

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).

OMB Number: 1810-0614	
Expiration Date: 07/31/2007	
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2005-2006 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2005-2006	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction	
Address: 125 South Webster Street, P.O. Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Mary Jo Parman	
Telephone: 608-266-2158	
Fax: 608-266-5188	
e-mail: maryjo.parman@dpi.state.wi.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Michael J. Thompson	
_____ Signature	<u>Friday, May 04, 2007, 4:50:24 PM</u> Date

This version (1.3) contains edits to sections 1.9.1.3 and 1.9.1.4

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

Wisconsin has developed and formally approved challenging academic content standards in Science. A brief history of key events in the development of Wisconsin's content standards is as follows:

In January 1997, then-Wisconsin governor Tommy G. Thompson required the creation of challenging academic content standards through Executive Order 302, dated January 24, 1997, which established the Governor's Council on Model

Academic Standards. Committees of Wisconsin educators, parents, policymakers, business leaders, and citizens participated in a year-long process of drafting and finalizing content standards specifying what Wisconsin students would be expected to know by the end of the 4th, 8th, and 12th grades. In January 1998, Wisconsin formally approved the Wisconsin Model Academic Content Standards (WMAS), which were signed by Governor Thompson on January 13, 1998, Executive Order 326.

Wis. Stats. 118.30(1g)(a), passed in 1998, required school districts to adopt pupil academic standards in mathematics, science, reading and writing, geography, and history. Districts were allowed to use the state content standards (WMAS) to serve this purpose, and all have done so.

The WMAS are benchmarked to the end of grades 4, 8, and 12, with specific expectations for the knowledge and skills expected of all students at the end of these three grades. With the move of Wisconsin's testing window from the spring to the fall in 2002, it became necessary for Wisconsin educators to establish grade-level content descriptors for all grades that defined what students should know and be able to do at the beginning of the school year based upon content expectations established in the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards. This issue was addressed beginning in the fall of 2003, when

committees of Wisconsin educators began meeting to develop Reading and Math "frameworks" designed to clarify the knowledge and skills appropriate for Wisconsin students at the beginning of grade 3-8 and 10.

WDPI then convened a group of outstanding Wisconsin science educators to develop an assessment framework establishing descriptors of assessment content for state Science tests administered at the beginning of grades 4, 8, and 10. There was extensive statewide participation of citizens, educators, and other stakeholder groups in establishing both the WMAS and the

Science Frameworks. A draft assessment framework for Science was completed in June 2005 and posted to WDPI's website, with final approval by the State Superintendent expected in February 2006.

The background information on the purpose and development of the Assessment Frameworks in Science have been disseminated to educators throughout the state in Wisconsin Educator's Guides for Elementary, Middle, and High Schools.

Both the WMAS and the Wisconsin Assessment Frameworks are available to educators, parents, community members, and the general public on the WDPI web site.

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

Wisconsin assessments (listed by grade and subject area) are as follows:

• Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination - Criterion Referenced Test (WKCE-CRT): used to determine AYP for Reading and Mathematics in grades 3-8 and 10; Science assessment are included in Safe Harbor determination at

grades 4, 8, and 10. All aspects of the WKCE-CRT and its predecessor, the WKCE received formal approval from the State Superintendent.

• Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities (WAA-SwD): used to determine AYP for Reading and Mathematics in grades 3-8 and 10 (and Science assessment at grades 4, 8, and 10) for students with the most significant

cognitive disabilities.

The WAA-SwD use alternate achievement standards, that are prerequisite skills aligned with the state content standards (WMAS) for eligible students upon the recommendation of Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams.

• Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for English Language Learners (WAA-ELL): used to determine AYP for Reading and Mathematics in grades 3-8 and 10 (and Science assessment at grades 4, 8, and 10) for beginning ELL students. The WAA-ELL uses grade level achievement standards that are based on the state content standards (WMAS) for beginning ELL students, who are defined as those with English language ability levels of 1-2 on Wisconsin's 7-level English language

proficiency scale.

