

**Office of English Language
Acquisition
Washington, D.C. 20024-6510**



Title III Biennial Report

**State Formula Grants under Title III, Part A, English Language Acquisition,
Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement Act**

(Public Law 107-110)

**CFDA NUMBER: 84.365A
FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 1885-0553, EXP. 8/31/2009**

DATED MATERIAL -- OPEN IMMEDIATELY

DUE DATE: DECEMBER 31, 2006

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for each of these years (2004-05 and 2005-06) must respond to this Title III Biennial Report (TBR) by **December 31, 2006**. This report is based on student performance data and other related information from the two preceding years 2004-05 and 2005-06.

The format states will use to submit the Title III Biennial 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 Title III Biennial Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Title III Biennial Report 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 TBR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the revised TBR form. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the revised TBR 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 "2006 TBR". The main TBR screen will allow the user to select the section of the TBR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the TBR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the TBR. A user can only select one section of the TBR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of the TBR, a lead state user will certify it and transmit it to the Department. Once the form 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 TBR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2006 TBR will be found on the main TBR 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 1885-0553. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 2.50 hours (or 150 minutes) per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-6510. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: OELA, U.S. Department of Education 550 12th Street SW, Room PCP 10-113, Washington, D.C. 20202-6510. Questions about the new electronic TBR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

State Response for Meeting Title III State Biennial Reporting Requirements

Reporting Instructions

States are to provide information for each section required for the Title III Biennial Report. States should respond to the items listed under each of the elements. If any of the information requested is not available, please **explain** why it is not available.

Please note the following:

- ***Specific instructions for each item are shown in bold type and/or enclosed in parentheses in this format.***
- ***Responses are required for all sections in the Title III Biennial Report.***
- ***Note that comment boxes are provided for each response should further information be needed however there is a limitation to the number of characters available therefore it is recommended that written responses be comprehensive and concise. Do not provide web site links or references and no attachments.***

Critical Elements (List of Sections within this Form)

- 1 Types of language instruction educational programs used by subgrantees
[SEC. 3115 (c)(1) p. 1698, 3121(b)(1) p.1701, 3123(b)(2) p. 1704]
- 2 Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees [SEC. 3121(a) p.1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]
 - LEP Student Progress Meeting AMAOs for English Language Proficiency
 - Performance of LEP Subgroup in Meeting State AYP Targets
 - LEP Students in Grades not Tested for AYP
 - Content Assessment in Native Languages
 - Accommodations for LEP Students
- 3 Academic content assessment results of monitored LEP students
[SEC. 3121(a)(4) p.1701, 3123(b)(8) p.1705]
 - Number of Former LEP Students by Year Monitored
 - Academic Achievement of Former LEP Students Tested for AYP
- 4 Title III Subgrantee Performance and State Accountability
[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701]
- 5 Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth
[SEC. 3115(e)(1)(A-G) p. 1699]
 - Number of Immigrants and Immigrant Subgrants
 - Subgrantee Programs or Activities
 - Distribution of Funds
- 6 Title III programs or activities conducted by subgrantees, as described in Section 3115 (c, d & e), terminated for failure to reach program goals during the two preceding years [SEC. 3123(b)(7) p.1705]
- 7 Teacher information and professional development activities conducted by the subgrantees [SEC. 3115(c)(1)(B) p. 1698, 3116 (c) p.1701, 3123(b)(5) p. 1705]
 - Number of Teachers
 - Teacher Certification
 - Teacher Language Fluency
 - Professional Development
- 8 State level activities conducted and technical assistance provided to subgrantees
[SEC. 3111(b)(2)(A-D) p.1691-2, 3123(b)(4) p. 1705]
 - Technical Assistance Provided by the State
 - Other State Activities
 - Parental Participation Compliance
- 9 Optional

Title III Biennial Report

State Formula Grants under Title III, Part A, English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement Act

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: Michael George

Telephone: 608-266-2364

Fax: 608-266-1965

e-mail: michael.george@dpi.state.wi.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Michael George

Signature

Thursday, December 28, 2006, 11:45:51 AM

Date

1. Types of Language Instruction Educational Programs Used by Subgrantees [Sec. 3115 (c)(1) p. 1698, 3121(b)(1) p.1701, 3123(b)(2) p. 1704]

1.1 Indicate the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program (as defined in Section 3301(8)) in Table 1.1.

