

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

Vermont's grade expectations in science were adopted by the State Board in October 2006.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

As of fall 2006, Vermont has fully implemented math and reading assessments in grades 3-8. In fall 2006, a new grade 11 math and reading assessment was piloted and will be fully implemented in fall 2007. A science assessment at grades 4, 8 and 11 will be piloted in spring 2007 and fully implemented in spring 2008. Vermont has a Lifeskills assessment, which is administered to those students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

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

Vermont has established achievement standards for mathematics and reading assessments, grades 3-8, and is submitting additional documentation, as required and outlined in the plan we submitted to the U.S. D.O.E. in response to the peer review of our assessment system. Achievement standards will be developed for the grade 11 math and reading tests and for all levels of the science assessment as part of the ongoing development and implementation of those tests and the appropriate documentation will be provided to the U.S. D.O.E. as available.

As part of the peer review process, we will also submit additional documentation of our alternate achievement standards and alternate assessment, the Life Skills Portfolio.

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	49148	99.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	169	99.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	713	99.30
Black, non-Hispanic	704	99.60
Hispanic	464	99.40
White, non-Hispanic	46743	99.80
Students with Disabilities	6819	99.20
Limited English Proficient	827	98.20
Economically Disadvantaged	14202	99.60
Migrant	157	71.00
Male	25240	99.70
Female	23908	99.80

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	49074	99.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	175	98.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	703	99.90
Black, non-Hispanic	689	99.70
Hispanic	467	100.00
White, non-Hispanic	46726	99.90
Students with Disabilities	6775	99.70
Limited English Proficient	775	99.20
Economically Disadvantaged	14164	99.70
Migrant	153	100.00
Male	25190	99.90
Female	23884	99.90

Comments:

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

1.2.2 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	4911	72.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1908	28.00

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	4722	69.50
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2053	30.20

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	6485	62.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	18	22.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	115	73.90
Black, non-Hispanic	111	37.80
Hispanic	61	47.50
White, non-Hispanic	6125	63.30
Students with Disabilities	805	23.90
Limited English Proficient	151	42.40
Economically Disadvantaged	2127	43.40
Migrant	38	23.70
Male	3336	63.90
Female	3141	61.60

Comments:

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	6515	66.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	55.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	112	82.10
Black, non-Hispanic	106	55.70
Hispanic	64	62.50
White, non-Hispanic	6157	66.80
Students with Disabilities	841	23.50
Limited English Proficient	142	53.50
Economically Disadvantaged	2145	49.70
Migrant	38	52.60
Male	3362	63.00
Female	3148	70.90

Comments:

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	6510	62.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	33.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	101	69.30
Black, non-Hispanic	97	37.10
Hispanic	65	46.20
White, non-Hispanic	6182	63.00
Students with Disabilities	828	16.70
Limited English Proficient	150	45.30
Economically Disadvantaged	2144	44.70
Migrant	32	31.30
Male	2743	54.80
Female	2609	54.00

Comments:

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	6561	66.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	26.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	101	72.30
Black, non-Hispanic	94	55.30
Hispanic	66	54.60
White, non-Hispanic	6228	66.80
Students with Disabilities	903	20.20
Limited English Proficient	142	47.90
Economically Disadvantaged	2170	49.70
Migrant	30	43.30
Male	3389	62.80
Female	3167	70.30

Comments:

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	6781	61.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	14	35.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	96	82.30
Black, non-Hispanic	118	41.50
Hispanic	62	45.20
White, non-Hispanic	6441	62.10
Students with Disabilities	897	15.40
Limited English Proficient	136	44.90
Economically Disadvantaged	2122	43.00
Migrant	26	26.90
Male	3448	62.60
Female	3333	60.70

Comments:

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	6839	63.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	14	50.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	81.90
Black, non-Hispanic	118	49.20
Hispanic	61	50.80
White, non-Hispanic	6500	63.40
Students with Disabilities	958	17.30
Limited English Proficient	125	47.20
Economically Disadvantaged	2154	45.40
Migrant	25	36.00
Male	3476	58.80
Female	3358	67.80

Comments:

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7081	62.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	35.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	108	72.20
Black, non-Hispanic	84	31.00
Hispanic	62	54.80
White, non-Hispanic	6732	62.80
Students with Disabilities	961	17.30
Limited English Proficient	103	34.00
Economically Disadvantaged	2139	41.40
Migrant	14	14.30
Male	3609	60.80
Female	3469	63.80

Comments:

