

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

The West Virginia Board of Education formally approved/adopted, on February 20, 2003, challenging academic content standards in science for elementary (grades K-5), middle (grades 6-9), and high school (grades 10-12), which include specific content expectations for each grade level.

The minutes of the February 20, 2003 meeting of the West Virginia Board of Education record the formal approval/adoption of challenging academic standards in science for grades K-12, and which include specific content expectations for each grade level.

West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2510, Assuring the Quality of Education: Regulations for Education Programs, requires that the approved West Virginia academic content standards are applied to all public schools and students in the state.

West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320, A Process for Improving Education: Performance Based Accreditation System requires that the approved West Virginia academic content standards are applied to all public schools and students in the state.

West Virginia's assessment system, including science standards, has been approved through USED peer review process in February of 2005.

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

Assessments

The West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) assessment system in mathematics, reading/language arts, science and social studies for all students in grades 3-8 and 10 was instituted in 2004-2005. Additionally, the West Virginia Alternate Assessment provided a coherent system of alternate standards that align to the West Virginia academic content standards and reflected articulation of knowledge and skills across grades in all four content areas.

All operational forms of WESTEST align with the West Virginia Content Standards

and Objectives. All test forms are equivalent to one another in terms of content coverage, difficulty and quality. WESTEST yields comparable results for all subgroups. WESTEST has depth and breadth coverage of the

standards and objectives and employs multiple approaches within specific grade and content to ensure coverage of the standards and objectives.

The West Virginia assessment system was approved in a federal peer review in February of 2005.

Alternate Assessment

WVDE's assessment system for 2004-2005 included an alternate assessment to WESTEST, aligned to extended standards, which yielded a student score for each grade level subject assessed.

Alternate Academic Achievement Standards and Assessment

In September, 2006, WVDE developed Alternate Academic Achievement Standards, Policy 2520.16, which were approved by the State Board of Education. These challenging academic achievement standards, developed in reading and mathematics, are linked to the State's grade-level academic content standards and promote access to the general curriculum. A new Alternate Assessment, based on the WV Alternate Academic Achievement Standards, was developed in the spring of 2005 and the completed documentation was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education on April 30, 2005. Again, the West Virginia assessment system was approved in a federal peer review in February 2005.

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

Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

West Virginia has formally approved/adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading and English language arts and mathematics for each of grades K-12. These were completed, approved and implemented before the 2003-2004 school year.

1. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2520.1 - Reading and English Language Arts Content Standards and Objectives for West Virginia Schools is evidence of performance descriptors for reading and English languages arts that were developed for grades K-12.
2. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2520.2 - Mathematics Content Standards and Objectives for West Virginia Schools is evidence of performance descriptors for mathematics that were developed for grades K-12.
3. The minutes of the March 10, 2005 meeting of the West Virginia Board of Education record the formal approval/adoption of challenging academic achievement standards (cut scores) in reading and English language arts, mathematics and science that cover each of the grades K-12.
4. State of West Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, approved by the U.S. Department of Education, documents that the West Virginia academic achievement standards have been developed are applied to all public schools and students in the State.
5. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2320, A Process For Improving Education: Performance Based Accreditation System, requires that West Virginia academic achievement standards have been developed and are applied to all public schools and students in the State.
6. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2340 - West Virginia Measures of Academic Progress documents that the WESTEST reports student achievement results on the West Virginia content standards.

Science

West Virginia has formally approved/adopted challenging academic achievement standards and performance descriptors in science for each of grades K-12. These were completed, approved and implemented before the 2003-2004 school year. West Virginia has adopted achievement level cut scores in science for each of grades K-12.

1. West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2520.3 - Science Content Standards and Objectives for West Virginia Schools is evidence of performance descriptors for science, which were developed for grades K-12.
2. The minutes of the March 10, 2005 meeting of the West Virginia Board of Education record the formal approval/adoption of challenging academic achievement standards (cut scores) in science that cover each of grades K-12.

Alternate Academic Achievement Standards and Assessment

In September, 2006, WVDE developed Alternate Academic Achievement Standards, Policy 2520.16, which were approved by the State Board of Education. These challenging alternate academic achievement standards, developed in reading and mathematics, are linked to the State's grade-level academic content standards and promote access to the general curriculum. Alternate academic achievement standards and a new Alternate Assessment, based on the WV Alternate Academic Achievement Standards, was developed in the Spring of 2005 and documentation was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education on April 30, 2006.

