

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

The State Board of Education (SBE) adopted academic grade-level standards in science for all students for kindergarten through twelfth grade as indicated in the SBE minutes for December 14, 2005.

The Bookmark procedure was used to set standards for the science tests in grades 3-8 and for the Physical Science test for high school. The science tests in grades 4 and 7 and the Physical Science test will be used to meet NCLB science requirements.

A new alternate assessment is being phased in to replace the PACT-Alt. The last administration of PACT-Alt was during the 2006-06 school year. The first administration of the new alternate assessment (SC-Alt) will be administered in spring 2007. Standards for the SC-Alt will be set in June 2007.

The process for standards review and revision is encapsulated in the Cyclical Review description attached to this report. (NOTE: This document was forwarded to EDEN as an e-mail attachment on March 3, 2006, and was e-mailed on December 1, 2006, as an addendum to this submission.)

The state's assessment system, including science standards, had been approved through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process).

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

On February 15, 2006, South Carolina became the first state to earn federal approval of its assessment system in mathematics and English language arts based on NCLB peer review. In his letter to the Honorable Inez M. Tenenbaum, State Superintendent of Education, Henry L. Johnson wrote, "the Department concludes that the State's assessment system - that is, the reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in each of grades 3-8 and high school, as well as the alternate assessment for both these subjects - meets all statutory and regulatory requirements."

South Carolina currently administers science assessments to all students in grades 3-8 and includes science in its alternate assessment for those grade levels. Science content standards have been revised. Assessments have been revised to reflect the changes in content standards and will be submitted for peer review before the end of the 2007-08 school year. The U.S. Department of Education has approved the use of the Physical Science end-of-course test to meet high school NCLB requirements, pending peer review. The alternate assessment system, in process of revision, will include a science component for grades 3-8 and high school. Both the Physical Science and alternate assessments will be included in the science submission for peer review.

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

In Section 1.1.2 of this report, the state response includes notification that the Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests (PACT) administered in grades 3-8, the High School Assessment Program (HSAP), and the alternate assessments (PACT-Alt and HSAPAlt) have received peer review approval under No Child Left Behind. Academic achievement standards are included in peer review. Hence, the academic achievement standards for English language arts and mathematics are included in the peer review approval.

The academic achievement standards for PACT include four levels of achievement: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient and Advanced. Achievement levels were set using a bookmark technique. For English language arts and mathematics the details of the standard setting process can be located in the technical report prepared by CTB/McGraw Hill and are summarized in the Technical Documentation for the 1999 Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests of English Language Arts and Mathematics, Grades Three through Eight on pages 37-39. The details of the science standard setting process can be located in the technical report prepared by the Buros Institute of Assessment Consultation and Outreach and are summarized in the Technical Documentation for the 2003

Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests of English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies on pages 21-22.

HSAP academic achievement standards include four levels of achievement: Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4. Achievement levels were set using a bookmark technique. For English language arts and mathematics the details of the standard setting process can be located in the 2004 technical report prepared by the American Institutes for Research and are summarized in a report to the State Board of Education.

Standards for HSAP-Alt were set using a bookmark technique. The details can be located in the 2003 technical report prepared by Measured Progress. PACT-Alt standard-setting workshops were conducted in 2002 by the Department with assistance from Measured Progress. The technical documentation for 2003 includes a summary of these activities.

The details of the Physical Science standard setting process can be located in the technical report prepared by the Buros Institute of Assessment Consultation and Outreach in 2003.

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	354422	97.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1074	97.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	4507	99.20
Black, non-Hispanic	140215	96.70
Hispanic	13855	98.30
White, non-Hispanic	194064	98.50
Students with Disabilities	46492	87.40
Limited English Proficient	10298	98.60
Economically Disadvantaged	186650	96.80
Migrant	406	96.40
Male	179974	97.10
Female	174578	98.40

Comments:

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

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	353713	97.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	1069	96.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	4502	99.00
Black, non-Hispanic	139782	96.40
Hispanic	13604	96.50
White, non-Hispanic	193679	98.30
Students with Disabilities	45903	86.30
Limited English Proficient	10061	96.30
Economically Disadvantaged	185884	96.40
Migrant	403	95.70
Male	179238	96.70
Female	174412	98.30

