

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

On January 5, 2002 the Pennsylvania State Board of Education adopted two sets of Academic Standards for instruction that come under the broad category of Science. The one set is for Science and Technology and the other for Environment and Ecology. These Academic Standards are required for instruction to all students in the public schools of Pennsylvania. This adoption was the result of a multi-year project that involved Pennsylvania Department of Education staff, teachers, school and district administrators, Intermediate Unit staff, parents, students, college and university representatives, and business and industry leaders.

As the requirement for an assessment became known, Pennsylvania recognized the need to identify from those broad Academic Standards for instruction, the content that is eligible for inclusion on the Science assessment. The Assessment Anchor Content Standards for the Science test were developed in 2006. These Assessment Anchor Content Standards identify the content eligible for items on the Science Assessment. The Science assessment will be first administered in 2007-2008 in Grades 4, 8, and 11 and required of all public school students in Pennsylvania in those grades. The Science assessment will include both multiple-choice and open-ended items. The open-ended items enable the measurement of higher order thinking skills and understanding.

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

Pennsylvania adopted the Academic Standards for instruction in Mathematics and in Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening in 1999. This adoption was the result of a multiyear project that involved Pennsylvania Department of Education staff, teachers, school and district administrators, Intermediate Unit staff, parents, students, college and university representatives, and business and industry leaders. Mathematics and Reading assessments were developed based on those broad academic standards in Grades 5, 8, and 11 for all students in the public schools of Pennsylvania. Assessments in Reading and Mathematics in Grade 3 had been planned prior to the advent of NCLB and were first administered in 2003.

It became readily apparent that the academic standards used for instruction were too broad to give direction to the schools as to what was important relative to the content of those academic standards and to enable valid and reliable assessments that measured higher order thinking skills and understanding to be developed. Pennsylvania went about the task, in consultation with Pennsylvania educators, of identifying the eligible content of those broad based academic standards for instruction. The results of this identification became the Assessment Anchor Content Standards for Mathematics and the Assessment Anchor Content Standards for Reading. Beginning in 2005, the assessments were based on those Assessment Anchor Content Standards.

Assessments in Mathematics and Reading were administered to all public school students in Grades 4, 6, and 7 in Pennsylvania for the first time in 2006. Thus all students in the public schools of Pennsylvania in Grades 3-8 and 11 were administered a Mathematics and Reading assessment in 2006.

Pennsylvania's Mathematics and Reading tests contain both multiple-choice and open-ended items. The open-ended items are constructed such as to provide the assessment of higher order thinking skills and understanding.

See section 1.1.1 for a discussion of the development of the academic standards for instruction and the Assessment Anchor Content Standards for Science. The first Science assessment based on those Assessment Anchor Content Standards will be administered in the 2007-2008 school year to all public school students in Pennsylvania in Grades 4, 8, and 11.

In December of 1998, Pennsylvania Department of Education's Bureau of Special Education issued a Request for Proposal to interested contractors to submit proposals for consideration by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in order to satisfy a need for the development of an Alternate Assessment for students with severe disabilities who cannot participate in the statewide assessment (PA System of School Assessment - PSSA). The need was derived from the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997 that were effective July 1, 1998 which requires that all students with special needs must participate in all statewide and district wide assessment, or if not appropriate, then an alternate assessment must be offered. Alternate assessment formats are necessary to allow students with the most significant disabilities, who are unable to participate in the PSSA, to demonstrate their mastery of skills and attainment of knowledge, in this case, the state standards.

The Pennsylvania Alternative System of Assessment (PASA) is an alternative assessment based on alternative achievement standards for reading and mathematics. Currently, for the 2006-2007 school year, students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 with the most severe cognitive delay are able to participate in the PASA as determined by their IEP team. In addition, a pilot version developed this past year of the PASA for science will be administered to the same grades for the 2006-2007 testing year.

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

Pennsylvania established its original academic achievement standards in 2001 in Reading and Mathematics for Grades 5, 8, and 11. Committees of Pennsylvania educators identified the levels of Advanced, Proficient, Basic and Below Basic using Performance Level Descriptors and a modified Bookmark procedure.