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	143904	99.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	152	98.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	913	99.40
Black, non-Hispanic	7176	98.90
Hispanic	1086	98.40
White, non-Hispanic	134577	99.20
Students with Disabilities	23560	98.20
Limited English Proficient	664	98.40
Economically Disadvantaged	75164	98.90
Migrant	50	100.00
Male	73914	99.00
Female	69990	99.30

Comments:

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

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	143924	99.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	153	99.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	912	99.20
Black, non-Hispanic	7183	99.00
Hispanic	1090	98.70
White, non-Hispanic	134586	99.20
Students with Disabilities	23577	98.20
Limited English Proficient	666	98.70
Economically Disadvantaged	75176	98.90
Migrant	50	100.00
Male	73939	99.00
Female	69985	99.30

Comments:

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

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

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

1.2.2

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	22108	92.10
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1452	6.10

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	22119	92.20
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1458	6.10

Comments:

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	19732	79.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	21	76.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	139	89.90
Black, non-Hispanic	1035	68.90
Hispanic	167	78.40
White, non-Hispanic	18370	79.80
Students with Disabilities	3640	59.30
Limited English Proficient	110	76.40
Economically Disadvantaged	11004	73.10
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	10122	78.80
Female	9610	79.90

Comments: Very small groups change dramatically from year to year.

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	19734	80.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	21	81.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	138	89.90
Black, non-Hispanic	1036	72.40
Hispanic	167	73.10
White, non-Hispanic	18372	80.40
Students with Disabilities	3642	50.70
Limited English Proficient	110	63.60
Economically Disadvantaged	11010	73.20
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	10122	75.80
Female	9612	84.40

Comments: Very small groups change dramatically from year to year.

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	19863	77.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	16	43.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	130	91.50
Black, non-Hispanic	1023	66.40
Hispanic	148	76.40
White, non-Hispanic	18546	77.90
Students with Disabilities	3498	50.90
Limited English Proficient	104	75.00
Economically Disadvantaged	11063	70.40
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	10187	76.20
Female	9676	78.70

Comments: small group

- 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	19863	81.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	16	62.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	130	88.50
Black, non-Hispanic	1023	75.10
Hispanic	148	77.00
White, non-Hispanic	18546	82.00
Students with Disabilities	3497	47.90
Limited English Proficient	104	68.30
Economically Disadvantaged	11062	74.90
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	10183	77.20
Female	9680	86.40

Comments: small group

- 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	20655	79.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	87.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	127	89.00
Black, non-Hispanic	1088	70.90
Hispanic	170	78.80
White, non-Hispanic	19246	80.10
Students with Disabilities	3321	46.40
Limited English Proficient	98	72.50
Economically Disadvantaged	11300	72.90
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	10530	79.20
Female	10125	80.20

Comments: small group

- 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	20655	79.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	87.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	127	86.60
Black, non-Hispanic	1088	73.00
Hispanic	171	73.70
White, non-Hispanic	19245	79.70
Students with Disabilities	3326	37.60
Limited English Proficient	98	63.30
Economically Disadvantaged	11300	72.00
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	10534	74.70
Female	10121	84.10

Comments: small group

- 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	20976	75.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	16	62.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	128	93.00
Black, non-Hispanic	1070	58.70
Hispanic	153	69.90
White, non-Hispanic	19609	76.10
Students with Disabilities	3339	36.20
Limited English Proficient	102	69.60
Economically Disadvantaged	11256	66.90
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	10955	74.50
Female	10021	76.00

Comments: small group

- 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	20984	81.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	16	75.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	128	91.40
Black, non-Hispanic	1071	70.20
Hispanic	153	79.70
White, non-Hispanic	19616	81.50
Students with Disabilities	3342	36.80
Limited English Proficient	102	71.60
Economically Disadvantaged	11261	73.70
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	10960	76.00
Female	10024	86.40

Comments: small group

- 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	21312	74.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	31	77.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	120	92.50
Black, non-Hispanic	1064	61.40
Hispanic	160	66.30
White, non-Hispanic	19937	75.50
Students with Disabilities	3374	33.30
Limited English Proficient	91	71.40
Economically Disadvantaged	11220	65.80
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	11070	73.80
Female	10242	75.90

Comments: small group

- 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	21329	80.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	68.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	120	91.70
Black, non-Hispanic	1066	74.10
Hispanic	161	74.50
White, non-Hispanic	19950	81.10
Students with Disabilities	3381	38.80
Limited English Proficient	92	70.70
Economically Disadvantaged	11232	73.20
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	11087	75.10
Female	10242	86.80