Comments:

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

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

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	44553	96.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1879	4.00

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	43972	95.90
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1876	4.10

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	48302	50.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	163	52.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	608	72.00
Black, non-Hispanic	18746	33.40
Hispanic	2077	37.10
White, non-Hispanic	26559	63.70
Students with Disabilities	7564	26.10
Limited English Proficient	1874	36.70
Economically Disadvantaged	26665	37.00
Migrant	90	24.40
Male	24700	50.40
Female	23602	51.30

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	48039	64.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	64.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	608	80.90
Black, non-Hispanic	18638	50.90
Hispanic	2040	48.40
White, non-Hispanic	26443	75.60
Students with Disabilities	7395	34.50
Limited English Proficient	1836	45.60
Economically Disadvantaged	26463	52.40
Migrant	90	32.20
Male	24513	59.00
Female	23526	71.10

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	47998	53.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	137	53.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	606	76.90
Black, non-Hispanic	18345	33.10
Hispanic	1927	44.20
White, non-Hispanic	26852	67.60
Students with Disabilities	6884	25.40
Limited English Proficient	1585	41.30
Economically Disadvantaged	26103	38.40
Migrant	78	30.80
Male	24535	54.00
Female	23463	53.00

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	47788	52.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	137	44.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	607	71.80
Black, non-Hispanic	18267	34.30
Hispanic	1889	39.70
White, non-Hispanic	26758	64.50
Students with Disabilities	6733	20.00
Limited English Proficient	1548	33.30
Economically Disadvantaged	25950	36.80
Migrant	78	32.10
Male	24370	46.40
Female	23418	57.80

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	49055	47.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	158	43.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	611	72.70
Black, non-Hispanic	19429	28.40
Hispanic	1942	39.20
White, non-Hispanic	26792	60.50
Students with Disabilities	6730	17.90
Limited English Proficient	1569	33.60
Economically Disadvantaged	26993	32.50
Migrant	70	31.40
Male	25267	46.70
Female	23788	47.40

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	48887	45.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	157	40.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	611	70.00
Black, non-Hispanic	19363	28.60
Hispanic	1905	33.90
White, non-Hispanic	26730	57.60
Students with Disabilities	6617	13.70
Limited English Proficient	1534	26.30
Economically Disadvantaged	26862	30.50
Migrant	69	34.80
Male	25135	37.90
Female	23752	53.20

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	50184	51.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	138	52.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	584	77.70
Black, non-Hispanic	20346	32.90
Hispanic	1754	43.60
White, non-Hispanic	27239	64.70
Students with Disabilities	6300	16.20
Limited English Proficient	1219	36.10
Economically Disadvantaged	27346	36.60
Migrant	29	13.80
Male	25742	49.00
Female	24442	53.50

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	50069	39.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	136	40.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	584	63.20
Black, non-Hispanic	20291	22.60
Hispanic	1741	27.90
White, non-Hispanic	27194	51.40
Students with Disabilities	6216	7.60
Limited English Proficient	1205	17.30
Economically Disadvantaged	27259	24.30
Migrant	29	10.30
Male	25648	32.10
Female	24421	46.20

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	51457	43.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	140	31.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	568	71.70
Black, non-Hispanic	21042	24.50
Hispanic	1774	33.80
White, non-Hispanic	27833	57.70
Students with Disabilities	6187	11.90
Limited English Proficient	1063	22.30
Economically Disadvantaged	27465	28.10
Migrant	40	22.50
Male	25899	42.90
Female	25558	43.80

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	51381	34.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	139	23.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	567	55.60
Black, non-Hispanic	20999	18.60
Hispanic	1745	23.10
White, non-Hispanic	27830	46.10
Students with Disabilities	6146	5.90
Limited English Proficient	1037	11.40
Economically Disadvantaged	27395	19.50
Migrant	39	12.80
Male	25836	27.40
Female	25545	40.90

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	51414	29.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	150	26.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	590	62.20
Black, non-Hispanic	20695	13.70
Hispanic	1630	22.10
White, non-Hispanic	28258	41.50
Students with Disabilities	5803	5.40
Limited English Proficient	918	14.10
Economically Disadvantaged	26561	16.50
Migrant	30	23.30
Male	25636	29.10
Female	25778	30.60