At this time, WDPI does not have an alternate assessment for students with disabilities that is aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

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

Wisconsin's challenging academic achievement standards have two primary components: proficiency descriptors that specify the types of content in which students must demonstrate mastery to be included in each of the state's four achievement levels described below, and cut scores specifying the numerical scale score students must achieve to be included in each achievement level. Wisconsin's academic achievement standards were adopted by current State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster.

Cut Scores and Proficiency Descriptors: Proficiency score standards (cut scores) and proficiency descriptors for the WKCE Reading, Mathematics, and Science assessments were originally established in 1997, when Wisconsin used "shelf" TerraNova tests. Cut scores and proficiency descriptors were re-set for the enhanced WKCE in February 2003 for Reading, Mathematics, and Science at Grades 4, 8, and 10. The February 2003 cut scores and proficiency descriptors were established through a "bookmark" standard-setting process.

Participants included a diverse group of 240 Wisconsin educators, parents, and community members.

The bookmark process, is a common form of standard setting based on Item Response Theory (IRT), using the consensus of participants working with test booklets ordered by level of item difficulty based upon actual student performance data. At a bookmark standard setting, participants first take the assessment then discuss the general types of knowledge and skills

students must demonstrate in order to be considered proficient and advanced in each content area at the beginning of that grade level. This discussion forms the foundation for a review of item booklets that are ordered in terms of difficulty, with participants placing "bookmarks" at the places within the booklet that represent their view of what each achievement level represents. Participants then compare the placement of each others' bookmarks, and engage in further discussion to arrive at consensus on cut scores for each achievement level. Based upon this consensus, proficiency descriptors that describe the

specific knowledge and skills within each achievement level are then written.

Cut scores and proficiency descriptors developed by participants in the February 2003 bookmark standard setting process were then reviewed by Wisconsin's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC, consisting of nationally-recognized experts in the field of testing and educational measurement is appointed by the State Superintendent to provide advice

regarding Wisconsin's standards, assessments, and accountability system. The TAC reviewed the cut scores and proficiency descriptors developed at the February 2003 bookmark standard setting, and recommended to the State Superintendent that they be approved.

Changes in cut scores resulting from the February 2003 were communicated to Wisconsin educators and the general public through regional post-test workshops, e-mail notification sent to each district's assessment coordinator, and information posted to WDPI's website explaining the changes. Questions and Answers Regarding the New 2002-03 WKCE Proficiency Levels, has been available on WDPI's website since February 2003, communicates the implications of the changes in WKCE cut scores.

The new WKCE-CRT scale was developed based on a widely-used statistical model called item response theory (IRT), which simultaneously considers test item characteristics (e.g., item difficulty) and students' performance on the items. In Reading and Mathematics, which have annual testing in grades 3-8 and 10, it is desirable to establish a common scale that allows for the comparison of performance across years and grade levels. This type of scale is known as a vertical scale.

In order for the vertical scale to be applicable across grades, a set of common items was administered to students at adjacent grade levels. Student performance on these items helped establish the scale. With a vertical scale, scores

from different grade levels can be directly compared in order to measure growth. A vertical scale is necessary for any potential growth calculations that may be allowable in the future for determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

The new Fall 2005 WKCE-CRT scale also required the establishment of new cut scores. DPI considered several options for establishing cut scores for the new test in consultation with measurement experts and concluded that the best option was to link scores at the state level using a procedure known as equipercentile linking. Scores from the new and old tests were statistically linked at the state level so that a score on a WKCE test can be associated with a score on a WKCE-CRT test that represents approximately the same level of performance.

Wisconsin has approved alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in

Reading and Mathematics that are linked to content standards for grades 3-8 and 10. These students are eligible to take the

Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities (WAA-SwD) if they meet eligibility criteria determined by

their IEP team, which must complete the Wisconsin Alternate Assessment Participation Checklist. This checklist determines

eligibility for the WAA-SwD in accordance with the student's (1) curriculum, (2) present level of educational performance, (3) need for instructional support, and (4) source of difficulty with the regular curriculum. Each of the four criteria must be considered with respect to each of the content areas in which the student is to be assessed, including Reading, Science, and

Mathematics.