Comments: small group

- 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	21683	72.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	75.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	124	91.10
Black, non-Hispanic	1057	56.90
Hispanic	165	63.00
White, non-Hispanic	20313	73.20
Students with Disabilities	3502	27.50
Limited English Proficient	88	53.40
Economically Disadvantaged	10991	63.00
Migrant	13	53.90
Male	11126	72.40
Female	10557	72.50

Comments: small group

- 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	21678	81.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	24	66.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	124	89.50
Black, non-Hispanic	1060	74.80
Hispanic	166	78.30
White, non-Hispanic	20304	81.50
Students with Disabilities	3497	36.30
Limited English Proficient	88	68.20
Economically Disadvantaged	10982	73.50
Migrant	13	76.90
Male	11126	75.00
Female	10552	87.80

Comments: small group

- 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	19683	68.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	75.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	145	88.30
Black, non-Hispanic	839	48.90
Hispanic	123	67.50
White, non-Hispanic	18556	69.50
Students with Disabilities	2886	21.70
Limited English Proficient	71	76.10
Economically Disadvantaged	8330	57.50
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	9924	67.20
Female	9759	70.40

Comments: small group

- 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	19681	76.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	90.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	145	79.30
Black, non-Hispanic	839	59.60
Hispanic	124	74.20
White, non-Hispanic	18553	77.00
Students with Disabilities	2892	27.40
Limited English Proficient	72	55.60
Economically Disadvantaged	8329	65.40
Migrant	<n	<n
Male	9927	69.70
Female	9754	83.00

Comments: small group

- 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	709	607	85.60

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	55	5	9.10

Comments: 5 districts made AYP in all

three programmatic areas

Based on the approved WV accountability plan, 34 districts made AYP at one or more programmatic levels (elementary, middle, and high school). Thus, only 21 districts have been identified for improvement.

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	361	337	93.40

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	55	5	9.10

Comments: Based on the approved WV accountability plan, 34 districts made AYP at one or more programmatic levels (elementary, middle, and high school). Thus, only 21 districts have been identified for improvement.

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

In the effort to address schools in need of improvement, West Virginia has established support teams at both the county and school levels. The county school support teams are appointed by the superintendent of schools and are responsible for providing support to all schools within the county that are identified for improvement. The tasks include reviewing all facets of the school's operations including the design and operation of instructional programs, and making recommendations for improving student performance. Furthermore, the team collaborates with others in revising the school improvement goals, the development of a school improvement plan, and implementing the plan. The county school support teams assist in monitoring the school improvement efforts and make recommendations to the county or West Virginia Department of Education concerning additional assistance that is needed by the school.

Each school in West Virginia that is identified for improvement shall identify a school support team. The principal appoints these team members. Their responsibilities include analyzing all facets of the school's operation and developing a comprehensive needs assessment. Furthermore, the team collaborates with others in revising the school improvement goals, the development of a school improvement plan, and implementing the plan. Needed technical assistance is noted and communicated to the county school support team as the school implements the plan. This team serves as the chairpersons of school reform efforts.

Six schools in West Virginia school are identified for corrective action. The SEA is working with each of these schools who must chose from the following options: 1) replace the school staff that are relevant to the failure to make adequate yearly progress; 2) institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including providing appropriate professional development for all relevant staff, that is based on scientifically based research and offers substantial promise of improving educational achievement for low-achieving students and enabling the school to make adequate yearly progress; 3) significantly decrease management authority at the school level; 4) appoint an outside expert to advise the school on its progress toward making adequate yearly progress, based on its school plan; or 5) restructure the internal organizational structure of the school. Each school identified for corrective action must submit a corrective action plan to the SEA. One school in the State is implementing alternative governance. This school has placed an additional assistant principal at the school whose focus is school improvement. The school made AYP this past school year.

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.

West Virginia Department of Education has a framework for high performing school systems. The framework focuses on establishing a systemic continuous improvement process. It is the belief of WVDE that high performing school systems share three broad commonalities (1) strong core beliefs that shape the culture of the school (2) system wide strategies that enhance curriculum, instruction, overall school effectiveness, and student/parent support; and (3) use of a systemic continuous improvement process to bring about change. High yield strategies for curriculum, instruction, school, effectiveness, and student/parent support form the pillars of our framework. In prior years each of these areas has been a focus of a three-day quarterly conference held for district support teams. For each component included in the pillars, a resource packet has been developed. The resource packets contain research articles, a three-hour professional development awareness module and a two-day professional development training module.