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	51350	36.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	150	38.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	591	55.50
Black, non-Hispanic	20659	21.20
Hispanic	1602	25.40
White, non-Hispanic	28258	47.20
Students with Disabilities	5768	5.10
Limited English Proficient	888	12.20
Economically Disadvantaged	26491	21.90
Migrant	30	16.70
Male	25587	28.60
Female	25763	43.60

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	46224	62.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	109	66.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	658	82.50
Black, non-Hispanic	18248	43.10
Hispanic	1310	52.70
White, non-Hispanic	25776	75.80
Students with Disabilities	5879	21.70
Limited English Proficient	727	43.70
Economically Disadvantaged	20176	46.00
Migrant	29	31.00
Male	22995	61.50
Female	23229	63.10

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	46307	61.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	110	64.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	660	72.00
Black, non-Hispanic	18301	43.60
Hispanic	1305	47.50
White, non-Hispanic	25807	73.70
Students with Disabilities	5915	17.90
Limited English Proficient	724	24.00
Economically Disadvantaged	20236	44.10
Migrant	29	31.00
Male	23054	56.10
Female	23253	65.80

Comments: Data has been verified.

- 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	1083	415	38.30

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	85	0	0.00

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	505	237	47.00

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	85	0	0.00

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.

Based on a tiered system of need, the state is providing the option of teacher specialists, curriculum specialists, principal specialists, and principal leaders to offer technical assistance onsite for the entire year, or an allocation to schools for needs-based expenditures designed to improve academic achievement performance. Many schools also receive services through literacy coaches on-site and through math/science centers. Of those in corrective action, most schools are opting to replace staff or implement a new curriculum. Additionally extensive staff development is ongoing.

Schools receive support and assistance through External Review and School Support teams. As appropriate, identified school districts that have repeatedly failed to meet the state's academic standards are offered another layer of support in the form of an additional monitoring instrument and a new curriculum.

External review teams (ERT) are formed from a diverse group of educators with administrative experience and expertise in scientifically-based research and

instructional practices. Team members receive training by the State Department of Education on both the process and the instrument used in the comprehensive study of school operations conducted through on-site visitations to schools in need of assistance. ERT members conduct three to five day monitoring visits to a designated school site. Upon completion of the site review, the team issues a list of specific recommendations. The following year, a revisit is conducted to determine if implementation of the team's recommendations has occurred. Based on the ERT's recommendations and/or the school's level of academic achievement, a school may be assigned support by a school support team.

School support teams consist of a pool of distinguished educators with strong

leadership skills and a history of high student academic performance. The constitution of the support teams vary, but may include district instructional facilitators, teacher specialists, curriculum specialists, principal leaders, and principal specialists. A principal mentor may act as an external resource to support the building principal. School support teams are provided ongoing training through the State Department of Education. The school support team members coach and mentor administrators, staff and teachers in best practices to improve academic achievement and build leadership capacity for school improvement and reform.

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.

If a district is identified in Corrective Action, the State Department of Education will offer support as indicated:

-As appropriate, the State Department of Education will implement a new curriculum based on the state standards in the core content areas for Pre K-8th grade. Training and support services are offered to the school district's faculty, staff and administration in the design, organization and use of the selected model. Pacing guides, unit plans and assessments frame a curriculum that features embedded strategies to bridge the learning gap and to target the diverse needs of student populations. This comprehensive curricular approach toward standardizing instruction is designed to offer the school district an instructional tool in its efforts to effectively achieve academic performance goals.

-Regional Educational Laboratory and consultant services are utilized in this effort. The expertise provided by these outside experts offers the State Department of Education and the districts vital technical assistance. In the initial stage of implementation, the services assist with the training process. Then, the Regional Educational Laboratory and consultants coordinate the development of a monitoring implementation instrument to be employed as an extension to the tool used in the External Review Team(ERT) process. The instrument acts as an additional resource to provide information to the school district to ensure that the initial support systems in the implementation process are sustained.