Students who take the WAA-SwD are assessed using Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs) and rating scales designed and validated for use on the WAA-SwD. APIs, from which all WAA-SwD test items are drawn, are extensions of the state content standards that describe how students with disabilities may meaningfully demonstrate their knowledge, and are intended to assist IEP teams in communicating with parents and educators about a student's current level of performance relative to the academic content standards.

Four achievement levels are used to rate student performance on the WAA-SwD: Prerequisite Skill (PS) Minimal, Prerequisite Skill (PS) Basic, Prerequisite Skill (PS) Proficient, and Prerequisite Skill (PS) Advanced. Cut scores for the achievement levels used on the WAA-SwD were developed by Wisconsin educators in June 2004 through a bookmark standard setting process facilitated by Dr. Stephen Elliott of Vanderbilt University, a nationally-recognized expert in the assessment of students with disabilities and were formally approved by State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster. Participants in the establishment of

proficiency standards for the WAA-SwD, represented the state of Wisconsin geographically, demographically, with educators, stake-holders, and other citizens involved the greatest extent possible.

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	445204	99.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	6474	98.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	16002	99.30
Black, non-Hispanic	46701	98.30
Hispanic	29012	98.80
White, non-Hispanic	346999	99.70
Students with Disabilities	61439	98.70
Limited English Proficient	21465	98.80
Economically Disadvantaged	137556	99.10
Migrant	504	95.10
Male	228201	99.40
Female	217003	99.50

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	445050	99.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	6467	98.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	15914	98.80
Black, non-Hispanic	46784	98.50
Hispanic	28903	98.40
White, non-Hispanic	346966	99.70
Students with Disabilities	61436	98.70
Limited English Proficient	21251	97.80
Economically Disadvantaged	137421	99.00
Migrant	505	95.30
Male	228138	99.30
Female	216912	99.50

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	55474	89.10
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	364	0.60
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	5601	9.00
Comments: WAA-ELL is aligned with grade-level standards		
Total SwD Enrollment was 62,254 (denominator)		

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	54897	88.20
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	283	0.50
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	6256	10.00
Comments: WAA-ELL is aligned with grade-level standards		
Total SwD Enrollment was 62,254 (denominator)		

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	58657	72.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	808	62.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	2134	71.00
Black, non-Hispanic	6317	37.60
Hispanic	4615	55.90
White, non-Hispanic	44783	79.00
Students with Disabilities	7702	50.10
Limited English Proficient	3733	55.50
Economically Disadvantaged	19896	54.80
Migrant	89	65.20
Male	29967	73.40
Female	28690	70.90

Comments:

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	58630	80.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	808	75.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	2132	72.30
Black, non-Hispanic	6329	58.40
Hispanic	4598	66.10
White, non-Hispanic	44762	86.10
Students with Disabilities	7703	50.80
Limited English Proficient	3714	57.70
Economically Disadvantaged	19880	67.00
Migrant	89	70.80
Male	29953	77.80
Female	28676	84.20

Comments:

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	59969	72.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	863	59.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	2251	68.70
Black, non-Hispanic	6509	39.70
Hispanic	4494	55.10
White, non-Hispanic	45851	79.80
Students with Disabilities	8291	48.60
Limited English Proficient	3652	52.40
Economically Disadvantaged	20041	55.00
Migrant	63	57.10
Male	30864	74.20
Female	29105	71.50

Comments: Migrant count is correct for 2005-06

- 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	59958	82.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	862	75.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2248	72.60
Black, non-Hispanic	6507	59.20
Hispanic	4497	67.80
White, non-Hispanic	45843	88.00
Students with Disabilities	8279	53.40
Limited English Proficient	3653	56.50
Economically Disadvantaged	20034	68.20
Migrant	65	56.90
Male	30856	80.90
Female	29102	84.40