With the advent of NCLB and input from Pennsylvania educators, changes were made to the assessment beginning in 2005. It became clear with the changes made that a validation of the 2001 achievement standards was necessary. Pennsylvania's Technical Advisory Committee provided guidance in the procedure to be used. In June 2005 the validation was completed for Grades 5, 8, and 11 using 2005 data and the resulting cut-scores were applied to the 2005 data and reported. The validation involved committees of Pennsylvania educators using the newly developed Performance Level Descriptors and a modified Bookmark procedure.

Grade 3 Mathematics and Reading assessments were operational in 2005 and committees of Pennsylvania educators set the first achievement standards for that grade. Performance Level Descriptors and a modified Bookmark procedure were used. The resulting cut-scores were applied to the 2005 test results and reported.

Tests in Reading and Mathematics were administered to all public school students in Grades 4, 6, and 7 for the first time in 2006. Achievement standards for those grades were set in June 2006 and applied to the data and reported. Committees of Pennsylvania educators used Performance Level Descriptors and a modified Bookmark approach. Thus in 2006 achievement standards were set and reported in Reading and Mathematics in all Grades 3-8 and 11.

The Science test will first be administered to all public school students in Grades 4, 8, and 11 in the spring of 2008. Achievement standards will be developed using Performance Level Descriptors already developed and a modified Bookmark approach by committees of Pennsylvania educators. The achievement standards will be applied to and reported using the 2008 test results.

The state board of education approved the alternate content achievement standards in reading and math for grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 on November 16, 2006. The PASA advisory committee made up of LEA and state stakeholders reviewed the alternative content achievement standards before the state board approval. In addition, Science alternate content achievement standards will be submitted for approval during the 2007-2008 school year.

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	938566	99.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1503	98.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	22664	99.60
Black, non-Hispanic	142115	98.20
Hispanic	55228	98.50
White, non-Hispanic	708189	99.30
Students with Disabilities	138648	97.90
Limited English Proficient	18366	99.00
Economically Disadvantaged	316577	98.60
Migrant	2293	99.30
Male	479293	98.90
Female	456210	99.20

Comments:

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

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	936591	98.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1499	98.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	22577	98.80
Black, non-Hispanic	141518	97.70
Hispanic	54939	97.70
White, non-Hispanic	707246	99.20
Students with Disabilities	138070	97.50
Limited English Proficient	18143	97.60
Economically Disadvantaged	315463	98.20
Migrant	2281	97.90
Male	478188	98.70
Female	455376	99.00

Comments:

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

1.2.2 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	138648	97.90
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	10869	96.00

Comments:

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	138070	97.50
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	10861	96.00

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	125004	83.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	374	82.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	3412	90.00
Black, non-Hispanic	19195	63.00
Hispanic	8268	64.00
White, non-Hispanic	91052	89.00
Students with Disabilities	17578	59.00
Limited English Proficient	3716	56.00
Economically Disadvantaged	46316	70.00
Migrant	393	58.00
Male	62901	84.00
Female	60769	82.00

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 3 data compared to this year's grade 3 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 3rd graders were last year's 2nd graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	124662	69.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	373	66.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	3398	75.00
Black, non-Hispanic	19115	45.00
Hispanic	8216	44.00
White, non-Hispanic	90880	76.00
Students with Disabilities	17484	36.00
Limited English Proficient	3668	29.00
Economically Disadvantaged	46131	51.00
Migrant	391	37.00
Male	62728	65.00
Female	60611	73.00

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 3 data compared to this year's grade 3 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 3rd graders were last year's 2nd graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	127959	77.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	167	66.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	3322	88.50
Black, non-Hispanic	19758	52.70
Hispanic	8251	56.30
White, non-Hispanic	95272	84.00
Students with Disabilities	19757	49.40
Limited English Proficient	3212	48.20
Economically Disadvantaged	46526	61.50
Migrant	350	58.90
Male	65648	78.40
Female	62047	76.30

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 4 data compared to this year's grade 4 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 4th graders were last year's 3rd graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	127680	68.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	166	61.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	3312	75.60
Black, non-Hispanic	19676	40.30
Hispanic	8194	41.80
White, non-Hispanic	95151	76.00
Students with Disabilities	19664	34.00
Limited English Proficient	3171	26.10
Economically Disadvantaged	46374	48.20
Migrant	348	40.30
Male	65494	65.90
Female	61929	70.60