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.	179
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.	162
How many of these schools were charter schools?	2
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.	925
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.	86936
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.	1282
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.	1282
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.	146
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	6465
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.	60006
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.	9579
Comments: The difference in the number who applied for SES and the number who received SES was due to parents not following through with their request. Districts did not turn parents away in 2005-06.	

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	199014	183284	92.10
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	22208	20406	91.89
Low-Poverty Schools	33915	32488	95.79
All Elementary Schools	145696	136218	93.49
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	16510	13607	82.42
Low-Poverty Schools	30890	28465	92.15
All Secondary Schools	53318	47066	88.27
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	24.00
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	65.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.00
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)	25.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	39.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	36.00
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	89.31	59.04
Poverty Metric Used	Percent eligible for free or reduced price lunch or Medicaid.	
Secondary Schools	79.26	50.03
Poverty Metric Used	Percent eligible for free or reduced price lunch or Medicaid.	

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	94.70

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 South Carolina ESOL Standards were approved in August 2006. They were reviewed for links to the state's content standards by the Curriculum and Instruction Office and by the Office of Federal Program's Title III Coordinator. The standards are written to reflect the four domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing that are also evaluated on the English proficiency test the state uses which was developed in conjunction with the CCSSO LEP SCASS. These ESOL Standards may be accessed at http://www.ed.sc.gov/agency/offices/fp/documents/ESOLstandards_000.doc.

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

South Carolina has done a linking review of the ESOL Standards compared with the State's academic content and student academic achievement standards. The linkages are very direct with the State's English Language Arts Standards. The ESOL Standards are also linked to the academic language and other skills associated with the content areas of mathematics, science and social studies including the use of graphs, calculations and content specific texts. Both the Office of Assessment and the Office of Curriculum and Standards were involved in this process.

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 </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>1. In South Carolina, the State uploads student data and forwards this data to the ELDA test publisher. SC pays for the test administration to insure that every ESOL student in the state identified in our student data collection system as an English language learner (ELL) in grades K-12 is tested.</p> <p>2. The ELDA test used in the State for grades K-12 during the 2005-2006 school year was specifically designed by the LEP SCASS consortium to address the requirements of Title III law. ELDA measures the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension.</p> <p>3. ELDA was developed by incorporating the ESOL Standards of consortia states into one set of standards from which the item development process, standards setting and all reliability and validity studies were derived. In South Carolina, we used these ESOL Standards to revise our previous State standards. These new Standards have been approved and are currently in use throughout the state to help guide instruction for ESOL students.</p> <p>4. South Carolina worked in partnership with the other LEP SCASS states to insure the technical quality of the ELDA test. State Department of Education assessment and ESOL curriculum specialists worked on item analysis, standards setting, and all phases of test development along with representatives from other member states, the American Institute of Research, C-SAVE, UCLA CRESST, CCSSO, and Measurement Incorporated to insure that the test is both a reliable and valid measure of the English proficiency of our ESOL students.</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	15446	76.90
2. Russian	533	2.70
3. Vietnamese	425	2.10
4. Korean	391	1.90
5. Chinese (All)	380	1.90
6. Hmong	350	1.70
7. Gujarati	215	1.10
8. Arabic	205	1.00
9. Japanese	175	0.90
10. Other	1959	9.80
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
8356	8314	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.)

The numbers of Title III eligible immigrants continues to grow in South Carolina although no major increases or changes in minority language groups has occurred. Most of the sudden immigrant population changes have occurred in the smaller more rural LEAs in the past, but it now appears that a shift toward medium sized cities has occurred with the latest count.

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

No change except that the state is now using the ELDA test for K-12. Cut scores for both the K-2 tests and the 3-12 tests follow.