It is the belief of the WVDE staff that schools and LEAs may be improved by building capacity at the district level. Each district is required to submit to the West Virginia Department of Education an on-line strategic plan that identifies strategies and includes action steps for implementing these strategies to improve the achievement of all students in the district. The development of the Five-Year Strategic Plan provides a means for districts to think long-term about what can be done to meet the challenging goals of No Child Left Behind. Furthermore, the plan unites all schools in the West Virginia Achieves mission of "Bringing all students to mastery and beyond and closing the achievement gap." The Five-Year Strategic Plan provides a process and format for creating a local "blueprint" or "road map" for improving achievement for all students. It is a way to create a coalition of knowledgeable stakeholders committed to the long-term transformation of the school system to a "learning for all" organization.

The 06-07 school year is the first time districts in WV have been identified for corrective action. The SEA will continue to provide technical assistance to the nine LEAs in corrective action. A team from the WVDE will visit the districts to assist the district support team in completing a comprehensive needs assessment and revising the district strategic plan. The LEA improvement plan is reviewed and approved by SEA. Federal NCLB funds will be deferred until the revised plan is approved by the SEA.

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.	25
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.	25
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.	93
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.	16523
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.	93
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.	93
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.	15
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	296
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.	4517
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.	296
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	80865	74126	91.70
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	3666	3612	98.50
Low-Poverty Schools	3322	3242	97.60
All Elementary Schools	14243	13922	97.70
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	5962	5058	84.80
Low-Poverty Schools	29308	26510	90.50
All Secondary Schools	66622	60203	90.40

Comments: The elementary data reflect a change in the methodology for counting elementary courses. Self contained classrooms were counted as one class. Prior to this year, each of the subjects taught by the self-contained teacher was considered a class.

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	9.00
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	5.30
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	85.70
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)	1.10
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	1.20
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	97.70
d) Other (please explain)	0.00

Comments: Prior to the highly qualified teacher requirement established in IDEA, WV only recorded courses in the core academic subjects taught by special education teachers. Therefore, courses not identified as core academic subjects were not counted in the total number of courses. The data collection system now records courses taught by all special education teachers.

WV's definition of a highly qualified teacher allows only those teachers who hold full professional certification in the core academic s/he is assigned to teach to be considered highly qualified. Therefore, the majority of courses that are taught by non-highly qualified teachers are teachers who lack full state certification.

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	63.70	42.70
Poverty Metric Used	The poverty metric used was percent of students receiving free or reduced lunch.	
Secondary Schools	63.60	42.80
Poverty Metric Used	The poverty metric used was percent of students receiving free or reduced lunch.	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	99.80

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

Challenging English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards, that mirror national and state goals, have been developed with input from a broad base of stakeholders including representatives from across the state, at both the school and district level, Title III, Title I and content areas. These ELP standards are PreK-12 standards that address all four domains of speaking, listening, reading and writing. They were developed to closely align with the state's Reading Language Arts Standards and link with the state's other content standards. The original standards were approved by the West Virginia Board of Education (WVBOE) in May 2003 and revised in May 2004 (W.Va. 126CSR15, West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2417: Programs of Study for Limited English Proficient Students).

The goal of the English language proficiency (ELP) standards is to provide the foundation that will enable LEP students to be successful in the content standards and across the curriculum. They are designed to provide guidance for the development of district English language proficiency curricula, the selection of instructional materials, the evaluation of students' learning, and in-service and pre-service professional development programs. Using the ELP Standards, teachers can develop a scope and sequence and select the specific content and learning activities that will lead students to a high level of language proficiency. Both the overarching ELP standards and proficiency level objectives form part of West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2417: Programs of Study for Limited English Proficient Students. This approved policy is currently on the West Virginia Department of Education website (<http://wvde.state.wv.us/policies/2417.html>), has been distributed to district superintendents and Title III directors, teachers and administrators as part of professional development sessions.