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

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7137	63.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	60.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	108	68.50
Black, non-Hispanic	84	41.70
Hispanic	61	55.70
White, non-Hispanic	6787	64.00
Students with Disabilities	1018	17.90
Limited English Proficient	97	29.90
Economically Disadvantaged	2162	44.10
Migrant	16	18.80
Male	3645	58.40
Female	3492	68.90

Comments:

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7205	59.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	25.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	110	65.50
Black, non-Hispanic	100	37.00
Hispanic	75	56.00
White, non-Hispanic	6871	59.30
Students with Disabilities	1043	11.00
Limited English Proficient	117	37.60
Economically Disadvantaged	1997	40.20
Migrant	20	25.00
Male	3717	56.50
Female	3487	61.60

Comments:

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7264	63.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	40.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	110	68.20
Black, non-Hispanic	99	54.60
Hispanic	76	60.50
White, non-Hispanic	6930	63.30
Students with Disabilities	1101	16.80
Limited English Proficient	113	43.40
Economically Disadvantaged	2018	43.60
Migrant	20	40.00
Male	3757	57.80
Female	3507	69.00

Comments:

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7580	57.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	34	23.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	79	67.10
Black, non-Hispanic	99	32.30
Hispanic	58	46.60
White, non-Hispanic	7279	58.10
Students with Disabilities	1031	10.90
Limited English Proficient	90	28.90
Economically Disadvantaged	2016	38.60
Migrant	15	26.70
Male	3851	55.40
Female	3728	59.80

Comments:

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7662	62.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	35	25.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	79	62.00
Black, non-Hispanic	98	48.00
Hispanic	60	55.00
White, non-Hispanic	7357	63.00
Students with Disabilities	1111	18.40
Limited English Proficient	84	38.10
Economically Disadvantaged	2058	43.30
Migrant	15	33.30
Male	3895	55.70
Female	3765	69.80

Comments:

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7124	73.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	45	48.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	103	81.60
Black, non-Hispanic	88	46.60
Hispanic	78	64.10
White, non-Hispanic	6770	73.70
Students with Disabilities	836	36.80
Limited English Proficient	79	45.60
Economically Disadvantaged	1459	57.00
Migrant		
Male	3676	72.20
Female	3440	74.20

Comments: Total number of Migrant students is below Vermont's Minimum N for reporting.

- 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	7113	87.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	51	78.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	99	91.90
Black, non-Hispanic	90	67.80
Hispanic	79	83.50
White, non-Hispanic	6767	87.50
Students with Disabilities	843	55.20
Limited English Proficient	72	61.10
Economically Disadvantaged	1457	77.60
Migrant		
Male	3666	83.60
Female	3447	91.10

Comments: Total number of Migrant students is below Vermont's Minimum N for reporting.

- 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	310	234	76.00

Comments: One Public Secondary School did not have a decision made.

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	240	177	74.00

Comments: One Public Secondary District did not have a decision made.

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	205	151	74.00

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	174	121	70.00

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

Each identified school is assigned a School Support Coordinator who works with the administration to establish a set of Required Actions to be approved by the Commissioner during the first two years. When the school is in corrective action and restructuring, the plan is also reviewed by the State Board. These set of Required Actions ask that the school document their progress in student achievement and indicate how they address the supports and instructional changes instituted when the progress is not sufficient to result in change. Pass Through money is given to schools to assist in this effort of 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.

School Support Coordinators work with the identified districts to develop a district-wide Improvement Plan to coordinate with the improvement plans of all schools in that district. Coordinators also assist the district to find other resources (money, people, materials, etc.) to support the district plan.

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.	0
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.	0
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.	0
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.	0
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.	0
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.	0
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.	2
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	10
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.	596
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

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

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	20308	18400	90.60
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	1730	1554	89.80
Low-Poverty Schools	1911	1746	91.40
All Elementary Schools	7479	6826	91.30
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	2254	2035	90.30
Low-Poverty Schools	3778	3522	93.20
All Secondary Schools	12829	11574	90.20

Comments: Situations where special educators provide primary instruction in a core content area (i.e. special education classes) are not included in this table. See attachment (Section 1.5.1 Special educator.doc) for the percentage of special education assignments being taught by teachers who are HQT for those assignments. Also see comment for 1.5.3.

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	31.50
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	0.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.70
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)	61.30
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	4.50
d) Other (please explain)	0.00

Comments: Percentages for special education categories are zero because special education classes are not included in this table. See attachment (Section 1.5.2 Special Educator.doc) for breakdown of special education assignments. Also see comment for 1.5.3.

