

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 2004-2005



**PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006**

**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 is 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:

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 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:

- o **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- o **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.
- o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- o **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 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 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 "2004-2005 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 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (<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: 07/31/2006

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
 Part I, 2004-2005 Part II, 2004-2005

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

10/1/2006 11:36 AM EST

Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART I DUE MARCH 6, 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.

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 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2004-2005 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	199159	99.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	2872	98.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	6871	99.2
Black, non-Hispanic	19289	97.5
Hispanic	11187	98.7
White, non-Hispanic	157433	99.6
Students with Disabilities	27023	98.1
Limited English Proficient	7830	99.1
Economically Disadvantaged	54566	98.6
Migrant	226	97.0
Male	101579	99.2
Female	96119	99.4

- 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 2004-2005 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	197842	99.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	2876	98.3
Asian/ Pacific Islander	6870	99.2
Black, non-Hispanic	19357	97.9
Hispanic	11202	98.8
White, non-Hispanic	157469	99.6
Students with Disabilities	27064	98.2
Limited English Proficient	7802	98.7
Economically Disadvantaged	54654	98.8
Migrant	225	96.6
Male	101638	99.2
Female	96182	99.4

The above reports Total number of students tested out of all students enrolled in the tested grades.

- 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 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 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	24570	89.2
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2333	8.5

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 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	24390	88.5
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2563	9.6

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

No testing at this grade.

- 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 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Testing only at Grades 4, 8, and 10.

- 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 04-05
All Students	59716	71.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	831	58.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	2135	70.2
Black, non-Hispanic	6679	40.9
Hispanic	4279	50.7
White, non-Hispanic	45776	78.3
Students with Disabilities	8149	43.5
Limited English Proficient	3484	47.6
Economically Disadvantaged	19888	53.4
Migrant	95	43.2
Male	30680	72.6
Female	29028	70.4

- 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 04-05
All Students	59704	80.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	832	74.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	2135	73.1
Black, non-Hispanic	6678	59.4
Hispanic	4264	61.9
White, non-Hispanic	45779	86.3
Students with Disabilities	8141	46.1
Limited English Proficient	3468	53.6
Economically Disadvantaged	19872	66.6
Migrant	92	50.0
Male	30675	77.2
Female	29021	84.7

- 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 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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 04-05
All Students	67620	73.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	1041	54.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	2396	68.2
Black, non-Hispanic	6770	31.7
Hispanic	3689	49.2
White, non-Hispanic	53706	80.5
Students with Disabilities	9673	29.6
Limited English Proficient	2442	41.3
Economically Disadvantaged	19157	50.4
Migrant	66	42.4
Male	35170	71.9
Female	32692	73.8

- 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 04-05
All Students	67496	84.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	1044	74.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	2364	75.3
Black, non-Hispanic	6802	56.5
Hispanic	3539	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	53729	89.6
Students with Disabilities	9672	44.2
Limited English Proficient	2250	50.3
Economically Disadvantaged	19036	68.1
Migrant	64	43.8
Male	34852	80.7
Female	32638	88.1

- 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 04-05
All Students	70371	71.6
American Indian/Alaska Native	1000	51.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	2334	59.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5840	26.6
Hispanic	3214	40.9
White, non-Hispanic	57949	78.6
Students with Disabilities	9200	24.4
Limited English Proficient	1892	26.1
Economically Disadvantaged	15512	46.1
Migrant	63	28.6
Male	35970	70.9
Female	34392	72.2

- 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 04-05
All Students	70247	75.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	1000	59.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	2312	59.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5874	43.0
Hispanic	3080	51.8
White, non-Hispanic	57947	80.5
Students with Disabilities	9214	31.0
Limited English Proficient	1730	28.2
Economically Disadvantaged	15415	54.6
Migrant	59	33.9
Male	35906	72.0
Female	34333	78.4

- 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 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 School Year Data	2206	2155	97.7

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 2004-2005 School Year Data	426	425	99.8

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 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 School Year Data	1120	1078	96.3

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 2004-2005 School Year Data	389	388	99.7

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2005-2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2005 - 2006 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP 2004-2005."