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 4 data compared to this year's grade 4 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 4th graders were last year's 3rd graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	131702	66.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	162	57.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	3277	83.30
Black, non-Hispanic	20589	40.40
Hispanic	8314	46.50
White, non-Hispanic	98368	73.80
Students with Disabilities	20977	33.30
Limited English Proficient	2892	37.50
Economically Disadvantaged	47995	49.20
Migrant	359	44.30
Male	67406	68.00
Female	64130	65.70

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 5 data compared to this year's grade 5 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 5th graders were last year's 4th graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	131488	60.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	50.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	3264	72.30
Black, non-Hispanic	20549	34.00
Hispanic	8278	36.10
White, non-Hispanic	98246	68.00
Students with Disabilities	20920	23.90
Limited English Proficient	2861	21.50
Economically Disadvantaged	47881	40.00
Migrant	358	27.40
Male	67282	57.70
Female	64040	63.70

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 5 data compared to this year's grade 5 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 5th graders were last year's 4th graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	136186	68.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	162	58.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	3264	83.60
Black, non-Hispanic	21911	38.40
Hispanic	8460	45.70
White, non-Hispanic	101401	76.00
Students with Disabilities	20975	29.20
Limited English Proficient	2619	33.80
Economically Disadvantaged	48536	48.80
Migrant	362	39.20
Male	69884	68.00
Female	66042	68.10

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 6 data compared to this year's grade 6 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 6th graders were last year's 5th graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	135914	65.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	162	59.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	3244	76.50
Black, non-Hispanic	21803	36.90
Hispanic	8435	40.10
White, non-Hispanic	101290	74.20
Students with Disabilities	20913	25.30
Limited English Proficient	2590	21.90
Economically Disadvantaged	48383	45.00
Migrant	361	35.50
Male	69742	62.20
Female	65920	69.90

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 6 data compared to this year's grade 6 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 6th graders were last year's 5th graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	141300	66.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	60.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	3168	84.80
Black, non-Hispanic	22269	37.80
Hispanic	8456	46.00
White, non-Hispanic	106142	73.70
Students with Disabilities	21256	25.40
Limited English Proficient	2390	34.20
Economically Disadvantaged	48621	46.60
Migrant	315	37.50
Male	72440	65.20
Female	68453	67.90

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 7 data compared to this year's grade 7 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 7th graders were last year's 6th graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	141012	68.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	65.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3156	79.10
Black, non-Hispanic	22155	41.20
Hispanic	8415	42.30
White, non-Hispanic	106016	75.60
Students with Disabilities	21170	26.20
Limited English Proficient	2361	22.40
Economically Disadvantaged	48414	47.40
Migrant	314	28.10
Male	72266	64.20
Female	68333	72.20

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 7 data compared to this year's grade 7 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 7th graders were last year's 6th graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	143749	62.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	244	55.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	3091	81.90
Black, non-Hispanic	22192	32.50
Hispanic	8120	38.90
White, non-Hispanic	109172	69.60
Students with Disabilities	21463	20.30
Limited English Proficient	2225	28.80
Economically Disadvantaged	47589	41.50
Migrant	325	30.20
Male	73849	62.60
Female	69598	61.90

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 8 data compared to this year's grade 8 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 8th graders were last year's 7th graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	143401	70.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	243	63.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	3076	80.50
Black, non-Hispanic	22076	43.90
Hispanic	8069	44.90
White, non-Hispanic	109023	77.80
Students with Disabilities	21370	27.40
Limited English Proficient	2190	23.80
Economically Disadvantaged	47375	50.20
Migrant	321	32.40
Male	73647	67.20
Female	69465	74.40

Comments: The comparison of last year's grade 8 data compared to this year's grade 8 data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. This year's 8th graders were last year's 7th graders, and the possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	132666	52.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	41.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3130	73.40
Black, non-Hispanic	16201	21.70
Hispanic	5359	24.60
White, non-Hispanic	106782	57.50
Students with Disabilities	16642	10.70
Limited English Proficient	1312	26.40
Economically Disadvantaged	30994	29.10
Migrant	189	32.30
Male	67165	52.80
Female	65171	51.20

Comments: The comparison of last year's high school data compared to this year's high school data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. The possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	132434	65.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	201	50.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3127	70.10
Black, non-Hispanic	16144	34.80
Hispanic	5332	35.30
White, non-Hispanic	106640	71.30
Students with Disabilities	16549	18.80
Limited English Proficient	1302	15.60
Economically Disadvantaged	30905	41.40
Migrant	188	29.80
Male	67029	61.70
Female	65078	68.90

Comments: The comparison of last year's high school data compared to this year's high school data could easily show a difference of 10% due to the fact that we're not reporting a cohort. The possibility to have different numbers in various subgroups is only natural.

