

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

Nevada's State Board of Education adopted challenging and rigorous statewide science standards that meet the requirements of NCLB in 1998-99. School districts implemented these standards during the 1999-2000 school year.

Nevada went through a process of revising its statewide science standards during the 2004-05 school year and those changes were subsequently adopted with implementation of the revised standards occurring during the 2005-06 school year.

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 provided table illustrates the tests used by Nevada to comply with NCLB standards and assessment requirements. As of the 2005-06 school year, all required assessments have been implemented with the exception of the high school science assessment. Science assessments must be implemented no later than the 2007-08 school year and Nevada will meet that timeline for its high school science assessment.

Grade Subject Year of Implementation

3 Reading 2001-02

Math 2001-02

4 Reading 2005-06

Math 2005-06

5 Reading 2001-02

Writing 2005-06a

Math 2001-02

Science 2003-04

6 Reading 2005-06

Math 2005-06

7 Reading 2005-06

Math 2005-06

8 Reading 2003-04

Writing Pre-2000

Math 2003-04

Science 2003-04

HS Reading Pre-2000

Writing Pre-2000

Math Pre-2000

Science 2007-08

a Prior to the 2005-06 school year, a writing test had been administered in grade 4 since the 1998-99 school year.

The Nevada Assessment Scales of Alternate Achievement (NASAA) was introduced in August of 2005. NASAA is based on benchmark performance skills derived by an expert panel of special education teachers, general education teachers, curriculum experts, and university faculty in state. The NASAA includes a very broad range of academic content, to ensure appropriate participation by students with severe disabilities. NASAA is constructed to take advantage of video recording technology and other automation features, to permit progress monitoring over time while addressing the rigorous technical requirements for consistent measurement depicted in NCLB regulations.

An alignment study was completed by an independent contractor in July 2005 to examine whether the content of the benchmark skills are appropriately linked to the intended content standard. A Vertical Benchmark Study was completed by independent contractor in June 2005 to assure that the benchmark skills were arrayed in proper sequence and the increases in skill complexity were consistent.

The process of setting alternate benchmarks identified 14 language arts strands are represented for eight of the Nevada Content Standards for English Language Arts . Three of these strands were determined essential and are mandatory for every student at every grade level. For math, nine strands are represented based on four of the Nevada Content Standards for Mathematics. These benchmarks were implemented during the 2006-2006 NASAA test administration.

For Science, a strand of Inquiry was established as mandatory, based on the recommendations of a professional panel held during the 2005-2006 school year. The Science benchmarks will be instituted for grades 5, 8 and 11 during the 2006-2007 NASAA test administration. Two side by side skills are assessed in each Mandatory Strand, for a total of 12 skills (14 at grades 5, 8 and 11).

NASAA is an assessment designed for those students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Nevada has not yet implemented an assessment for those students with less significant disabilities who still may not perform well on the regular assessment, with or without accommodations. During the 2006-2007 school year, the state will begin participation in a multi-state grant consortium to further validate the state's alternate assessment (NASAA) and to begin development of a modified alternate assessment to be administered to students who do not qualify to take the NASAA, but who would not be successful on the state CRT with or without appropriate accommodations. The consortium's work is expected to be completed in the Spring of 2008.

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

Using a systematic process, achievement standards to support content standards for English language Arts, Math, and Science in grades 3, 5, 8, and 12 were developed and implemented prior to the onset of the No Child Left behind Act. In a series of meetings involving a broad representation of Nevada educators, achievement levels standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics for grades 4, 6, and 7 have also been established. Consistent with Nevada's timeline for completion of its final assessment system under the NCLB provisions, several meetings with Nevada educators occurred during the Spring of 2005-06 culminating in the adoption of the achievement standards by Nevada's Council to Establish Academic Standards in September of 2006.

The state has progressed significantly, during the 2005-2006 school, year in developing an assessment that is targeted to students academic achievement based on alternate achievement standards.

Alignment to state academic content standards is based on a framework of 14 strands representing eight Nevada Content Standards for Kindergarten and Grades 1-8 and 12 for English Language Arts. Three strands were determined essential enough for them to be mandatory for every student.

For Math, nine strands are based on four of the Nevada Content Standards for Kindergarten and Grades 1-8 and 12. Three Math strands are set as mandatory for every student's participation.

The 2006-2007 school year sees Science added as a component of the assessment for grades 5, 8 and 11. A strand of Inquiry was established as mandatory.