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

In May 2004, the WV Board of Education revised Policy 2417 which outlines the state's ELP standards. At that time the ELP Standards were developed to closely align with the state's Reading Language Arts (RLA) Standards by creating linkages that:

1. Address the domains of: Oral (Listening/Speaking), Reading, and Writing in three standards
2. Are consistent with RLA standards
3. Use a uniform numbering and formatting system
4. Articulate five levels of proficiency and defer to the RLA standards when developmentally appropriate

In October 2005, the Committee for ELP/Math/Science Standard Alignment was formed. The Committee, comprised of West Virginia ESL, Math and Science teachers, began developing a framework for aligning/linking the ELP standards with the Math and Science standards. The committee reviewed all three sets of standards and various models used by other states for linking them. Ultimately, the committee developed its own framework design by which the state's standards are linked.

Committee Goals

The Alingment/Linking Framework:

1. Articulates clear linkages between ELP and Content Standards
2. Creates a rubric that describes how LEP students can demonstrate their content knowledge at all 5 levels of English Language Proficiency
3. Provides a succinct and meaningful tool for both Content and ESL classroom teachers to use for assessing students' mastery of content.

Assumptions

1. Given that linking every ELP objective with each content objective would yield a cumbersome and inaccessible document, the framework document highlights broad linkages between the ELP standards and the overarching content standards. Thus, the framework is articulated by Content Standard (1 page table per grade cluster per standard) and designed to link the performance descriptor to the three ELP domains.
2. Given comprehensive examples within each standard, content teachers can draw meaningful implications for specific content lessons
3. Given that both sets of standards (ELP and Content) are designed to spell out what students should know and be able to do at each performance level, the language used in the Linking Framework similarly articulates (in broad terms) what the student should know and be able to do:
 - a. Within each grade cluster
 - b. According to each content standard
 - c. At each English language proficiency level

4. If an LEP student has gaps in his/her content knowledge, the content teacher should use a formative assessment to identify those gaps and rely on the content standards to guide the teaching of the missing knowledge

Linking Results

West Virginia's ELP Standards represent a bridge for LEP students to gain access to the Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and other content standards. The committee produced several documents that articulate the linking of the ELP Standards with content standards and are available at <http://wvconnections.k12.wv.us/elpstandards.html> The Committee will reconvene after the West Virginia State Board completes the adoption of Policy 2520 in which all West Virginia content standards are currently under revision.

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

1. In 2002, West Virginia began actively participating in a Council of Chief State School Officers consortium, called the Limited English Proficiency State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards, or LEP SCASS, to develop an English language proficiency assessment that meets all the requirements of NCLB and is aligned to West Virginia ELP standards. The English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) is designed to measure the progress and attainment of English language proficiency of K-12 LEPs. Other entities involved with the ELDA test development are the American Institutes for Research (AIR), Measurement Incorporated (MI), Center for the Study of Assessment Validity and Evaluation (C-SAVE) and the UCLA National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing (CRESST). As a member of the CCSSO LEP SCASS consortium, West Virginia state and local district educators have been actively involved in the test development process, standard setting, and have participated in one operational test.

The ELDA assessment, referred to in West Virginia as the WESTELL, was operationalized in these timelines:

- a. Spring 2005- operationalized in grades 3-12
- b. Spring 2006 -1st year operationalied in grades K-12
- c. Spring 2007- 2nd year of K-12 operationalization statewide

(2.1) West Virginia Board of Education Policy 2417 requires that all LEP students, K-12, annually participate in the WESTELL assessment (<http://wvde.state.wv.us/policies/p2417.doc>). LEA compliance with this policy is monitored through an annual Desk Audit of all LEAs, as well as on-site monitoring every three years. In addition, the state reviews student participation data at the LEA level as part of the annual WESTELL data analysis used for evaluation of AMAOs.

(2.2) The WESTELL score reports generate both level and scale scores for each of the domain subtests (listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension) and are available for review at: <https://wveis.k12.wv.us/nclb/private/nclbdata05/eldarpt1.cfm>

(2.3) In 2004 and 2005 the American Institutes for Research (AIR) and Measurement Incorporated (MI) studied the alignment of the assessment to the standards, as well as other technical issues and produced two Technical Reports.