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	47.00	22.00
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Price School Meals	
Secondary Schools	35.00	17.40
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Price School Meals	

Comments: 2.4% of total core area non-special education classes were excluded from the poverty analysis because of the following reasons: Classes from 18 schools were excluded from the H-L poverty comparisons because of incomplete data (they are included in the other calculations). Classes reporting SU or a Technical Center as place of service were excluded (no data available.)

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	97.60

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 K-12 English language proficiency standards represent an amalgam of the thinking of educators of English language learners participating in the WIDA Consortium (World-Class Instructional Design and Assessments). More than 65 teachers, administrators, and researchers at the classroom, district, state, university, and national levels, all closely or directly involved with creating and implementing programs for English language learners, provided invaluable input and feedback to the process. The result is a useful product unique to the field of language testing and teaching. The English language proficiency standards serve to ground large-scale state and classroom assessment as well as stimulate and guide curriculum and instruction.

Vermont is a member of WIDA. In May 2003, eight WIDA states convened in Madison, Wisconsin to begin development on English language proficiency standards linked to state standards in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Using NCLB and TESOL's (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) original K-12 standards as guides, WIDA drafted common standards that encompass five areas: 1) Social/Instructional Language of the Classroom, 2) the language of classroom Language Arts, 3) the language of classroom Mathematics, 4) the language of classroom Science, 5) the language of classroom Social Studies. The standards are linguistically and

developmentally appropriate, benchmarked to grade clusters K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12, and address all four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Nationally recognized ELL standards and assessment expert Margo Gottlieb synthesized the work of the state committees and worked with Deborah Short (Center for Applied Linguistics) and Lorraine Valdez Pierce (George Mason University) on revisions to ensure NCLB compliance and the integration of best ELL practice for the WIDA ELP Standards.

The first edition of the WIDA standards was finalized by March 2004 and has been disseminated to ELL Coordinators and ESL teachers in Vermont. This compendium of standards, includes: ELP Standards Framework for Large-Scale Assessment; ELP Standards Framework for Classroom Instruction and Assessment; and State Academic Content Standards. The WIDA ELP Standards are available at www.wida.us, and also at the Vermont Department of Education's website.

The New England states of Vermont, Maine, and New Hampshire conducted one three-day institute in June 2004. In January 2006, ELL Coordinators in Vermont participated in a basic workshop to learn what the ELP standards are, how to use them to develop standards-based instruction, and how these standards are assessed with the ACCESS for ELLs proficiency test.

The State is consulting and planning with educators in the state on how to expand professional development opportunities that will actively involve ESL teachers, content teachers, and administrators in using the ELP standards for designing curriculum and instruction and for classroom assessment.

In 2005-2006, the work on WIDA ELP standards continues. As new states join the consortium, WIDA is aligning and augmenting the WIDA ELP standards with their academic standards. Vermont is participating in the WIDA Subcommittee, that was formed at the October 2005 Steering Committee, to work with WCER on future iterations of the ELP standards, development of new strands of model performance indicators for the large-scale assessment and classroom frameworks, and professional development for ELP standards and best practice in the WIDA states.

Another version of the WIDA ELP Standards, which will expand and configure the lower end to include PK/K cluster, has also been discussed. There is consideration of adding an ELP Level .5 for ELLs w/ severe cognitive disabilities.

The WIDA ELP standards provided the foundation for the national TESOL model standards which were rolled out in March 2006 at the national TESOL convention. These standards will be fully NCLB compliant and reflective of best practice for ELLs. (TESOL was particularly impressed with the WIDA standards because of the clear linkages to state academic standards and the model it provides to teachers for teaching academic content language within ESL and bilingual programs).

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

Fifty national and local educational experts (including VT SEA and LEA personnel) convened in Madison, Wisconsin, in May 2003. The goal of the two-day meeting was to determine the breadth and depth of the English language proficiency standards and the role of the standards in the enhanced assessment system for ELLs. The first day was devoted to inspecting and expanding existing English language proficiency and English language development standards from TESOL and around the country. Groups applied specific criteria for the selection of progress indicators or student achievement standards for determining their relevance and potential adoption by the Consortium. Next, the groups augmented the progress indicators, taking into account the following considerations:

â€¢ The language complexity required of the standard;

â€¢ The level of cognitive engagement required of the student;

â€¢ The presence of a developmental progression in relation to the other standards; and

â€¢ An equal representation of standards across language domains for a given grade level cluster.