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	118575	98.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	1858	98.15
Asian or Pacific Islander	9227	98.65
Black, non-Hispanic	12945	97.13
Hispanic	12945	98.29
White, non-Hispanic	55228	98.57
Students with Disabilities	12565	93.23
Limited English Proficient	17482	98.15
Economically Disadvantaged	47983	98.12
Migrant	56	100.00
Male	59845	98.06
Female	58730	98.54

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	118654	98.36
American Indian or Alaska Native	1857	98.05
Asian or Pacific Islander	9234	98.73
Black, non-Hispanic	12943	97.13
Hispanic	38738	98.44
White, non-Hispanic	55241	98.57
Students with Disabilities	12514	92.75
Limited English Proficient	17488	98.19
Economically Disadvantaged	48020	98.19
Migrant	56	100.00
Male	59859	98.07
Female	58795	98.65

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	22920	93.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1518	99.60

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	22867	92.80
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1518	99.60

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	31919	50.53
American Indian or Alaska Native	508	43.11
Asian or Pacific Islander	2421	64.31
Black, non-Hispanic	3477	33.91
Hispanic	11606	38.70
White, non-Hispanic	13637	62.84
Students with Disabilities	3579	27.63
Limited English Proficient	7492	29.98
Economically Disadvantaged	15070	37.81
Migrant	26	38.46
Male	16266	50.98
Female	15653	50.07

Comments: Although these numbers and percentages are outside the established parameters, they 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.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	31956	50.89
American Indian or Alaska Native	507	45.96
Asian or Pacific Islander	2423	64.30
Black, non-Hispanic	3480	37.30
Hispanic	11630	36.35
White, non-Hispanic	13645	64.70
Students with Disabilities	3575	22.49
Limited English Proficient	7519	24.34
Economically Disadvantaged	15097	36.42
Migrant	26	26.92
Male	16290	47.13
Female	15666	54.81

Comments: Although these numbers and percentages are outside the established parameters, they 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.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	32268	55.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	537	47.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2336	70.40
Black, non-Hispanic	3437	39.00
Hispanic	11592	43.40
White, non-Hispanic	14177	68.10
Students with Disabilities	3626	27.30
Limited English Proficient	5390	26.20
Economically Disadvantaged	14688	42.90
Migrant	11	45.50
Male	16442	55.40
Female	15722	56.40

Comments: Although the highlighted data lie outside the established parameters, these data 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	32261	53.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	538	46.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	2337	64.60
Black, non-Hispanic	3433	39.80
Hispanic	11591	38.90
White, non-Hispanic	14173	67.50
Students with Disabilities	3617	21.80
Limited English Proficient	5388	16.30
Economically Disadvantaged	14683	39.60
Migrant	11	27.30
Male	16435	49.70
Female	15722	57.70

Comments: Although the highlighted data lie outside the established parameters, these data 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	32849	54.67
American Indian or Alaska Native	503	46.12
Asian or Pacific Islander	2468	69.81
Black, non-Hispanic	3611	35.83
Hispanic	3611	43.38
White, non-Hispanic	14581	66.17
Students with Disabilities	3789	20.80
Limited English Proficient	4963	23.15
Economically Disadvantaged	15723	41.06
Migrant	18	44.44
Male	16480	53.25
Female	16369	56.09

Comments: Even though the highlighted numbers are outside the established parameters, they 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.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	32844	39.27
American Indian or Alaska Native	503	35.59
Asian or Pacific Islander	2468	48.30
Black, non-Hispanic	3610	22.55
Hispanic	11429	25.76
White, non-Hispanic	14582	52.83
Students with Disabilities	3777	10.56
Limited English Proficient	4955	7.69
Economically Disadvantaged	15722	24.60
Migrant	18	5.56
Male	16471	35.38
Female	16373	43.18

Comments: Even though the highlighted numbers are outside the established parameters, they 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.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Comments: When preparing the data for this report, significant problems were detected in the data files. The data will be available as soon as these problems are corrected.

- 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		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Comments:

- 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		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Comments: When preparing the data for this report, significant problems were detected in the data files. The data will be available as soon as these problems are corrected.