- 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	3121	2570	82.30

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	501	476	95.00

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	1800	1487	82.60

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	493	468	94.90

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 school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring in Pennsylvania is provided state funds in the amount of \$9500 to support their school improvement efforts. Additionally, in 2005-06, Title I buildings were allocated approximately \$39,000 in Title I SI funds per building to support school improvement efforts. Additional Title I SI funds were also awarded to Title I buildings in higher levels of improvement and/or with the most severe academic needs.

Pennsylvania also provides technical assistance to all schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring. Through our 29 Local Intermediate Units, professionals provide school support in the analysis of data, the identification of problems, the necessary course(s) of action to be taken to address the problems and the development of a school improvement plan.

Additionally, Pennsylvania has a Distinguished Educator program designed to deploy on-site assistance to school districts with schools in the highest levels of improvement and/or with the most severe academic needs. These Distinguished Educators work side-by-side with district and school staff for at least a year to assist in all facets of school operation in order to promote school improvement.

School improvement planning is required for all schools in school improvement, corrective action or restructuring as well. Frameworks have been developed by PDE for use by schools in developing comprehensive plans for improvement.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

Districts identified for improvement are required to work closely with the local intermediate units, as school in school improvement do, to review district-level data, define district-level problems and find solutions. Districts are then required to develop district improvement plans, using a PDE designed framework.

Intermediate Unit staff provides one-on-one assistance and support with district improvement planning as needed and as requested by each district.

Districts with the most severe academic problems are assigned Distinguished Educators to assist them in all of their district-level and school-level improvement needs.

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.	
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.	76
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.	575
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.	153361
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: For question number 1: This data was not collected in 2005-2006. It is being collected in the 2006-2007 school year.	

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.	174
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	4213
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.	117984
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: 4. N/A	

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	98299	93226	94.80
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	15531	12956	83.40
Low-Poverty Schools	17269	16948	98.10
All Elementary Schools	61680	57941	93.90
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	7088	6482	91.50
Low-Poverty Schools	12371	12239	98.90
All Secondary Schools	34543	33570	97.20

Comments: All Pennsylvania data is reported by the first, second and third assignments that each teacher instructs. Ninety-seven percent of all teachers in Pennsylvania instruct in a single (first) assignment area.

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	0.00
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	70.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	30.00
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)	20.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	40.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	40.00
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	56.00	16.60
Poverty Metric Used	Free and reduced lunch, TANF, Medicaid, Census	
Secondary Schools	40.20	13.60
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Lunch, TANF, Medicaid, Census	
Comments: Data was not complete. Will submit at a later date.		

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	75.00

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

The Pennsylvania Department of Education State School Board approved English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards for Classroom Instruction and Assessment in the content areas of Math, Language Arts and Social and Instructional addressing the four domains of speaking, listening, reading and writing in each content area in March 2005.

The standards were developed using PA Academic Standards for all students and aligned with the PA's Assessment Anchors Content Standards. The ELP Standards are aligned with, and a complement to, both PA Academic Standards and PA Assessment Anchors Content Standards.

The standards development process involved PDE Content Area Advisors, School District Administrators, Teachers, Intermediate Unit, and University Staff as well as the guidance of a National Consultant. Detailed information is available on the ESL homepage of the PA's Department of Education's website.

The PDE continues work on ELP standards for the content areas of Social Studies and Science. These two content areas are currently in draft form pending finalization.

Sustained professional development and planned regional training meetings continue with additional trainings to take place in the near future to further educate administrators and teachers on the purpose, use and integration of ELP standards into instructional planning for all teachers working with ELLs.

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

An alignment study entitled

Pennsylvania: English Language Proficiency Standards, Academic Standards,

and Assessment Anchors

ALIGNMENT STUDY

was submitted to Jenelle Leonard at the US Department of Education on September 27, 2006 with the response to the Title III Grant, Part A, Attachment T.