Comments: Migrant count is correct for 2005-06

- 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	60291	72.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	824	61.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2219	69.80
Black, non-Hispanic	6596	38.50
Hispanic	4376	52.80
White, non-Hispanic	46273	79.90
Students with Disabilities	8441	43.20
Limited English Proficient	3413	51.10
Economically Disadvantaged	20022	54.10
Migrant	62	41.90
Male	30983	73.30
Female	29308	72.20

Comments:

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	60338	83.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	824	76.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	2214	77.50
Black, non-Hispanic	6610	58.90
Hispanic	4383	68.30
White, non-Hispanic	46303	88.30
Students with Disabilities	8451	50.00
Limited English Proficient	3409	59.10
Economically Disadvantaged	20041	70.00
Migrant	62	64.50
Male	31007	81.50
Female	29330	84.70

Comments:

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	62946	73.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	958	59.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	2253	70.60
Black, non-Hispanic	6950	36.70
Hispanic	4096	54.70
White, non-Hispanic	48681	80.40
Students with Disabilities	8886	37.60
Limited English Proficient	3039	51.00
Economically Disadvantaged	20412	54.20
Migrant	40	57.50
Male	32136	72.20
Female	30809	74.20

Comments:

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

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	62898	83.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	957	74.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	2239	74.30
Black, non-Hispanic	6956	56.80
Hispanic	4064	67.00
White, non-Hispanic	48673	89.50
Students with Disabilities	8880	47.40
Limited English Proficient	2990	55.90
Economically Disadvantaged	20371	68.70
Migrant	40	62.50
Male	32106	81.00
Female	30790	86.40

Comments:

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	65006	74.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1012	58.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2333	69.50
Black, non-Hispanic	6938	34.50
Hispanic	4060	55.70
White, non-Hispanic	50661	81.60
Students with Disabilities	9249	36.70
Limited English Proficient	2770	48.10
Economically Disadvantaged	20311	54.00
Migrant	55	40.00
Male	33532	74.30
Female	31474	74.10

Comments:

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	64980	84.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1009	76.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	2324	74.30
Black, non-Hispanic	6952	58.20
Hispanic	4028	68.00
White, non-Hispanic	50664	89.70
Students with Disabilities	9251	47.60
Limited English Proficient	2724	53.30
Economically Disadvantaged	20296	69.60
Migrant	55	54.60
Male	33520	81.70
Female	31459	86.90

Comments:

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	66637	74.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1015	56.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	2272	72.90
Black, non-Hispanic	7112	37.50
Hispanic	3943	54.30
White, non-Hispanic	52293	81.60
Students with Disabilities	9475	35.40
Limited English Proficient	2569	52.50
Economically Disadvantaged	19936	55.40
Migrant	101	71.30
Male	34341	73.90
Female	32294	75.30

Comments: LEP and Migrant counts are correct!

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	66612	85.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	1013	76.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2259	78.10
Black, non-Hispanic	7124	57.70
Hispanic	3925	69.30
White, non-Hispanic	52290	90.50
Students with Disabilities	9485	49.80
Limited English Proficient	2535	57.50
Economically Disadvantaged	19919	70.40
Migrant	100	75.00
Male	34333	83.10
Female	32278	87.30

Comments: Counts for Hispanic, LEP, and Migrant are correct!

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	71704	72.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	994	53.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2540	66.00
Black, non-Hispanic	6279	29.50
Hispanic	3428	47.40
White, non-Hispanic	58457	79.60
Students with Disabilities	9395	29.40
Limited English Proficient	2289	40.30
Economically Disadvantaged	16938	49.60
Migrant	94	60.60
Male	36378	72.20
Female	35323	73.40

Comments: LEP & Migrant counts are correct!