At the close of the first day, the entire group reached consensus on the core English language proficiency standards and identified sample progress indicators (later to be named model performance indicators) at each grade level cluster.

Effort at Aligning ELP Standards w/ Academic Content Standards

On the second day, representatives from individual states examined their academic content standards and, based on a set of criteria derived from linguistic theory (Bachman, 1990; Halliday, 1973, 1976), agreed on a common set of language functions to be used across content areas for the various levels of cognitive engagement. Groups worked with their individual state academic content standards in the areas of language arts/reading, mathematics, science, and social studies to extract the language functions to be applied to the English language proficiency standards.

From the two-day discussion emerged a consensus among the eight participating states on key decision points. It was agreed upon that there would be four standards (to represent the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing) to be defined by progress indicators, six areas of language proficiency confined to the school setting (to represent social language, academic language and the language of the content areas of language arts, math, science, and social studies), five levels of language proficiency, four grade level clusters, and two applications [large-scale state and classroom]. In regard to the coverage of specific content areas, No Child Left Behind minimally requires the assessment of language arts/reading, mathematics, and science for academic achievement. However, the members of the Consortium strongly felt that the English language proficiency standards, as well as the English language proficiency test, should also address the content area of social studies.

Creating and reviewing the K-12 English language proficiency standards

The work that the eight groups of participants generated over the two-day meeting was synthesized. The synthesis involved a systematic review of all materials (disks and paper copies) produced. Model performance indicators for each English language proficiency standard, derived from English language proficiency frameworks and state academic content standards, were then plotted onto a map by grade level cluster and language proficiency level. Additional source documents from the states provided full sets of the states' academic content standards that helped supplement the model performance indicators. Subsequently, the WIDA development team decided on the most appropriate format to display the performance indicators. The initial K-12 English language proficiency standards were drafted in July 2003.

WIDA's K-12 English language proficiency standards for large-scale state assessment underwent formal review at the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, DC in August 2003. Eighteen representatives from consortium

states and outside experts participated in the vetting process. The purpose of the review was to elicit specific, useful feedback on the standards prior to undergoing revision and refinement. This step was critical as the standards are to serve all member states of the Consortium and are to be used as anchors for task specifications that, in turn, will impact item writing for the language proficiency test.

Each component of the language proficiency standards was meticulously examined, through a set of guiding questions, in small groups divided by grade level clusters. From the whole group debriefing, a set of decisions emerged: 1). the standards should be reorganized (the areas of language proficiency were to become the standards and the current standards were to become the domains); 2). the sample progress indicators should be renamed model performance indicators; 3). for the large-scale state framework, the model performance indicators should largely represent declarative knowledge with some cross-referencing to procedural knowledge that would be mainly captured in the classroom framework; 4). the model performance indicators should maintain a uniform level of specificity; and 5). the model performance indicators should each present a clear focus on language use in content areas rather than on content per se.

Based on the recommendations and the materials from the initial development phase, the K-12 English language proficiency standards for large-scale state assessment were revised during August and edited in early September 2003. The names of the proficiency levels were finalized and draft performance definitions were proposed for each level. The introduction was amplified to include a rationale and a more thorough description of the process and products of standards development.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

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

- An independent alignment study Yes
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

Independent Alignment Study:

The WIDA Consortium has contracted with Dr. Gary Cook from the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER) to conduct an independent alignment study of the alignment between the WIDA ELP Standards (adopted by Vermont) and the ACCESS for ELLs® ELP assessment, Vermont's measure of English proficiency growth. The alignment will be conducted by teachers from Vermont and the 14 other WIDA Consortium states in Madison, Wisconsin, December 4-5, 2006. Dr. Norman Webb's alignment procedures will be used and the teachers will enter their findings in the Web Alignment Tool, a federally funded on-line alignment framework that identifies match, depth of knowledge, and balance between the standards and the assessment. Webb's system is one of four federally recognized methodologies for conducting alignments. Dr. Cook has adapted the Webb system for use with English proficiency standards and ELP tests. Dr. Cook is one of the leading authorities in this area. Dr. Cook will analyze and synthesize the teachers' finding and write the summary report on the degree of alignment including any recommendations for changes to the standards or the assessment. The report should be available by March 1, 2007 and will be shared with all WIDA member states and the US Department of Education.