(2.4) The Center for the Study of Assessment Validity and Evaluation (C-SAVE) conducted a study examining the Field Test Validity Results of the WESTELL (ELDA) and found results that support the test's validity and reliability. All technical reports issued by these organizations are available for review at <http://wvconnections.k12.wv.us/assessment.html>

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	603	49.00
2. Mandarin Chinese	85	14.00
3. Arabic	61	5.00
4. Cantonese	36	3.00
5. Russian	35	3.00
6. Vietnamese	35	3.00
7. Japanese	27	2.00
8. Korean	22	2.00
9. German	15	1.00
10. French	17	1.00
Comments:		

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

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

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

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
1005	880	1

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

The West Virginia Department of Education did not institute a formal system for collecting immigrant data until May 2002. Beginning with the 2003-04 school year data collection, each student was assigned a student number (Student ID) for identification purposes. Using this new system, student records transfer with students whenever they transfer within the state (i.e. from district to district) thereby ensuring a more accurate determination of students' Immigrant status (length of time in West Virginia/US schools). These county-level data were analyzed according to:

- (A) The numerical difference between 05 and 06 Immigrant students
- (B) The percentage difference between 05 and 06 Immigrant students

Overall demographic trends indicate the largest growth is occurring in the state's eastern panhandle. Although the total LEP population averages less than 1% statewide, most West Virginia school systems have low-incidence LEP populations. However, of the total small number of LEP students, many districts experience a relatively high percentage of "immigrant students." The implication for West Virginia schools is that although they are serving fewer students than national averages, those students that do enroll are often those with the least language proficiency. In the 2005-06 school year, one West Virginia district in the eastern panhandle was awarded a \$10,000 subgrant for its significant increase in Immigrant students.

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

In September 2003, the West Virginia Department of Education submitted its original baseline data and accountability definitions for Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) required by Title III of NCLB. However, in the Spring of 2005, West Virginia operationalized its standard-based assessment, the West Virginia Test of English Language Learning (WESTELL). In December of 2005, after receiving two years of WESTELL data, the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) staff convened a Title III accountability committee to provide suggestions on the development of the AMAOs. Extensive analyses of baseline data from the 2004 field-test data and 2005 administration of the WESTELL were conducted to determine appropriate targets for the AMAOs. In March 2006, the state submitted these targets as a revision to the Consolidated State Application, along with plans to conduct an Impact Study that measures the accuracy of current targets and makes final recommendations regarding revising the AMAO targets beginning in Fall 2007. In its current Consolidated State Application, West Virginia defines proficient as Level Four Intermediate with all domain areas (listening, speaking, reading, writing, comprehension) at Level Three or above.

1. The test score range for WESTELL are:

Grade Cluster/ Test Beginning (Level 2) Intermediate (Level 3) Advanced (Level 4) Fully English Proficient (Level 5)

K Listening 4 9 16 19

K Speaking 6 12 18 22

K Reading 8 20 36 40

K Writing 7 16 21 26

1-2 Listening 6 11 16 19

1-2 Speaking 8 13 18 22

1-2 Reading 10 22 21 39

1-2 Writing 8 17 21 25

3-5 Listening 450 544 645 725

3-5 Speaking 450 547 668 809

3-5 Reading 450 580 648 770

3-5 Writing 450 577 669 934

6-8 Listening 554 626 718 869

6-8 Speaking 458 611 719 825

6-8 Reading 460 612 691 829

6-8 Writing 553 653 722 897

9-12 Listening 556 632 729 850

9-12 Speaking 570 650 765 850

9-12 Reading 545 630 718 850

9-12 Writing 509 631 719 850

2. Explanation of Rules for Weighting Domains (R,W,L,S,C) Comprehension proficiency levels are based on a combination of the proficiency levels students received on Listening and Reading. The table on the next page shows how Listening and Reading proficiency levels are combined to yield a Comprehension level:

Rules for Combining Listening and Reading Levels to Yield a Comprehension Level

If Reading Level is: And Listening Level is: Then Comprehension Level is:

1 1 1

2 1

3 1

4 2

5 2

2 1 2

2 2

3 2

4 2

5 3

3 1 2

2 3

3 3

4 3

5 3

4 1 3

2 3

3 4

4 4

5 4

5 1 3

2 3

3 4

4 5

5 5

For example, if a student received a level 3 on Reading and a level 2 on Listening, the student received a level 3 for Comprehension. However, if the levels were reversed (3 on Listening and 2 on Reading), the Comprehension level would have been 2.

A similar set of rules is used to create an intermediate score called Production (from Speaking and Writing). While Production is not reported, it is combined with Comprehension to produce the Composite score (next page).