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

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	71643	76.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	994	63.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	2498	62.90
Black, non-Hispanic	6306	41.00
Hispanic	3408	53.80
White, non-Hispanic	58431	82.20
Students with Disabilities	9387	33.30
Limited English Proficient	2226	36.10
Economically Disadvantaged	16880	56.00
Migrant	94	64.90
Male	36363	72.40
Female	35277	80.30

Comments: Hispanic, LEP & Migrant counts are correct!

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	2150	2063	96.00

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	426	425	99.80

Comments:

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

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1091	1036	95.00

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	360	359	99.70

Comments: One LEA missed AYP.

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.

Support to Schools Identified for Improvement

The Department of Public Instruction is implementing the following strategies to support improvement in schools identified for improvement (SIFI) under No Child Left Behind:

Prioritization for funding through discretionary grant programs across the agency:

Schools identified for improvement are given priority for funding in five discretionary grant programs:

- Reading First, a federally funded grant program designed to assist schools in establishing reading programs for students in kindergarten through third grade. These programs must be founded on scientifically-based reading research and aid in ensuring every student can read well by the end of third grade.
- Comprehensive School Reform (CSR), a federally funded grant program that provides financial incentives for schools to develop/adopt and implement comprehensive school reform programs based upon scientifically-based research and effective practices. CSR applications must include an emphasis on basic academics, professional development, and parental and community involvement.
- Community Learning Centers (CLC), a federal grant program to support the development of after school programs, implemented through community partnerships, that provide tutoring and enrichment programs designed to complement the regular academic program. Community learning centers must also offer the families of participating students literacy and educationally-related development.
- Reading Excellence and Demonstration of Success (READS), a federally funded grant program that increases the capacity of staff to provide evidence-based instruction to all students, and to implement progress monitoring systems that provide a critical link to adjusting instruction to meet student needs. To this end, participating schools use READS funds to increase universal, selected and targeted literacy instruction and intervention options made available to students.
- Early and Ongoing Collaboration and Assistance (EOCA), supported by federal funding, this initiative provides leadership, coordination and technical assistance to help education communities increase the use, variety and quality of general education options made available to all children, particularly those at greatest risk for school failure or being identified as having a disability.

All of these discretionary grant programs include intensive technical support from the DPI and other education consultants.

Allocation of additional Title I funds:

Districts with schools identified for improvement are awarded supplemental Title I funds to support district level improvement efforts, as well as building level improvement efforts. Currently, every district and school identified for improvement receives these funds totaling approximately five million dollars statewide. Examples of strategies being implemented by schools and districts through utilization of these funds include, but are not limited to: after school, intercession and summer school tutoring programs in reading and mathematics; curriculum development and alignment to Wisconsin model academic standards, particularly as it relates to reading instruction in middle and high schools; professional development for regular and special education staff to more effectively adapt instruction for the neediest students; development of benchmark assessments and data collection and analysis

systems to monitor student progress; home visits to make connections with students' families and strengthen the home/school partnership; school community partnerships to enhance efforts to decrease truancy and professional development for school leaders to build the capacity of principals

and lead teachers.

School 2 School Program

The DPI, in partnership with Milwaukee Public Schools, is developing a school visitation program to allow staff from SIFI to observe staff in schools that have been successful in closing the achievement gap. Host schools are being selected based on demonstrated success in reading, mathematics, attendance and graduation with all students, including critical subgroups such as students with disabilities, English language learners and disadvantaged youth. The 2005-06 pilot program will be launched statewide in the 2006-07 academic year.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Handbook

The DPI has published a handbook for principals in schools that have missed AYP under No Child Left Behind. It details critical strategies for improving student performance in reading, mathematics, test participation and attendance/graduation.

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.