- 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		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Comments:

- 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	32087	50.45
American Indian or Alaska Native	497	44.47
Asian or Pacific Islander	2392	67.56
Black, non-Hispanic	3706	32.30
Hispanic	10475	35.26
White, non-Hispanic	14900	63.29
Students with Disabilities	3248	10.96
Limited English Proficient	3637	17.51
Economically Disadvantaged	12750	34.89
Migrant	11	18.18
Male	16398	49.33
Female	15689	51.63

Comments: Even though the numbers and percentages reported here are outside the established parameters, they 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.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	32106	51.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	499	47.49
Asian or Pacific Islander	2397	63.33
Black, non-Hispanic	3703	34.51
Hispanic	10484	35.08
White, non-Hispanic	14907	64.59
Students with Disabilities	3266	11.97
Limited English Proficient	3641	12.50
Economically Disadvantaged	12757	35.56
Migrant	11	27.27
Male	16416	46.13
Female	15690	56.09

Comments: Even though the numbers and percentages reported here are outside the established parameters, they 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.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	21586	72.08
American Indian or Alaska Native	349	65.04
Asian or Pacific Islander	1940	79.64
Black, non-Hispanic	2129	48.66
Hispanic	5118	57.56
White, non-Hispanic	12050	81.38
Students with Disabilities	1871	23.73
Limited English Proficient	1368	33.33
Economically Disadvantaged	4380	55.43
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	10610	74.96
Female	10976	69.31

Comments: Even though the numbers and percentages reported here are outside the parameters established above, they 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	10976	89.78
American Indian or Alaska Native	347	87.03
Asian or Pacific Islander	1943	91.41
Black, non-Hispanic	2133	80.83
Hispanic	5164	82.11
White, non-Hispanic	12080	94.46
Students with Disabilities	1860	48.66
Limited English Proficient	1355	51.96
Economically Disadvantaged	4401	80.28
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	10631	88.15
Female	11036	91.36

Comments: Even though the numbers and percentages reported here are outside the parameters established above, they 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	613	325	53.00

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	17	15	88.00

Comments:

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

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	135	80	59.00

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	17	15	88.00

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

Each Title I school that is identified in the attached chart has been required to revise its school improvement plan, and each plan is then peer reviewed at the district level to make certain it is compliant with all the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB in terms of what the revised school improvement plan must contain. The district also determines if the plan will, in the LEA's opinion, contribute to the academic growth of the children who attend that school.

In order to help the schools make meaningful revisions of their school improvement plans, the Nevada Department of Education has mandated that each school must spend a portion of its school improvement funds for planning purposes. With these planning dollars, each school is required to engage the services of an approved external facilitator who has experience in working with schools identified as in need of improvement.

Each external facilitator works with the school throughout the 90 day window during which the school must revise its plan. The external facilitators use a school improvement process which has been developed by NDE called SAGE (Student Achievement Gap Elimination). The SAGE procedure takes the school through a four-part planning process which includes a comprehensive needs assessment, an inquiry process, the design of a master plan, and the development of an implementation and evaluation timeline for putting the plan into action. When the school completes the SAGE process, with the external facilitator's assistance, the NDE provides the bulk of the school improvement money to the school so that it may begin implementing its newly revised school improvement plan.

By requiring school to engage the services of an external facilitator during the planning phase, NDE has seen a dramatic increase in the quality of the school improvement plans. In turn, NDE will be conducting an evaluation study of SAGE to determine the impact that participating in the SAGE process has on the school who engaged in the process and on the academic achievement of the students who attend these schools. Preliminary evaluation data shows that several of the schools who engaged in the SAGE process actually made AYP during the 2004-2005 school year or even if the school did not make AYP, made dramatic achievement gains in many of the subpopulations present at these schools.

Based on the 2004-2005 AYP data, NDE identified 18 Title I schools who were either in the 3rd or 4th year of improvement during the 2005-2006 school year. Building on the external facilitator model, these schools were assigned an entire school support team consisting of 5 team members whose roles are identified in state statute. These teams worked intensively with each of the 18 schools, and were in fact so successful that many of the schools actually made AYP for the 2005-2006 school year. These teams assist with the revision of the school improvement plan, but then remain active at the school for the remainder of the school year, filing monthly reports with NDE regarding the status of the implementation of the action steps of the school's improvement plan.

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.

Three districts were identified as being in need of improvement for the 2006-2007 school year. Of those three districts, two made AYP during the 2005-2006 school year, and are therefore classified as being in Year 2 (Hold) status. One district has actually moved into Year 3 of Improvement, and the SEA is thus required to take a corrective action against that district. The corrective action chosen by NDE is the implementation of a new curriculum, and for the purposes of assisting the district in identifying issues in the alignment and implementation of its current curriculum, NDE developed a tool called the Nevada Comprehensive Curriculum Alignment Tool (NCCAT). The Clark County School District has been officially notified of its improvement status and of the intent of NDE to use the option of implementing a new curriculum as the corrective action chosen by the State. The evaluation of the curriculum will take place during the 2006-2007 school year.