Composite proficiency levels are based on a combination of the proficiency levels students received on all four language domains. A Production level, which is a combination of Speaking and Writing, is determined for each student and combined with the Comprehension level the student received. The Production level is not reported as a separate score; it is used only to determine the Composite level. The next table shows how Speaking and Writing proficiency levels are combined to yield a Production level:

Rules for Combining Speaking and Writing Levels to Yield a Production Level

(All Grade Levels)

If Writing Level is: And Speaking Level is: Then Production Level is:

1 1 1

2 1

3 1

4 2

5 2

2 1 2

2 2

3 2

4 2

5 3

3 1 2

2 3

3 3

4 3

5 3

4 1 3

2 3

3 4

4 4

5 4

5 1 3

2 3

3 4

4 5

5 5

The next table shows how Comprehension and Production proficiency levels are combined to yield a Composite level:

Rules for Combining Comprehension and Production Levels to Yield a Composite Level

(All Grade Levels)

If Production Level is: And Comprehension Level is: Then Composite Level is:

1 1 1

2 1

3 2

4 2

5 3

2 1 1

2 2

3 2

4 3

5 3

3 1 2

2 2

3 3

4 3

5 4

4 1 2

2 3

3 3

4 4

5 4

5 1 3

2 3

3 4

4 4

5 5

When the Comprehension and Production levels are not the same, the rule is to average the two levels and round down. For example, if the Production level were 3 and the Comprehension were 4, the average would be 3.5, and the final Composite would be 3.

3. Additional Factors for determining Proficiency

In addition to the WESTELL ELP Assessment results, West Virginia requires that LEP students obtain a score of "Mastery" or above on the state's content RLA assesment WESTEST.

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

Under the revisions submitted in March to the Consolidated State Application, West Virginia defines the annual growth metric for "Making Progress" as gaining one proficiency level annually until students reach the Level 3 with no sub-skill below Intermediate. For students who have reached Level 3 with no sub-skill below Intermediate, the bi-annual goal is to gain one proficiency level. For students who have reached Levels 4 and 5 with no sub-skill below Intermediate but have not been re-designated, the annual goal is to maintain this level of proficiency. These changes are currently being measured through an impact study conducted by the state to determine the impact on the state's accountability plan.

1. The state's English Language Proficiency levels are defined in Policy 2417 as:
<http://wvde.state.wv.us/policies/p2417.doc>

Negligible (Level 1)*

Students can comprehend simple statements and questions with additional visuals and gestures. They have a limited understanding of the general idea of basic messages but rely on visual cues and prior knowledge with the topic. Comprehension is limited to simple phrases containing high frequency words. They are able to copy simple English letters and words from a model and are beginning to use prewriting strategies and available technology.

Very Limited (Level 2)*

Students can comprehend simple statements and questions. They can understand the general idea of basic messages and conversations and will respond to basic statements and engage in basic face-to-face conversations with more fluent speakers. They can understand the general message of basic reading passages that contain simple language structures and syntax. Comprehension is limited to simple language containing high frequency vocabulary and predictable grammatical patterns. Errors in spelling and grammar, basic vocabulary and structures in simple sentences are characteristic of student writing at this level.

Limited (Level 3)*

Students can comprehend short conversations on simple topics and they can understand frequently used verb tenses and word-order patterns in simple sentences. Students can initiate and sustain a conversation although they often speak with hesitation and rely on known vocabulary. They typically use the more common verb tense forms, but make numerous errors in tense formation and verb selection. They can use contextual cues to derive meaning from texts and can begin to identify the main idea and supporting details. Students can write simple notes, make brief journal entries, and write short reports using basic vocabulary and common language structures.

Intermediate (Level 4)*

Students can understand standard speech delivered in most settings with some repetition and rewording. They can understand the main ideas and relevant details of extended discussions or presentations and are beginning to detect affective undertones and inferences in spoken language. They can communicate orally in most situations. Students can comprehend many texts independently but still require support in understanding texts in the academic content areas. They can write multi-paragraph compositions, and present their thoughts in an organized, understandable manner.

Fluent (Level 5)*

Students can understand most standard speech and identify the main ideas and relevant details of discussions or presentations on a wide range of topics, including unfamiliar ones. They are able to understand the nuances in meaning represented by variations in stress, intonation, pace, and rhythm. They are approaching grade-level mastery of the language structures and vocabulary necessary for understanding academic content subject area texts. They are able to use the language structures and content vocabulary required for writing in the academic subject although they may make errors.