Support to Districts Identified for Improvement

The Department of Public Instruction is implementing the following strategies to support improvement in districts identified for improvement (DIFI) under No Child Left Behind:

Allocation of additional Title I funds:

Districts with schools identified for improvement are awarded supplemental Title I funds to support district level improvement efforts, as well as building level improvement efforts. Currently, every district and school identified for improvement receives these funds totaling approximately five million dollars statewide. Examples of strategies being implemented by schools and districts through utilization of these funds include, but are not limited to: after school, intercession and summer school tutoring programs in reading and mathematics; curriculum development and alignment to Wisconsin model academic standards, particularly as it relates to reading instruction in middle and high schools; professional development for regular and special education staff to more effectively adapt instruction for the neediest students; development of benchmark assessments and data collection and analysis

systems to monitor student progress; home visits to make connections with students' families and strengthen the home/school partnership; school community partnerships to enhance efforts to decrease truancy and professional development for school leaders to build the capacity of principals and lead

teachers.

The Alliance for Attendance:

Three districts with schools identified for improvement have been awarded funding to support the development of school and community-based strategies to promote student attendance and decrease truancy. The formation of these partnerships is facilitated by staff from the DPI. The districts involved

are Milwaukee Public Schools, Menominee Indian and Green Bay Area. Funding supports collaborative planning between school and community partners, greater outreach to students and their families, and strategies to strengthen student engagement and connectedness to school.

High School Task Force:

Teachers, principals, and district and community leaders from Milwaukee, Racine, Beloit, Menominee Indian and Madison school districts (districts that currently have SIFI) are among the many K-16 educators from across Wisconsin that are examining the strengths and needs of high schools. The Task Force is identifying strategies to raise achievement, close the achievement gap, and promote post-secondary success and citizenship for all students; embracing the strengths of our high schools and identifying where change is needed; examining new models of student learning and engagement; rethinking the roles and relationships that frame high schools; and advancing best practices which

promote equity, quality and accountability in the high school experience.

Assessment of district effectiveness in supporting SIFI:

The DPI, in partnership with staff from each district with schools identified for improvement and Cooperative Educational Service Agencies, is developing an evaluation process to help districts evaluate the effectiveness of the services they target to SIFI. The evaluation consists of a self study of district efforts in five areas: Vision, Values and Culture; Leadership and Governance; Decision Making and Accountability; Curriculum and Instruction; and Professional Development. Results of the self study are reviewed and validated by exemplary educators from similar districts. Findings will be used to target future school improvement funding to the district's most effective support strategies. A bank of technical assistance providers will be assembled by the DPI to work with districts to strengthen

their support strategies for SIFI. Districts currently involved in this initiative are Milwaukee Public Schools, Kenosha Unified, Madison, Beloit, Racine, Green Bay Area and Menominee Indian.

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.	27
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.	20
How many of these schools were charter schools?	3
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.	197
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.	17010
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.	327
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.	197
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.	19
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	4103
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.	10968
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.	4106
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	51272	50694	98.90
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	7050	6887	97.70
Low-Poverty Schools	6637	6618	99.70
All Elementary Schools	26808	26562	99.10
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	5014	4816	96.10
Low-Poverty Schools	7183	7106	98.90
All Secondary Schools	24464	24132	98.60
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	20.00
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	23.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	57.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	20.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	37.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	43.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	46.40	16.40
Poverty Metric Used	Eligible for subsidized lunch 185% of federal poverty level.	
Secondary Schools	36.30	13.90
Poverty Metric Used	Eligible for subsidized lunch 185% of federal poverty level.	

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	98.10

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

Pursuant to the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 schools are required to annually assess the English language proficiency of their English Language Learners (ELLs) in kindergarten through grade 12 using a standards-based instrument that is common throughout the state. In response to this mandate, the federally funded WIDA (World-class Instructional Design and Assessment) Consortium, currently a group of 15 states[1], created English language proficiency (ELP) standards that are aligned to Wisconsin's academic content standards. The assessment, ACCESS for ELLs, was then developed based upon the WIDA ELP standards. The ELP standards and the ACCESS for ELLs meet the federal requirements of assessing ELLs' proficiency levels in the domains of Speaking, Listening, Reading, and Writing. ACCESS for ELLs provides reliable, valid and useful information on ELL progress in learning academic English for use by schools, teachers, students and parents.