Other Evidence:

Vermont's teachers were involved in the process of developing the WIDA ELP Standards and model performance indicators. A content match procedure was used at the time the ELP Standards were developed (see WIDA ELP Standards Overview, Gottlieb, 2004).

New NCLB Compliant ELP Assessment

1. Vermont uses the ACCESS for ELLs® ELP assessment. The test provides annual, secure forms for Kindergarten through grades 12 (grade clustered tested are K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12.) 33% of the test items are changed annually based on the ELP standards and test blue print guidelines. Test item development is conducted at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL).

2. ACCESS for ELLs® tests four separate domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and provides score reports in those four plus comprehension (based on the listening and reading domains).

3. ACCESS for ELLs® is aligned to the WIDA ELP Standards adopted by Vermont.

4. ACCESS for ELLs® has undergone rigorous pilot, field testing and annual assessments of technical quality. The WIDA Consortium has an active technical advisory council with national experts to assist with ensuring the highest standards of validity and reliability. (see Development and Field Report, 2005 and the Annual Technical Report Series, 100, 2006).

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. Serbo-Croatian	282	18.00
2. Spanish	208	13.30
3. Vietnamese	184	11.80
4. Chinese	122	7.80
5. Maay	107	6.80
6. French	100	6.40
7. Russian	59	3.80
8. Korean	37	2.40
9. Turkish	37	2.40
10. German	26	1.70
Comments:		

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

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

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

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
656	276	2

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.)

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

Vermont was one of the first 3 WIDA Consortium states to transition to the new, standards-based ELP test, ACCESS for ELLs, in spring 2005. Unlike our interim ELP assessment, the new test measures academic language proficiency. In April 2005, qualified teachers, under the direction of the ACCESS for ELLs development team from the Center for Applied Linguistics, set proficiency level cut scores based on the proficiency level definitions and test data through a bookmarking process. These performance standards and cut scores were finalized in July 2005. In August 2005 and July 2006, test score reports were sent to school districts which participated in the assessment.

1. Test Score Range / Cut Scores for ACCESS for ELLs: Key:

(a) 1/2 means the cut score between level 1 and 2; 2 starts with the score given in the table, and so on.

(b) Overall means the weighted "composite" score made up of all four domains.

(c) "Compre" means the weighted comprehension score based on listening and reading.

d) The lowest possible score is 100, which was only observed for Kindergarteners.

FINAL WIDA ACCESS CUT SCORES

(In Final Scale Scores)

Grades Domain Cut

1/2 2/3 3/4 4/5 5/6

1-2 List 255 279 308 323 352

3-5 List 253 322 350 370 394

6-8 List 320 349 378 404 436

9-12 List 340 376 396 419 439

Grades Domain Cut

1/2 2/3 3/4 4/5 5/6

1-2 Speak 287 322 348 365 389

3-5 Speak 303 330 350 366 390

6-8 Speak 320 347 368 384 407

9-12 Speak 324 352 377 395 419

Grades Domain Cut

1/2 2/3 3/4 4/5 5/6

1-2 Read 263 284 297 308 323

3-5 Read 305 331 350 362 386

6-8 Read 330 358 369 379 391

9-12 Read 353 378 386 395 411

Grades Domain Cut

1/2 2/3 3/4 4/5 5/6

1-2 Write 244 274 317 346 372

3-5 Write 291 318 350 381 404

6-8 Write 307 336 380 405 420

9-12 Write 353 376 413 434 447

Grades Domain Cut

1/2 2/3 3/4 4/5 5/6

1-2 Overall 259 285 313 332 354

3-5 Overall 292 325 350 370 394

6-8 Overall 319 347 374 393 410

9-12 Overall 347 373 396 412 429

Grades Domain Cut

1/2 2/3 3/4 4/5 5/6

1-2 Compre 261 283 300 313 332

3-5 Compre 289 328 350 364 388

6-8 Compre 327 355 372 387 405

9-12 Compre 349 377 389 402 419

2. 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:

Per NCLB requirements, individual scores will be reported for each domain—Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing—as well as Comprehension (Reading and Listening) and composite scores (All). Weightings for the composite score are: 15% Listening, 15% Speaking, 35% Reading, and 35% Writing.

The comprehension score = 70% Reading + 30% Listening

3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

Initial comparisons of two years of ACCESS for ELLs language proficiency scores with academic achievement scores from Vermont's state assessments, the New England Comprehensive Assessment Program (NECAP), seem to suggest that students who score a composite proficiency level of approximately 5.0 also score "proficient" on the state assessments.