2. In order to move from one proficiency level to the next, students must meet the following cut score criteria:
<http://wvconnections.k12.wv.us/documents/ScoreInterpGuide.doc>

Grade Cluster/ Test

Lev2 Lev3 Lev4 Lev 5

3-5 Listening 450 544 645 725

3-5 Speaking 450 547 668 809

3-5 Reading 450 580 648 770

3-5 Writing 450 577 669 934

6-8 Listening 554 626 718 869

6-8 Speaking 458 611 719 825

6-8 Reading 460 612 691 829

6-8 Writing 553 653 722 897

9-12 Listening 556 632 729 850

9-12 Speaking 570 650 765 850

9-12 Reading 545 630 718 850

9-12 Writing 509 631 719 850

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

West Virginia defines the cohort for AMAO 1 is:Â·

All LEP students, K-12, who have two years of WESTELL data.

The cohort for AMAO 2 is:

Â· Students with two years of WESTELL scores who have been in U.S. schools for four or more years;

Â· Students at the Level 3 or above who did not reach English proficiency the prior year;

Â· Students below the Level 3 the prior year who met the English proficient level. These changes were submitted in March 2006 as revisions to the Consolidated State Application. See <http://wvconnections.k12.wv.us/elpstandards.html> for a more complete definition of the two AMAOs.

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	% 75.00	# 337	% 74.00	# 333	% 6.00	# 29	% 11.00	# 56

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	75.00	304	75.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		105	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	6.00	37	8.00
TOTAL		446	

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	12
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	12
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	12
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	11
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	12
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	12
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	0
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: All twelve districts met 2 AMAOs, so by extension, all 12 also met at least 1 AMAO. Hence, both questions were answered with 12.

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

1.6.11.1 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	11	100.00
4	<n	<n
5	<n	<n
6	<n	<n
7	<n	<n
8	<n	<n
H.S.	<n	<n

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	10	91.00
4	<n	<n
5	<n	<n
6	<n	<n
7	<n	<n
8	<n	<n
H.S.	<n	<n

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

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

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

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

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	84.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	63.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.20
Black, non-Hispanic	81.20
Hispanic	88.50
White, non-Hispanic	84.30
Students with Disabilities	75.20
Limited English Proficient	87.80
Economically Disadvantaged	78.00
Migrant	100.00
Male	82.50
Female	86.10
Comments: Small group of students	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

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

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

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	2.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.50
Black, non-Hispanic	3.10
Hispanic	2.80
White, non-Hispanic	2.70
Students with Disabilities	1.70
Limited English Proficient	0.90
Economically Disadvantaged	1.90
Migrant	2.60
Male	2.90
Female	2.50
Comments: Accurate values	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

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

STATE RESPONSE

The instructional term shall commence no earlier than the twenty-sixth day of August and terminate no later than the eighth day of June.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	39	39
LEAs with Subgrants	16	16

Comments: We have 2 LEAs that have more than one subgrant in there county. The subgrant is school based.

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	69	200
1	71	191
2	57	204
3	70	177
4	80	137
5	91	170
6	77	153
7	57	155
8	48	159
9	55	176
10	51	86
11	27	89
12	40	72

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	115	202
Doubled-up	385	1069
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	231	254
Hotels/Motels	27	55
Unknown	27	389

Comments:

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

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

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

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	98
1	112
2	121
3	135
4	137
5	142
6	149
7	121
8	125
9	123
10	54
11	56
12	41

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
64

Comments: We are continuing to work on identifying this population.

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

95

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)	472
English Language Learners (ELL)	<n
Gifted and Talented	<n
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	15
Expedited evaluations	4
Staff professional development and awareness	7
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	6
Transportation	9
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	9
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	7
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	5
Coordination between schools and agencies	11
Counseling	12
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	5
Clothing to meet a school requirement	9
School supplies	13
Referral to other programs and services	10
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional)	2

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	16
School selection	3
Transportation	3
School records	5
Immunizations or other medical records	7
Other enrollment issues	9

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
Identification of students experiencing homelessness	9
n/a	0
n/a	0

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

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

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	61	39
Grade 4	Yes	64	35
Grade 5	Yes	74	40
Grade 6	Yes	83	54
Grade 7	Yes	91	66
Grade 8	Yes	96	60
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	37	20
Grade 11	N/A	0	0
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

Comments: Several of the students that were served by the grant were not enrolled at the time of the assessment or entered after the assessment.

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	65	44
Grade 4	Yes	63	36
Grade 5	Yes	76	48
Grade 6	Yes	83	45
Grade 7	Yes	90	64
Grade 8	Yes	97	49
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	36	19
Grade 11	N/A	0	0
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

Comments: Several of the students that were served by the grant were not enrolled at the time of the assessment or entered after the assessment.

* 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.