide for teachers to use in adapting Math instruction for English Language Learners.

May 2007:

â€ Final draft of the Alignment Report approved by Dr. Veronica Garcia,
NM Secretary of Education.

â€ Final meeting of the task force to complete the draft of a guide for
teachers to use in adapting Math instruction for English Language
Learners.

June 2007: Rough draft of the guide for teachers submitted to NMPED-Bilingual Multicultural Education Bureau and
Math & Science Education Bureau for review, revision and publication.

July 2007:

â€ Completion of revision of guide for teachers by Bilingual
Multicultural Education Bureau (BMEB) and Math & Science Education
Bureau, and

â€ Its approval by Dr. Veronica Garcia, NM State Secretary of Education.

â€ Orientation workshop presented at the New Mexico Coalition of School Administrators' Annual Conference (end
of July 2007) by task force members and BMEB/Math & Science Bureaus.

August 2007: Publication and distribution to all districts, charter schools, and private schools of the Alignment Report
and the Guide for Teachers.

Fall 2007: Training workshops provided by task force members and BMEB/Math & Science Bureaus at:

â€ NM Math and Science Teachers' Association Annual Conference
(November 2007)

â€ Dual Language New Mexico Annual Conference (November 2007)

â€ New Mexico Association for Bilingual Education Annual Conference
(April 2008)

Ongoing from Fall 2007: As part of the Technical Assistance/Focused Monitoring visits to districts, BMEB will
regularly monitor schools regarding the awareness of teachers re alignment of the standards, and their
implementation of the Alignment Guide.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

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

- An independent alignment study Yes
- Other evidence of alignment No

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

â€ March 2006: NMPED signed contract with the Harcourt Company to produce NMELPA (the New Mexico English Language Proficiency Assessment). This assessment was reviewed by an independent consultant hired by Harcourt to ensure alignment with the NMELDS. Harcourt is also committed to distribute the test to schools, to provide training for test administration, and to compile and analyze results of the test. For grades K-12, the NMELPA addresses the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension.

â€ April 2006: Statewide administration of the NMELPA, the first statewide assessment for English Language proficiency (New Mexico English Language Proficiency Assessment) was conducted.

â€ June-November 2006: A series of studies and meetings analyzing and evaluating student performance on the NMELPA. Test items and statewide student performance have been analyzed with the purposes of future improvement of the assessment (for validity and reliability, etc.) and for improved understanding of the English language instructional needs of English Language Learners in New Mexico.

â€ August 2006: The New Mexico English Language Placement Test (NMELPT) - the first statewide assessment for identification and placement of English Language Learners- was developed, adopted and disseminated statewide for use.

â€ January-February 2007: Based on feedback from teacher reviewers in June and in October 2006, two parts of the NMELPA are planned to be revised in January-February 2007: the Grade K-1 level test for Reading and Writing, and the Grade 9 test. This revision of NMELPA is planned so as to improve alignment of the test with NMELDS and to have greater reliability and validity. All Grade K-1 ELL students are planned to take the revised test in April 2007.

â€ Summer 2007: Based upon feedback from teachers and other test administrators, the revision plan for NMELPT for Grades K-1 will take place in Summer 2007 (revised or replaced) to better align with the NMELDS.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	50483	77.90
2. Navajo	9781	15.10
3. Zuni	1405	21.00
4. Keres	1151	1.70
5. Vietnamese	246	0.40
6. Towa	138	0.20
7. Arabic	110	0.20
8. Tewa	76	0.10
9. Korean	68	0.10
10. Russian	48	0.10

Comments: This count was obtained from the public school Accountability Data System. It is an under-representation of Native American languages, since BIA school data is not included.

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

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

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

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
8915	2119	14

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.)

Year by year, the number of districts who are experiencing Immigrant students for the first time is growing. Many of these are very small rural districts.

The major cities (Albuquerque, Las Cruces, Santa Fe, etc.) in the state have experienced large immigrant population influxes, but their Immigrant populations have grown gradually over the years, so they usually do not apply for the Emergency Immigrant funds.

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

Since April 2006, the State of New Mexico has required that the assessment of English Language Learners be measured by their performance on the new statewide New Mexico English Language Proficiency Assessment (NMELPA). The NMELPA includes 4 tests addressing student grade level clusters: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12. The level of performance is determined by a cut score gauged to each grade level (k, 1, 2, etc.). This cut score is the average of the 5 domain scores. The domain scores are weighted equally in this average ("Composite Score"). "Proficiency" on this test is defined as performance at the cut score of the "Advanced Level."

Similarly, in the New Mexico English Language Placement Test (NMELPT), the "Proficient" classification is based upon a student performance cut score averaged from the 5 domains and gauged to each grade level. This test is significantly shorter than the formal NMELPA, but it is composed of the most discriminating items from the NMELPA. The NMELPT can be locally scored and indicates "Proficient" or "Not Proficient" classification.

The NMELPA addresses all the standards of the NMELDS. However, the English Language Proficiency tests used by schools in previous years (LAS, IPT and Woodcock-Muñoz) were not aligned with the NMELDS. Thus, student performance on the NMELPA (for each level) cannot be directly compared with their performance on the assessments used in previous years. We cannot expect the performance record for 2005-2006 to show a simple progression of improved student performance, as expected by the AMAO Chart developed in 2003.

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

As was discussed in the previous section (1.6.5), the new test (NMELPA) addresses different standards from those of the 3 tests used earlier.

Classification of student performance is based upon cut scores composed of the average of scores on the 5 domain tests for each grade level cluster. The cut score is different for each grade level (k, 1, 2, etc.). The levels addressed in the "Making Progress" objective are: "Emergent (Beginning)," "Early Intermediate," "Intermediate," and "Early Advanced." Student performance on the new assessment cannot be directly compared with student performance on the assessments used in previous years. The 2005-2006 assessment results provide a new baseline of data.