Based on the best available data at this time (two years of ACCESS for ELLs data and one year of NECAP test results for grade levels 3-8), the DOE will consider any student who scores a composite proficiency level 5.0 to have "attained proficiency" for accountability purposes. At that point, a student will no longer be required to take the annual assessment, although that decision will be up to the school. Students who score 5.0 can be counted as "exited" and included in the 2 year monitoring category for LEP students taking state assessments.**

The DOE and the WIDA Consortium will continue to collect quantitative and qualitative data in order to firmly establish the relationship between these tests in order to ensure that a composite score of English Language Proficiency Level 5 (Bridging) on the ACCESS for ELLs truly equates with our definition of "attaining proficiency." Further research on the performance of native English speakers on the ACCESS for ELLs test will also be instructive.

For purposes of making program decisions, especially for "exiting" students from ELL services, districts/schools are encouraged to use multiple measures. Other important sources of information for making program decisions include: ESL and classroom teacher judgments about students' needs for language and academic support in grade-level content areas; performance on state, local, and classroom assessments; and parental input. The WIDA Consortium's Framework for Classroom Instruction and Assessment is a recommended tool for formative assessment yielding valuable information about the students' progress in attaining English language proficiency for academic purposes.

Districts are also encouraged to look at students' scores in each language domain, because there are cases in which students score a composite proficiency level of 5.0 but continue to need support services in a particular language domain.

**One caveat, in general the primary grades are more oriented to the crucial development of basic and concrete English skills. Academic language, as we commonly conceptualize it, becomes increasingly prominent as students progress to higher grades. Experience and research have consistently demonstrated that English language learners can sometimes appear proficient in the primary grades, and that deficits in the more abstract academic English may not become apparent until later. Therefore, schools will be reminded to keep a watchful eye on students' progress as they move from the primary classroom into higher grades and may be requested to test students who score at proficiency level 5.0 or higher for at least an additional year. This is certainly not to say that all students from second language backgrounds require support services.

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

1. Description of English Language Proficiency (ELP) Levels

Vermont's definition of "making progress" is based on the WIDA English Language Proficiency levels, as defined by the WIDA K-12 ELP standards and the ACCESS for ELLs assessment.

The WIDA framework recognizes the continuum of language development within the four domains with five proficiency levels, in order to facilitate the reporting of progress toward English Language Proficiency Level 6, Reaching.

Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Level 4 Level 5

Entering Beginning Developing Expanding Bridging

These levels describe the spectrum of a learner's progression from knowing little to no English to acquiring the English skills necessary to be successful in an English-only mainstream classroom without extra support. The criteria for the English language proficiency performance definitions are:

Comprehension and use of the technical language of the content areas

Extent of discourse control

Development of phonological, syntactic, and semantic understanding or usage

Within each combination of grade level, content area, and language domain, there is a Performance Indicator (PI) at each of the five points on the proficiency ladder, and the sequence of these five PIs together describe a logical progression and accumulation of skills on the path to full proficiency.

(See Appendix: Criteria for Performance Definitions Descriptive of the Levels of English Language Proficiency for WIDA's English Language Proficiency Standards)

2. Criteria for progressing from one proficiency level to the next

In order to progress from one proficiency level to the next, students must meet the relevant cut points that are included above in C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency--Definition of Proficient--Test Score Range/Cut Scores for ACCESS for ELLs.

The ACCESS for ELLs will be the instrument used to measure and report growth in a consistent manner, and districts and schools will be held accountable for the English language development gains of their English language learners.

3. Description of the language domains in which student must make progress

The ACCESS for ELLs assesses students in the domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. Each

domain is treated as a separate section, or "testlet," within the ACCESS for ELLs. The domain of Comprehension is a score which combines Reading (70%) and Listening (30%).

Domain Administration times

Speaking Individually administered up to 15 minutes per student

Listening Group administered approximately 25 minutes

Reading Group administered approximately 35 minutes

Writing Group administered approximately 60 minutes

The ACCESS for ELLs is not a timed test. The above times are given as approximate guidelines and do not include the time necessary for classroom management procedures (e.g., passing out booklets, giving general direction) or going through practice items. Test administrators should monitor student progress and allow them a few minutes beyond the suggested times if the student appears to be near completion on the given task. Students who are struggling and/or will clearly not finish within a reasonable time (within about ten minutes) should be stopped.

Test Format

Each domain (Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing) is treated as a separate test, meaning that each domain is tested in a separate section of the whole ACCESS for ELLs. Listening, Reading and Writing, however, are contained within a single booklet.