[1] Alabama, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

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

As part of Project WIDA, Wisconsin has developed, adopted and operationalized the English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners in Kindergarten through Grade 12 (known as the WIDA ELP Standards). These standards exemplify the second language acquisition process, and they are innovative in the field because they focus primarily on academic language relevant for academic success in the major content areas of language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. These ELP standards for raising the level of ELP are derived from the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing and they are aligned with Wisconsin's achievement of the challenging State academic content and student achievement standards. Commercially available tests of English language proficiency are typically not tied directly to any state standards, and they tend to focus on social English and a generic conception of academic English as it relates to language arts. Thus, they do not meet the stringent requirements of NCLB, nor do they align with the standards among the consortium states. Consequently, the WIDA Consortium developed the ACCESS for ELLs English language proficiency test.

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

Beginning in the 2005-06 school year, a new English language proficiency test was administered to all English Language Learners (ELLs) enrolled in Wisconsin schools. The test - Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State to State for English language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs) - was used to determine the English language proficiency levels and the progress of ELLs in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension as required by the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. ACCESS for ELLs, and the English language proficiency standards upon which it is based, were developed by World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA), a federally funded, multi-state assessment consortium made up of Alabama, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin. The ELP assessments are based on WIDA/WI's ELP standards. The ACCESS for ELLs instrument is valid and reliable.

The testing window currently scheduled for Wisconsin is: (1) December 4, 2006 through February 16, 2007. Below are the important dates relating to the implementation of ACCESS for ELLs in Wisconsin:

Districts order test booklets - October 2-20, 2006

Districts submit Pre-ID data - November 3, 2006

Districts receive materials - November 27, 2006

Test window - December 4, 2006 - February 16, 2007

Additional materials deadline - February 2, 2007

Booklets returned to MetriTech, Inc. - March 2, 2007

Score reports sent to districts - April 27, 2007

Note: Before NCLB, WI did not collect individual student data; all data were collected in aggregates. WI has recently developed a system that will assign all students an individual and unique student identification number. WI is committed to meeting the requirements for reporting LEP data. At regular intervals, all LEAs will submit all pertinent data to a data warehouse, allowing the SEA to extract data collected at the student level.

Beginning in 2005-06, WI began collecting individual student ELL data through ACCESS for ELLs. Data from ACCESS has been entered into the state individual student record system and it will now be possible for the SEA to follow cohorts of students, as required by Title III.

Independent Alignment Study:

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

Other Evidence:

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

New NCLB Compliant ELP Assessment

1. Wisconsin uses the ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment. The test provides annual, secure forms for Kindergarten through grades 12 (grade clustered tested are K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12.) 33% of the test items are changed annually based on the ELP standards and test blue print guidelines. Test item development is conducted at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL).
2. ACCESS for ELLs tests four separate domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and provides score reports in those four plus comprehension (based on the listening and reading domains).
3. ACCESS for ELLs is aligned to the WIDA ELP Standards adopted by Wisconsin.
4. ACCESS for ELLs has undergone rigorous pilot, field testing and annual assessments of technical quality. The WIDA Consortium has an active technical advisory council with national experts to assist with ensuring the highest standards of validity and reliability. (see Development and Field Report, 2005; and the Annual Technical Report Series 100, 2006).

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	19547	48.20
2. Hmong	9709	24.00
3. Gheg Albanian	289	0.00
4. Standard Arabic	282	0.00
5. Russian	279	0.00
6. Lao	211	0.00
7. Mandarin	210	0.00
8. Korean	195	0.00
9. Urdu	156	0.00
10. Vietnamese	153	0.00
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 immigrants subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

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

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
5587	939	15

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.)

No changes.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

No changes made.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

No changes made.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

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

STATE RESPONSE

No changes made.

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	% 90.00	# 28621	%	#	% 90.00	# 2894	% 38.00	# 803

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.