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

Attached is the revised .xls file (May 15, 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 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2005 - 2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action). Additionally for any Title I district identified for improvement or corrective action for the 2005 - 2006 school year that made AYP based on data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP for 2004-2005."

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

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

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 2004-2005 school year. 37

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 2004-2005 school year. 43 How many of these schools were charter schools? 5

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 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 school year. 16430

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 2004-2005 school year. 410

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 2004-2005 school year. 356

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services

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 2004-2005 school year. 23

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 3519

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 11337

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 2004-2005 school year. 3918

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2004-2005 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	51884	51598	99.5
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	12498	12365	98.9
Low-Poverty Schools	13920	13879	99.7
All Elementary Schools	27200	27061	99.5
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	5481	5419	98.9
Low-Poverty Schools	6842	6819	99.7
All Secondary Schools	24684	24537	99.4

The numbers entered into the first two columns above should be followed by "FTE".

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, 2005, 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 being 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 the classes taught by not highly qualified teachers).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0
d) 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)	0
e) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0
f) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0
g) Other (please explain)	100.0

g) Other: Do not hold licenses or permits.

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	Low-Poverty Schools
Elementary Schools	More than <u>47.7%</u>	Less than <u>16.4%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Eligible for subsidized lunch, 185% of federal poverty guidelines.	
Secondary Schools	More than <u>35.5%</u>	Less than <u>12.8%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Eligible for subsidized lunch, 185% of federal poverty guidelines.	

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 2004-2005 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
2004-2005 School Year	97.1

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 No

Approved, adopted, sanctioned Yes No

Operationalized Yes No (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)

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 nine 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, Illinois, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin. Wisconsin is the lead state.

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 2006 . 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:**
 - **The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;**
 - **The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;**
 - **ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;**
 - **Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)**

STATE RESPONSE

Beginning in the 2005-06 school year, a new English language proficiency test will be 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™)*—will be 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, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin. The ELP assessments are based on WIWA/WI's ELP standards. ACCESS for ELLs instruments valid and reliable.

The testing window currently scheduled for Wisconsin is: (1) December 5, 2005 through February 17, 2006: Speaking section and Kindergarten Assessment (individual administration); and (2) January 9 though February 17, 2006: Listening, reading, and writing sections (group administration). Below are the important dates relating to the implementation of ACCESS for ELLs™ in Wisconsin:

Test Administrator training	August 2004 - January 2005
Districts order test booklets	October 7-21, 2005
Districts submit Pre-ID data	November 11, 2005
Speaking and Kindergarten test window opens	December 5, 2005
Listening/reading/writing test window opens	January 9, 2006
Test window closes	February 17, 2006
Booklets returned to MetriTech, Inc.	February 24, 2006
Score reports sent to districts	May 3, 2006

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. The data presented are for all ELLs as identified and reported to the SEA by LEAs through the 2005 state LEP data collection census (totals by proficiency levels) and the 2004-05 Title III End-of-Year Report (total served, making progress, and becoming proficient). WI has 5 levels of limited English proficiency and proficient (i.e., fully English proficient) for purpose of this report: Fed. level 1-Basic = WI levels 1-2; Interim = WI levels 3-4.5; Advanced = WI 4.5-5.

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2004-2005** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information. The information following the chart is meant to explain what is being requested under each column.

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State											
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency							
		Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (4)	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (5)	Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (6)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (7)						
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
LAS, IPT, Woodcock-Munoz, Mac 2	39329	39329 100.0	13211 33.0	12781 33.0	13337 34.0	3997 10.0					

The total is from 2005 state LEP data collection census because this is where data are collected by proficiency level. Proficient and transition students are the same in WI. WI districts used their choice of assessments. ELP levels were not reported by assessment used.