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.	44
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.	60
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	1092
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.	36657
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.	48
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	5389
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.	34858
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	49705	39938	80.35
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	3032	2529	83.41
Low-Poverty Schools	3138	2726	86.90
All Elementary Schools	11839	10121	85.49
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	6788	4753	70.02
Low-Poverty Schools	10731	9050	84.34
All Secondary Schools	37866	29817	78.74
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	14.51
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	57.20
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	16.22
d) Other (please explain)	
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	48.71
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	61.20
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	26.91
d) Other (please explain)	
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	67.66	24.52
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Lunch Rates	
Secondary Schools	49.52	18.97
Poverty Metric Used	Free and REduced Lunch Rates	

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	100.00

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

Nevada ELP Standards have been developed, approved and are used by the districts and schools to direct English language instruction in ESL and regular classroom instruction.

The ELP Standards are used to direct instruction through their use as the "language objective" in (SIOP) Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol lesson plans. All districts are integrating SIOP methods into their instruction.

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 ELP Standards were developed after the academic content and academic achievement standards. The ELP Standards were developed so as to align with the content standards. A subsequent review/study confirmed the alignment. There is a proposal to update the English Language Arts Standards. After that is completed, another review and possibly some changes will be required in the ELP Standards.

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:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent alignment study <u>Yes</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of alignment <u>No</u>
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:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nevada uses the LAS-Links assessment by CTB McGraw/Hill as its (ELPA) English Language Proficiency Assessment. It is used in all grades K-12. All LEP students are assessed. 2. It assesses all five domains. 3. Alignment with the ELP Standards was studied and assured prior to administration and adoption of the assessment. 4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.) were investigated and assured prior to administration and adoption of the assessment. <p>Standards setting to establish unique cut scores for Nevada was accomplished in May of 2006.</p>

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	71049	96.00
2. Tagalog	740	1.00
3. Chinese	518	0.70
4. Korean	296	0.40
5. Vietnamese	290	0.20
6. Filipino	148	0.20
7. Thai	141	0.20
8. Serbo-Croatian	139	0.20
9. Arabic	75	0.10
10. Russian	71	0.10
Comments:		

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

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

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

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
14328	14328	5

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.)

Overall, State continues to experience an increase in the number of enrolled immigrant children and youth. There has been, however, no significant change in the growth patterns--simply the fact that growth continues unabated.

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

1. Nevada has made changes in its requirements to determine English language proficiency because of its utilization of the LAS-Links (new to Nevada as of school year 2005-2006) as its English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA).

LAS-Links Nevada

Cut Scores

K

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 438 473 356 323 397 397 397

Intermediate 450 490 379 390 414 414 427

Advanced Inter 466 520 422 426 444 444 458

Proficient 500 552 475 450 487 487 494

1

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 444 473 396 378 420 458 422

Intermediate 467 490 424 436 445 478 454

Advanced Inter 492 520 467 471 479 506 487

Proficient 518 552 496 494 507 535 515

2

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 455 453 436 433 445 454 444

Intermediate 480 481 469 482 474 480 478

Advanced Inter 508 521 498 510 503 514 509

Proficient 536 547 517 538 526 541 534

3

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 455 453 438 434 446 454 445

Intermediate 491 485 477 482 484 488 483

Advanced Inter 520 523 508 516 514 521 516

Proficient 549 548 527 539 538 548 540

4

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 455 453 440 435 447 454 445

Intermediate 494 488 479 482 486 491 485

Advanced Inter 523 525 509 514 516 524 517

Proficient 550 549 527 539 538 549 541

5

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 455 453 445 437 450 454 447

Intermediate 495 489 488 482 491 492 488

Advanced Inter 529 526 515 518 522 527 522

Proficient 551 550 533 542 542 550 544

6

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 455 453 450 438 452 454 449

Intermediate 496 489 494 484 495 492 490

Advanced Inter 530 528 520 521 525 529 524

Proficient 552 550 537 545 544 551 546

7

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 455 453 455 441 455 454 451

Intermediate 497 489 502 485 499 493 493

Advanced Inter 530 529 528 523 529 529 527

Proficient 552 551 545 549 548 551 549

8

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 455 453 461 444 458 454 453

Intermediate 499 492 508 490 503 495 497

Advanced Inter 531 529 537 527 534 530 531

Proficient 552 553 557 551 554 552 553

9

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 455 454 465 446 460 454 455