Comments for 1.6.8:

Title III AMAOs have been shared with Wisconsin districts. Because we have not legally been able to collect student-level data until 2005-06, we are not yet able to follow English language progress or attainment by cohort. Such data will be available beginning with 2006-07 reports. 2005-06 was a transition year in data collection, and numbers of students progressing in/achieving ELP were not collected. Beginning in 2006-07, we will be able to calculate these data because we will have two data points of individual student-level data.

Comments for 1.6.9:

Because we have not legally been able to collect student-level data until 2005-06, we are not yet able to follow English language progress or attainment by cohort. Such data will be available beginning with 2006-07 reports. The new data collection system will allow us to follow monitored LEP students for two years following their attainment of English language proficiency. They will then be reflected in Table 1.6.9 in the "Attained English Proficiency" section.

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	0.00	0	0.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		0	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL		0	

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	82
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	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? *	<u>No Response</u>

Comments: Because we have not legally been able to collect student-level data until 2005-06, we are not yet able to follow English language progress or attainment by cohort. Such data will be available beginning with 2006-07 reports.

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

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

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments		
Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	230	90.60
4	370	87.70
5	539	88.10
6	653	83.60
7	814	81.10
8	821	80.60
H.S.	626	65.00

Comments: Students with English Language Level 6 (WI=Proficient) on WSAS (WKCE, WAA-SwD, WAA-ELL).

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	192	75.60
4	321	76.10
5	435	71.10
6	541	69.30
7	701	69.80
8	686	67.40
H.S.	615	63.90

Comments: Students with English Language Level 6 (WI=Proficient) on WSAS (WKCE, WAA-SwD, WAA-ELL).

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	88.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	70.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	88.50
Black, non-Hispanic	62.90
Hispanic	72.40
White, non-Hispanic	92.60
Students with Disabilities	80.60
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	87.10
Female	90.70

Comments: We are not yet able to calculate graduation rates for LEP and economically disadvantaged subgroups. Since multiple years of disaggregated data are required, graduation rates for these subgroups will not be available until 2007-08 graduation rates are reported. Migrant data will be available 2009-10 at the earliest.

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	1.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.80
Black, non-Hispanic	5.80
Hispanic	4.00
White, non-Hispanic	1.10
Students with Disabilities	2.10
Limited English Proficient	2.80
Economically Disadvantaged	2.80
Migrant	
Male	2.00
Female	1.50

Comments: Migrant data will be available in 2006-07 at the earliest.
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 school year shall begin the first day of July and end on the thirtieth 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	430	390
LEAs with Subgrants	10	10

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	246	665
1	171	457
2	146	480
3	123	434
4	112	395
5	101	425
6	105	399
7	101	368
8	102	360
9	109	392
10	131	278
11	122	229
12	228	308

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	87	1532
Doubled-up	1356	3192
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	33	126
Hotels/Motels	125	250
Unknown	196	90
Comments:		
* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.		

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

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

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	583
1	401
2	418
3	385
4	340
5	374
6	344
7	313
8	300
9	319
10	238
11	181
12	286

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

120

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

331

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)

40

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)	949
English Language Learners (ELL)	537
Gifted and Talented	42
Vocational Education	15

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	9
Expedited evaluations	7
Staff professional development and awareness	9
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	10
Transportation	9
Early childhood programs	8
Assistance with participation in school programs	9
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	10
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	7
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	10
Coordination between schools and agencies	10
Counseling	9
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	9
Clothing to meet a school requirement	9
School supplies	10
Referral to other programs and services	10
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional)	1

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	0
School selection	0
Transportation	0
School records	0
Immunizations or other medical records	0
Other enrollment issues	1

Comments: other-lacking birth certificate

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
lack of birth certificate	1

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	293	235
Grade 4	Yes	266	226
Grade 5	Yes	263	215
Grade 6	Yes	238	193
Grade 7	Yes	230	186
Grade 8	Yes	216	162
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	151	93
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	295	127
Grade 4	Yes	270	137
Grade 5	Yes	270	147
Grade 6	Yes	238	146
Grade 7	Yes	227	136
Grade 8	Yes	215	131
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	151	80
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:

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