"Though there are five levels of language proficiency in the PA ELP Standards, this document is based on only MPI 5 (Bridging), which is the highest level of language proficiency addressed and the level specifically designed to connect to the Pennsylvania Academic Standards and Assessment Anchors, thus the PSSA."

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>No Response</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of alignment <u>Yes</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
<p>The state will use the WIDA ACCESS assessment beginning the 2006-2007 school year. The state is participating with the WIDA consortium states in an alignment study. To meet federal requirements and as a measure of construct validity, the WIDA Consortium is hosting an alignment study focusing on ACCESS for ELLs® and the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards. When: Monday and Tuesday, December 4 & 5, 2006 Where: Fluno Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison,</p> <p>This alignment study, employing the methodology of Norman Webb and adapted for English language proficiency by Gary Cook, requires that qualified educators conduct the actual alignment. PA is sending, at minimum, 6 educators representing the grade clusters of K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Additionally, the state will participate in setting cut scores at a meeting to be held in January and February in Atlanta, GA.</p> <p>Also, the PA Department of Education is conducting statewide training to ensure the appropriate annual assessment of ELLs. Training is scheduled for October 4, November 8, December 11 and December 12, 2006 on the implementation, process and procedures for administration, and scoring of the speaking section of the assessment for all educators and administrators directly involved with the ELP assessment. The state has posted its assessment timeline for the 2006-2007 assessment on its ESL homepage of the PA Department of Education's website.</p> <p>The state will use the WIDA consortium's large scale assessment standards on which the ACCESS assessment is based. The state will participate and send educator representatives to the WIDA consortium meetings for item development, cut score setting, and alignment of standards.</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	27683	60.20
2. Vietnamese	1710	3.70
3. Russian	1585	3.50
4. Arabic	1195	2.80
5. Korean	1142	2.50
6. Chinese (Mandarin)	1082	2.40
7. Cambodian (khmer)	934	2.00
8. Chinese, Yue (Cantonese)	610	1.30
9. Gujarati (India)	502	1.10
10. French	486	1.10
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 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
16139	15730	74

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.)

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.

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

PA will make changes to its definition of proficient based on the new WIDA ACCESS assessment and dependent upon the outcome of the upcoming WIDA consortium meetings for alignment, item review, cut scores, etc. The revised definition of proficient is under development. . PA is working with WIDA and MACC (Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center) to revise its accountability plan.

Other criteria for the determination of attaining proficiency is PA's exit criteria for ELLs from English language instructional programs.

The current exit criteria for PA ESL/Bilingual programs includes:

Required Exit Criteria:

1. Score of Basic on the annual Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA).

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES:

â€ For students transferring from other states, out-of-state academic achievement assessment results may be considered when the academic proficiency level is comparable to Basic on the PSSA.

â€ For students that are in a grade that is not assessed with the PSSA, LEA's must use each of the remaining criteria listed below to exit students.

2. Score of Proficient (Bridging as per the Pennsylvania Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners) in the areas of Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing on the annual state English language proficiency assessment. The Proficient (Bridging) score will be based on the total composite assessment results.

Additional Exit Criteria:

1. Final grades of C or better in core subject areas (Mathematics, Language Arts, Science and Social Studies).
2. Scores on district-wide assessments that are comparable to the Basic performance level on the PSSA.

Assurance of implementation of the exit criteria by LEAs will take place within the Federal Programs Consolidated Monitoring Plan beginning with the 2006 school year.

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

PA will make changes to its definition of making progress based on the new WIDA ACCESS assessment and participation in upcoming meetings of the WIDA consortium that will address cut scores and data from multiple sources. . PA is working with WIDA and MACC (Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center) to revise its accountability plan.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

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

STATE RESPONSE

The definition of cohort is currently under revision and planned to be a part of the proposed amendment to the accountability plan for Title III AMOs. PA is working with WIDA and MACC (Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center) to revise its accountability plan.