Intermediate 501 495 514 494 507 498 501

Advanced Inter 532 530 540 529 536 531 532

Proficient 552 553 557 552 554 552 553

10

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 455 454 472 449 463 454 457

Intermediate 503 497 519 499 511 500 504

Advanced Inter 537 531 545 532 541 534 536

Proficient 560 554 562 554 561 557 557

11

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 455 454 478 451 466 454 459

Intermediate 505 500 525 503 515 502 508

Advanced Inter 539 533 551 534 545 536 539

Proficient 562 555 568 555 565 558 560

12

Listening Speaking Reading Writing Comp List/Speak Overall

Emerging 455 454 484 454 469 454 461

Intermediate 507 503 531 508 519 505 512

Advanced Inter 542 535 557 537 549 538 542

Proficient 565 556 574 557 569 560 563

2. The five domains are weighted equally. LEP students becomes "proficient" when they achieve proficient on the "overall" score. However, they do not exit the ESL program until they have achieved proficient on the overall score of the ELPA; achieved at least a level "4" (Advanced Intermediate) on each of the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension; and achieved at least "approaching standard" on an AYP assessment. Nevada uses no other criteria.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

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

Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

No Change

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.

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	% 100.00	# 74305	% 94.00	# 69841	% 12.50	# 9288	% 15.00	# 11033

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

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

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

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

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

Definitions:

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

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	100.00	69841	94.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		4464	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	12.50	11033	15.00
TOTAL		85338	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	10
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	4
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	8
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	5
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	2
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	4
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	6
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	1
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	5
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	5
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:

* 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	869	80.70
4	1146	45.50
5	1250	20.70
6	1410	29.40
7	1651	23.10
8	1421	22.60
H.S.	751	55.90

Comments: We do not have access to assessment data for former Title III students who transitioned to monitor status only during the previous school year. The data we are reporting includes students who transitioned to monitor status in either of the previous 2 years. Additionally, for 10th grade administration, this is not the actual data used for AYP, which includes both 10th and 11th grade scores. This data is for 10th grade administration of the test only.

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	867	75.20
4	1146	51.10
5	1249	43.30
6	1410	37.40
7	1651	51.20
8	1419	22.80
H.S.	750	28.80

Comments: See note above. Same conditions apply to this data, as well.

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	64.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	55.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	73.70
Black, non-Hispanic	49.70
Hispanic	50.70
White, non-Hispanic	72.80
Students with Disabilities	0.00
Limited English Proficient	0.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	62.20
Female	67.60
Comments: Graduation data not available for Students with disabilities, Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged, or 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	5.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.80
Black, non-Hispanic	7.30
Hispanic	7.80
White, non-Hispanic	4.50
Students with Disabilities	0.00
Limited English Proficient	0.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	6.10
Female	5.20
Comments: Data not available for Students with Disabilities, Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged, or 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

Nevada Revised Statute defines a school year as running from July 1 through June 30.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	14	14
LEAs with Subgrants	3	3

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	10	582
1	12	678
2	13	627
3	13	569
4	11	590
5	3	528
6	3	471
7	6	436
8	12	448
9	18	433
10	0	286
11	8	151
12	0	144

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	16	813
Doubled-up	18	3320
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	4	123
Hotels/Motels	4	1688
Unknown	1	61
Comments:		
* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.		

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

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

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	582
1	678
2	627
3	569
4	590
5	528
6	471
7	436
8	448
9	433
10	321
11	151
12	144

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

33

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

135

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)

0

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)	749
English Language Learners (ELL)	560
Gifted and Talented	56
Vocational Education	19

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	315
Expedited evaluations	0
Staff professional development and awareness	600
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	134
Transportation	20
Early childhood programs	2
Assistance with participation in school programs	385
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	404
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	385
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	385
Coordination between schools and agencies	385
Counseling	288
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	123
Clothing to meet a school requirement	308
School supplies	385
Referral to other programs and services	385
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	385
Other (optional)	0

Comments: Two districts did not track this information.

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School selection	1
Transportation	2
School records	1
Immunizations or other medical records	2
Other enrollment issues	0

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

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

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

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

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	399	140
Grade 4	Yes	416	139
Grade 5	Yes	406	79
Grade 6	Yes	307	68
Grade 7	Yes	267	115
Grade 8	Yes	297	112
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	108	68
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	400	120
Grade 4	Yes	409	143
Grade 5	Yes	375	118
Grade 6	Yes	307	125
Grade 7	Yes	261	101
Grade 8	Yes	297	115
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	117	24
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:

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