Reading and Listening items are all multiple choice. Kindergarten, grade cluster 1-2 and all items targeting English language proficiency level 1 on Tier A forms (all grades) give students a choice of three response options. All other items have four response options.

Speaking and Writing are constructed response tasks. Speaking is an adaptive form containing a maximum of 13 items addressing three different topics, or themes. Students are presented only with the items within each topic that they can answer. If they reach a point where they cannot respond, the test ends. Writing forms contain three short Writing tasks (all tiers) and one long task (tiers B and C). In the long task students are asked to produce an essay appropriate to the grade level cluster. The Writing form is not adaptive; all students should attempt all tasks.

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 Vermont DOE will revise its definition of cohort. A cohort includes all students who were tested for the first time in any given year (starting in 2002-2003), minus the students who graduate, leave the state, or drop out of school. Students who "attain proficiency" are maintained in the cohort as long as they remain in school. Therefore, a new cohort is added each year that the test is given. As of September 2006, there are a total of 4 cohorts. This revised definition of cohort will better enable the state to track the performance of the same group of students over time.

Within the cohorts for each year, the DOE will use the grade level clusters (K;1-2;3-5;6-8;9-12) and English language proficiency levels when last tested to set growth targets for the next year. The AMAO for "making progress" is the same for all cohorts, but there will be different growth targets (based on students' grade level and proficiency level when last assessed) within cohorts.

ACCESS for ELLs is an English language proficiency measure that is vertically equated across five grade level clusters and horizontally equated across five levels of English language proficiency, represented in three tiers. It uses the IRT-based standard scores for reporting its subscales. Thus, WIDA has more confidence in the maintenance of longitudinal data for cohorts of ELLs.

English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

*Unit of Analysis/Cohort: ___ First Year Assessed_____

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

Based on analysis of available data from Vermont and two other WIDA states that have administered the new ACCESS for ELLs English language proficiency test for two consecutive years, the Vermont Department of Education is resetting its AMAOs as follows:

English Language Proficiency Targets for Percent of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency

AMAO #1. As mentioned above, the "making progress in English" growth target for individual students in each cohort (first year tested) will be figured according to two factors, (1) student's grade level cluster and (2) English language proficiency level--when last tested. To determine whether Title III-funded LEAs are meeting the AMAO for "making progress", the scores of all LEP students will be aggregated from individual schools at the district or consortium (multiple districts belonging to the consortium) level. To make the determination of whether the State is making the AMAO, the VT DOE will aggregate the scores of students from all Title III-funded LEAs.

One-Year Growth Targets for Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency (Based on Tenths of a Proficiency Level)

Preliminary analysis of ACCESS for ELLs data seems to indicate that students acquiring English language proficiency can be expected to show greater gains at the earlier grade levels and lower level levels of proficiency. Conversely, it is generally typical for students to show more limited annual growth as they move up the grade levels and also as they acquire higher levels of proficiency. This initial finding confirms prior language acquisition theory, which suggests that students' growth will eventually "taper off" in later years, not following as steep a trajectory as it does for students in earlier years of English language exposure and instruction.

In setting challenging and reasonable growth targets for students taking the new ACCESS for ELLs test, the State has factored in the relevant information (mentioned above) and tentatively set AMAO#1 at 50%, with growth targets for "making progress." (See Table 1 for targets).

With still only two years of ACCESS for ELLs data, the VT DOE must use caution when estimating a growth pattern. Because this is a brand new assessment, the DOE anticipates the need to reexamine its growth targets for both "making progress" and "attaining proficiency" once it has a third year of ACCESS for ELLs data, and thus a more complete picture of students' expected English language proficiency growth (and attainment) trajectories. The WIDA Consortium is also analyzing and refining scaling for students who fall at the borderline between grade cluster assessments, which may also require slight revision to targets in future years.

AMAO set at 50%:

Table 1: 2005-2006 Growth Targets

Previous Year's Composite English Language Proficiency Level

<2 2-3.5 >3.5 Grade Average.

Grade Level

K 1 1 NA 1.0

1-2 .8 .8 .5 .70

3-5 .8 .5 .3 .53

6-8 .5 .3 .2 .33

9-12 .5 .2 .2 .30

English Language Proficiency Targets for Percent of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency

AMAO #2. The State has developed a formula for setting targets for the percent of students who will attain proficiency (now defined as Level 5.0 or higher). The attainment target is a function of the percent of students who would be proficient if all growth targets for making progress are met.