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? No

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

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

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

Cohort All LEP Students Making Progress in Learning English

Projected AMAO Target Actual

% # % #

Grades k-5 20 N/A 64.1 16032

Grades 6-8 22 N/A 63.9 5444

Grades 9-12 28 N/A 62.8 4715

All LEP Students that Attained English proficiency

Projected AMAO Target Actual

% # % #

Grades k-5 80 N/A 35.9 8988

Grades 6-8 78 N/A 36.1 3080

Grades 9-12 72 N/A 37.2 2798

SECTION 1.6.9 (Per EDEN)

cohort K-5

AMAO TARGET ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS

% # %

MAKING PROGRESS 20 14587 64.1

DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS N/A N/A

ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY 80 8143 35.8

Cohort 6-8

AMAO TARGET ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS

% # %

MAKING PROGRESS 22 4967 64.1

DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS N/A N/A

ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY 78 2787 35.9

Cohort 9-12

AMAO TARGET ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS

% # %

MAKING PROGRESS 28 4306 63.5

DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS N/A N/A

ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY 72 2477 36.5

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

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

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

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

Definitions:

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

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

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	103
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	78
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	7
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	9
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	71
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	23
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	9
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	103
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments: Comment for fourth question - PA requires that LEAs have 40 or more students in the LEP subgroup to count the LEP subgroup for AYP. Due to this requirement, only those LEAs with 40 or more students in the cohort grade clusters are included in the chart for AMAO 3.

Comment for sixth question - If a LEA does not meet PA's requirement of 40 or more students for AYP in the LEP subgroup, those LEAs are considered as having met AMAO 3.

Comment for eighth question - In this table, the nine districts listed did not assess Title III students. They exited the program before assessment; therefore, no data was available to determine meeting AMAOs

* 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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
H.S.		

Comments: N/A. This was a new requirement and assessment was never collected before. We will for 2006-2007 school year.

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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
H.S.		

Comments: N/A. This was a new requirement and assessment was never collected before. We will for 2006-2007 school year.

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	9

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	87.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	86.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.40
Black, non-Hispanic	74.20
Hispanic	68.20
White, non-Hispanic	91.20
Students with Disabilities	81.30
Limited English Proficient	72.00
Economically Disadvantaged	79.00
Migrant	71.50
Male	85.90
Female	89.20

Comments: AI/AN primary response is that the numbers are small and therefore any change reflects a larger percentage.

The limited English percentages are not different by more than 5%. Therefore, no response.

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	2.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.70
Black, non-Hispanic	4.20
Hispanic	4.90
White, non-Hispanic	1.30
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	2.20
Female	1.70

Comments: A. Students with Disabilities, Limited English Proficient and Economically Disadvantaged are listed as N/A because data was not collected for the 2004-05 school year.

B. Except for migrant, the dropout rate was calculated using individual student dropout data divided by aggregate Oct. 1 enrollment that included grade, race, and gender only. The migrant rate used enrollments from the migrant education data system in the denominator.

C. A state database containing student level data using a state assigned ID is under development and planned to be functional for the 2007-08 school year. This data will produce rates for all requested categories at that 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.

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

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

STATE RESPONSE

The Pennsylvania Homeless Children's Initiative grant runs from October 1st through September 30th.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	493	439
LEAs with Subgrants	8	8

Comments: For LEAs with Subgrants: Eight regional subgrants now serve all 501 LEAs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

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	0	2142
1	0	2143
2	0	2143
3	0	2143
4	0	2143
5	0	2143
6	0	2143
7	0	2084
8	0	2083
9	0	2083
10	0	1250
11	0	1250
12	0	1250

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	0	10000
Doubled-up	0	12500
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	0	0
Hotels/Motels	0	2500
Unknown	0	0

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	5250
1	2293
2	2293
3	2293
4	2293
5	2293
6	2292
7	2230
8	2229
9	2229
10	1338
11	1337
12	1337

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

525

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

847

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: No data

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)	8000
English Language Learners (ELL)	1600
Gifted and Talented	800
Vocational Education	3200

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	8
Expedited evaluations	8
Staff professional development and awareness	8
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	8
Early childhood programs	8
Assistance with participation in school programs	8
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	8
Counseling	8
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	8
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	8
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	8
Other (optional)	0

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	8
School selection	8
Transportation	8
School records	8
Immunizations or other medical records	8
Other enrollment issues	8

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
Residency	8
Lack of Staff Awareness	8
School Uniforms	8

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	164	77
Grade 4	Yes	170	55
Grade 5	Yes	180	48
Grade 6	Yes	176	56
Grade 7	Yes	154	43
Grade 8	Yes	188	88
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	80	19
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	164	95
Grade 4	Yes	170	75
Grade 5	Yes	180	70
Grade 6	Yes	176	53
Grade 7	Yes	154	49
Grade 8	Yes	188	71
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	80	10
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.