We are aware that the K-12 students who enter English as a Second Language/English Language Development programs bring a wide range of English language skills upon entry. The data from our state average indicates:

- a. Relatively few ELL students enter and continue to perform for a long period at the Emergent (Beginning) Level. These are usually Immigrant students.
- b. The vast majority of ELL students are native-born New Mexicans, who are fluent in conversational English, but are not yet proficient in academic levels of English. These students usually enter the ESL/ELD programs with a skill level performance of Intermediate or Early Advanced.
- c. The above two levels (Intermediate and Early Advanced) did not have counterpart scoring levels on the earlier-used tests. We cannot conclude that the students scoring at this level in Spring 2006 (first administration of NMELPA) made progress from the lower levels in that school year. Thus, we have entered "0" on the charts reporting the "Making Progress" AMAO until we can determine a way to compare the earlier-used tests with the NMELPA.
- d. We also cannot expect that the NMELPA student performance will correspond to the expectations of the 2003 Chart of AMAO target for "Making Progress," which was based on student performance on the earlier-used tests. For this reason, we are requesting that an amendment be made to the target chart of AMAOs.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

No change has been made in this definition.

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	% 37.00	# 25233	% 0.00	# 0	% 15.00	# 10230	% 21.10	# 13677

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.

Comment: See the discussion about using baseline data of 2005-2006 in Sections 1.6.5 and 1.6.6. We have discussed this issue with OELA staff who visited us on December 4, 2006. They are aware that we were unable to report this data.

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

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

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

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

Definitions:

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

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	37.00	0	0.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		0	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	15.00	13508	27.00
TOTAL		13508	

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

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	53
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	40
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	2
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	40
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments: In sections 1.6.9 and 1.6.10, the total cannot be stated for all questions that include the determination of "Making Progress." (There was no comment section obvious for section 1.6.9.) On December 4, 2006, we discussed this issue with OELA staff who visited our Department - they are aware that we were unable to report this data.

* 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	596	69.50
4	772	65.60
5	890	67.20
6	899	43.70
7	777	52.10
8	691	58.80
H.S.	546	66.80

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	597	55.80
4	771	49.40
5	890	39.10
6	899	24.70
7	777	23.70
8	692	27.60
H.S.	546	27.10

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

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

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

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

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

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	85.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	76.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.00
Black, non-Hispanic	83.00
Hispanic	84.00
White, non-Hispanic	90.00
Students with Disabilities	73.00
Limited English Proficient	76.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	77.00
Male	83.00
Female	88.00

Comments: Information for economically disadvantaged was not available in 04-05.

Graduation is computed as the percentage of students enrolled on the 40th day of their senior year that receive a standard diploma on time.

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	5.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.10
Black, non-Hispanic	6.80
Hispanic	6.60
White, non-Hispanic	3.70
Students with Disabilities	0.00
Limited English Proficient	0.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	54.00
Female	46.00

Comments: Student with Disabilities, LEP, Economic Disadvantage, Migrant, categories were not collected in SY04-05. That data will be available starting SY05-06

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.

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

The NMAC 6.30.2.10 Letter H defines the New Mexico Public School Instructional Days in

The following format:

Grades 1st - 6th (5.5 hours per day for a total of 990 hours per year)

Grades 7th - 12th (6 hours per day for a total of 1,080 hours per year)

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	73	59
LEAs with Subgrants	16	16

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	<n	282
1	<n	482
2	<n	473
3	<n	469
4	13	462
5	14	457
6	<n	363
7	15	376
8	<n	356
9	31	404
10	28	304
11	30	274
12	31	264

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	60	1079
Doubled-up	35	3227
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	16	221
Hotels/Motels	<n	353
Unknown	34	365

Comments: 5 Couch surfers/living/sleeping with sporadic freindsidentified

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

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	493
1	462
2	471
3	443
4	454
5	443
6	345
7	359
8	332
9	356
10	281
11	249
12	242

Comments: Other (i.e., Adult Education) 16 identified.

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

101

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

319

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

78

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	732
English Language Learners (ELL)	1308
Gifted and Talented	30
Vocational Education	399

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

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

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	19
Expedited evaluations	16
Staff professional development and awareness	16
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	20
Transportation	16
Early childhood programs	13
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	16
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	11
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	13
Coordination between schools and agencies	14
Counseling	15
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	9
Clothing to meet a school requirement	18
School supplies	21
Referral to other programs and services	16
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	9
Other (optional)	9

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	6
School selection	2
Transportation	3
School records	2
Immunizations or other medical records	1
Other enrollment issues	1

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

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

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Homeless student not able to receive medicaid	1
Lack of affordable housing	1
Medical care for undocumented students	1

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

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

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	284	84
Grade 4	Yes	293	81
Grade 5	Yes	300	97
Grade 6	Yes	271	46
Grade 7	Yes	224	55
Grade 8	Yes	201	53
Grade 9	Yes	172	30
Grade 10	DNA	0	0
Grade 11	DNA	0	0
Grade 12	DNA	0	0

Comments: Please note that Albuquerque Public Schools was not able to provide this information to the NM Public Education Department due to the timeliness of this federal report due.

Mathematics Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	284	77
Grade 4	Yes	293	68
Grade 5	Yes	302	46
Grade 6	Yes	271	23
Grade 7	Yes	221	43
Grade 8	Yes	201	17
Grade 9	Yes	171	24
Grade 10	DNA	0	0
Grade 11	DNA	0	0
Grade 12	DNA	0	0

Comments: Please note that Albuquerque Public Schools was not able to provide this information to the NM Public Education Department due to the timeliness of this federal report due.

* 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.