$X + Y = \text{Attainment target (Percent of LEP students at Proficiency Level 5)}$

N

When ...

X = number of (Tier C) students who will reach Proficiency Level 5 by meeting growth targets

Y = number of students who reached Proficiency Level 5 in previous years and have not graduated or left school

N = Total number of students minus graduates and "school leavers" (students who moved out-of-state or dropped out of school)

In order to determine whether the districts, consortia, and state met the target, the VT DOE will analyze the data to see what percentage of students predicted to "attain proficiency" actually scored a composite score of Proficiency Level 5.

This system ensures that the attainment targets are based on the actual (changing) enrollments of students (in LEAs and the state) who are predicted to reach Proficiency Level 5, and is the fairest way to hold them accountable for AMAO#2. The district, consortium, or state can only be held accountable for meeting the target based on the actual number of students who were predicted to attain proficiency (Proficiency Level 5.0 or higher) if all growth targets for making progress are met. This means that individual districts, consortia, and the state will be evaluated according to the proficiency level profiles of the cohort members and whether the most advanced students meet the attainment target. This will prevent setting arbitrary targets that do not reflect a particular district's enrollment of language proficiency levels of students.

In other words, the number of students predicted to attain proficiency in the next year will vary from year-to-year, both

within and across districts and the state, thus necessitating a system with a fixed formula rather than a fixed percentage.

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	# 479	% 61.00	# 584	% 8.20	# 92	% 16.60	# 159

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	461	60.30
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		304	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	9.50	129	16.90
TOTAL		765	

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	11
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	11
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	11
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	10
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	10
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	1
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	0
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	1
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	Yes

Comments:

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
H.S.		

Comments: Data by grade are not reportable because it would violate Vermont's reporting rules protecting personally identifiable information. Aggregated data across grade show 41, or 93.18%, formerly Title III served, monitored LEP students performing proficient or advanced in reading.

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: Data by grade are not reportable (except at grade 10) because it would violate Vermont's reporting rules protecting personally identifiable information. Aggregated data across grade show 41, or 93.18%, formerly Title III served, monitored LEP students performing proficient or advanced in mathematics.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	87.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.00
Black, non-Hispanic	0.00
Hispanic	0.00
White, non-Hispanic	0.00
Students with Disabilities	0.00
Limited English Proficient	0.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	0.00
Female	0.00

Comments: This is the first year using a four year cohort graduation rate as recommended by the National Governors Association. Subgroup graduation rates will be available beginning with the 2005-2006 school year. Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 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	7.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.00
Black, non-Hispanic	5.20
Hispanic	2.50
White, non-Hispanic	3.30
Students with Disabilities	3.40
Limited English Proficient	0.70
Economically Disadvantaged	5.90
Migrant	4.60
Male	3.80
Female	2.80
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.	

1.9.1.1 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 State of Vermont requires 175 student contact 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	60	60
LEAs with Subgrants	4	4

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	44	10
1	35	12
2	45	11
3	44	<n
4	52	<n
5	48	10
6	38	16
7	40	12
8	34	21
9	21	20
10	30	26
11	25	22
12	30	20

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	78	99
Doubled-up	226	81
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	30	<n
Hotels/Motels	111	<n
Unknown	41	<n

Comments:

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

1.9.2.1 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	10
1	12
2	11
3	<n
4	<n
5	10
6	16
7	12
8	21
9	20
10	26
11	22
12	20

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

<n

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

59

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

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

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

0

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

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

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	56
English Language Learners (ELL)	0
Gifted and Talented	0
Vocational Education	0

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	3
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	3
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	4
Transportation	4
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	4
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	4
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	4
Coordination between schools and agencies	4
Counseling	3
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
Clothing to meet a school requirement	3
School supplies	2
Referral to other programs and services	4
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional)	2

Comments: Other= field trips, enrichment activities, biopsychosocial assessments and group work.

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School selection	2
Transportation	2
School records	0
Immunizations or other medical records	0
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
1. Chronic Homelessness	1
2. Reduction in Section 8 Funding	1
3. Precludes optimal enrollment	1

Comments: 4. Consistant school attendance= 1

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	0	0
Grade 4	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 5	Yes	0	0
Grade 6	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 7	Yes	0	0
Grade 8	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	<n	<n
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	0	0
Grade 4	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 5	Yes	0	0
Grade 6	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 7	Yes	0	0
Grade 8	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	<n	<n
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.