ELDA K-2 Cut Scores (Raw Score metric)

Grade/ Beginning Interm. Advanced Fully English Proficient

Test (Level 2)(Level 3)(Level 4)(Level 5)

K Listening 4 9 16 19

1-2 Listening 6 11 16 19

K Speaking 6 12 18 22

1-2 Speaking 8 13 18 22

K Reading 8 20 36 40

1-2 Reading 10 22 31 39

K Writing 7 16 21 26

1-2 Writing 8 17 21 25

ELDA 3-12 Cut Scores (Scale Score metric)

Grade/ Beginning Interm. Advanced Fully English Proficient

Test (Level 2)(Level 3)(Level 4)(Level 5)

3-5 Listening 450 544 645 725

6-8 Listening 554 626 718 806

9-12 Listening 556 632 729 850

3-5 Speaking 450 547 668 809

6-8 Speaking 458 611 719 825

9-12 Speaking 570 650 765 850

3-5 Reading 450 580 648 770

6-8 Reading 460 612 691 829

9-12 Reading 545 630 718 850

3-5 Writing 450 577 669 934

6-8 Writing 553 653 722 897

9-12 Writing 509 631 719 850

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

Unchanged for the 2005-2006 school year. A longitudinal study is currently being conducted to determine how this definition will change using the new assessment.

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

This definition will change as part of the longitudinal study of ELDA test results for the past two years. For the 2005-2006 school year the definition includes all students who took the ELDA test.

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	% 50.00	# 10006	% 77.60	# 15521	% 0.10	# 1001	% 8.10	# 1613

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	50.00	15163	77.60
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		2793	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	0.10	1584	8.10
TOTAL		19540	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? 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	60
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	60
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	52
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	35
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	35
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	17
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	8
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	2
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	2
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>Yes</u>

Comments: The total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP does not include 21 subgrantees that had insufficient sample size. Four Title III districts did not make AYP for LEP.

* 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	67	69.10
4	97	68.80
5	121	65.40
6	120	52.40
7	117	41.50
8	120	40.80
H.S.	140	67.00

Comments: Data includes all LEP students no longer receiving services under Title III. The State cannot disaggregate the data otherwise at this time.

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	57	58.20
4	98	68.50
5	128	69.20
6	145	63.60
7	158	55.60
8	110	37.50
H.S.	138	67.00

Comments: Data includes all LEP students no longer receiving services under Title III. The State cannot disaggregate the data otherwise at this time.

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: There are no schools that meet the definition of an at risk or a persistently dangerous school.

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	77.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	67.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	83.80
Black, non-Hispanic	68.70
Hispanic	67.40
White, non-Hispanic	83.20
Students with Disabilities	35.10
Limited English Proficient	51.60
Economically Disadvantaged	64.90
Migrant	33.30
Male	72.00
Female	81.90

Comments: Data has been verified.
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	3.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.30
Black, non-Hispanic	3.90
Hispanic	5.30
White, non-Hispanic	2.80
Students with Disabilities	5.20
Limited English Proficient	6.70
Economically Disadvantaged	4.10
Migrant	0.00
Male	3.90
Female	2.70

Comments: Migrant data is still under review

and will not be released until March.

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

A total of 180 instructional days.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	73	73
LEAs with Subgrants	12	12

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	198	480
1	295	482
2	241	393
3	244	417
4	223	410
5	208	356
6	224	306
7	228	280
8	177	258
9	177	252
10	115	199
11	82	128
12	89	76

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	345	798
Doubled-up	1495	2761
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	10	46
Hotels/Motels	575	302
Unknown	76	130

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	288
1	324
2	296
3	294
4	307
5	233
6	192
7	199
8	168
9	140
10	109
11	58
12	50

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

316

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

36

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)

26

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)	409
English Language Learners (ELL)	48
Gifted and Talented	117
Vocational Education	41

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	12
Expedited evaluations	8
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	11
Transportation	11
Early childhood programs	8
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	12
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	11
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	12
Coordination between schools and agencies	11
Counseling	8
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	10
Clothing to meet a school requirement	12
School supplies	12
Referral to other programs and services	10
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	12
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	5
School selection	4
Transportation	7
School records	5
Immunizations or other medical records	5
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	227	145
Grade 4	Yes	208	128
Grade 5	Yes	198	112
Grade 6	Yes	132	59
Grade 7	Yes	104	47
Grade 8	Yes	121	47
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	34	27
Grade 11	N/A	0	0
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	224	125
Grade 4	Yes	205	114
Grade 5	Yes	203	99
Grade 6	Yes	127	60
Grade 7	Yes	108	59
Grade 8	Yes	119	37
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	35	21
Grade 11	N/A	0	0
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

Comments:

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