- (1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
- (3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
- (4-7) In columns four-seven, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State

2004-2005 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number and Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State	
1. Spanish	22674	58.0
2. Hmong	11283	29.0
3. Arabic	370	
4. Russian	369	
5. Korean	318	
6. Lao	287	
7. Chinese Mandarin	283	
8. Vietnamese	198	
9. Khmer	175	
10. Punjabi	169	

- 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 1.6.4.1.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III												
Name of ELP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency								Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (7)	
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)			
LAS, IPT, Woodcock-Munoz, Mac 2	39329	100.0	13211	33.0	12781	33.0	13337	34.0	3997	10.0		

The total is from 2005 state LEP data collection census because this is where data are collected by proficiency level. Proficient and transition students are the same in WI. WI districts used their choice of assessments. ELP levels were not reported by assessment used.

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year.
- (3-6) In columns three-six, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2004-2005 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-6 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (7) In column seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111©:

1.6.4.1	Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2004-2005	<u>2851</u>
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	<u>946</u>
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	<u>14</u>

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), 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

The State of Wisconsin has made no changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report (for school year 2003-2004).

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), 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

The State of Wisconsin has made no changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report (for school year 2003-2004).

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

The State of Wisconsin has made no changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report (for school year 2003-2004).

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 No

Wisconsin did not have ACCESS for ELLs for testing LEP students in 2004. The first administration of ACCESS for ELLs for in fall 2005. The districts continued to use commercial tests for measuring English language proficiency in 2004. We plan to have AMAOs data available in fall 2007.

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	
2004-2005 School Year	90.0	27447	55.0	16712	90.0	7949	45.0	3997

Prior to ACCESS for ELLs, all data were collected in aggregate based on 4 different state-approved assessments. The data above reflect district Title III EOY reports of ELL making progress and attaining proficiency in the aggregate. Data reported starting in 2005-06 from ACCESS will track individual student progress.

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

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

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	90.0	27447	55.0	16712	90.0	7949	45.0	3997

Prior to ACCESS for ELLs, all data were collected in aggregate based on 4 different state-approved assessments. The data above reflect district Title III EOY reports of ELL making progress and attaining proficiency in the aggregate. Data reported starting in 2005-06 from ACCESS will track individual student progress.

1.6.10 Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2004-2005 School Year

	Number:
Number of Title III subgrantees	75
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	0
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	0

Data on Title III subgrantees meeting all three of Title III objectives will be available in fall 2007. We plan to have data on making progress, attainment, and AYP available in fall 2007. This is after we have data a single assessment instrument from two points of assessment employing ACCESS for ELLs (spring 2006 and spring 2007).

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2004-2005, 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 2004-2005 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	0	0
4	419	89.0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	1062	86.0
H.S.	993	67.0

Only grades 4, 8, and 10 were tested (Reading) in 2004-05.

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	0	0
4	419	82.0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	1061	72.0
H.S.	993	61.0

Only grades 4, 8, and 10 were tested (Mathematics) in 2004-05.

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

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 2005 - 2006 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
2005-2006 School Year	0

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 2003-2004 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.

High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	91.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	79.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	65.7
Hispanic	77.1
White, non-Hispanic	94.7
Students with Disabilities	85.1
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	89.9
Female	92.5

Grad. (reg. diploma) rate reporting changed in 03-04 to align state formula with Sec. 200.19. 03-04 was year of transition to new student data collection and as a result 03-04 high school completion data may not be comprehensive. We are not yet able to calculate rates for LEP & econ. disadv. - data for these groups were incomplete in 03-04. Since multiple years of disag. data are required, grad. rates for LEP & econ. disadv. will not be available until 07-08 grad. rates are reported.

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 2003-2004 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.

Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	1.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	2.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4.2
Hispanic	2.4
White, non-Hispanic	0.6
Students with Disabilities	1.5
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	1.2
Female	0.9

03-04 was a year of transition to a new dropout data collection, and as a result 03-04 dropout data may not be comprehensive. Note that we are not able to calculate dropout rates for LEP & econ. dis. students because demographic data for these groups were incomplete in 03-04. Dropout rates for LEP & econ. dis. students should be available for 04-05.

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.