Note: A significant amount of information needed to generate the Biennial Report to Congress will be gathered through other information collections. Specifically, the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for the 2004-2005 (OMB # 1810-0614) and 2005-2006 school years, the Annual Collection of Elementary and Secondary Education Data for the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) for 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 (OMB # 1880-0541). Each provides information to the OELA Biennial Report. Information from other collections, which will be utilized in the OELA Biennial Report, has been marked in this collection form with the exact question or element number in the specific data collections.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time for use in the current Biennial Report to Congress.

Definitions:

- 1. # of Subgrantees Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may have multiple programs. If multiple programs are used, report each program.
- 2. Type of Program** = type of programs described in the subgrantee local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>

Table 1.1 Summary of Language Instruction Educational Programs

# of Subgrantees Using Program		Type of Program	Language of Instruction % English	Other Language % OLOI*
2004-2005	2005-2006			
10	0	Dual Language		
5	24	Two way immersion		
24	33	Transitional bilingual		
0	37	Developmental bilingual		
3	31	Heritage language		
33	63	Sheltered English instruction		
33	0	Structured English immersion		
0	0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)		
59	0	Content-based ESL		
0	0	Pull-out ESL		
22	71	Other (explain)		

Comments:

State response 1.1: (Provide further information as to the variations of the types of programs e.g., dual language, two-way/one-way, as implemented by subgrantees, including "Other". In reference to the type of instructional programs, see descriptions listed on NCELA's website: <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>)

Brief descriptions of the programs checked [Please note: The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (SEA) does not proscribe a curriculum or program model for local educational agencies (LEAs). Statewide, LEAs have flexibility in program models chosen and how they are implemented. Because there is a wide variety in the ELL populations - size and languages - and a wide variety in resources among the 426 school districts, programs are implemented in many ways. That is, there is no single implementation method for any of the language instructional educational models statewide. We see this as a strength because it allows LEAs to better serve the needs of their unique populations with the resources available.]

Notes for 05-06 responses: 2005-06 was the rollout year for a new ELP assessment (ACCESS for ELLs) in Wisconsin. Much of the data required under Title III are now being collected via this assessment instrument. For the 2005-06 administration, there were a limited number of options for program type provided (e.g., dual language and two-way immersion programs were combined as one option, as were Sheltered English instruction and Content-Based ESL). Based on our knowledge of programs provided by Wisconsin LEAs, we have included the number of subgrantees in the cell for the type of program most offered in the state.

Dual language and two-way immersion programs are bilingual programs that serve English speakers and English language learners (ELLs) in the same classroom, with a 50-50 mix of students from each language population. Both English and the first or native language of the ELL students is used in content and language arts instruction. In Wisconsin, the native language of the ELLs is used for approximately 80-90% of content and language arts instruction in early grades with a gradual reduction to 50% of instruction in the native language of the ELLs in content and language arts. The goal of such programs is bilingualism in both groups of students.

Transitional bilingual programs use the first language of the ELLs in instruction but with a rapid progression to all or most of the instruction in English. Native language skills are developed only to assist the students' transition to English. The goal of such programs is English acquisition and a quick transfer into mainstream (English-only) classrooms.

Developmental bilingual programs use the first language of the ELLs in instruction. Like dual language or two-way immersion, bilingualism is the goal and, at first, mostly the native language is used in language arts and content instruction, with English increasing as students gain proficiency.

Heritage language programs use the non-English language background (heritage language) of the students. All students share same non-English/heritage language. Students may or may not be proficient in the language. That is, the students may be fluent and the program is a developmental or maintenance program (e.g., Spanish for Spanish speakers), or the language is being renewed/reclaimed in the community (e.g., Native American languages that are not used by all in a community). The target language is the primary language of content instruction and/or language arts instruction. The goal of the program is bilingualism.

Sheltered English instruction programs often serve ELLs from more than one language background. Instruction is in English adapted to the students' English proficiency levels and provides modified curriculum-based content. Teachers enhance context by providing visual props, hands-on learning experiences, drawings, pictures, graphic organizers, and small-group learning opportunities. Sheltered English instruction programs offer instruction to ELLs at lower English proficiency levels, often newcomers to the United States. The goal of the program is English acquisition. As students gain English proficiency, they are served in other types of ESL (English as a second language) programs.

Structured English immersion programs serve ELLs in the mainstream classroom. Students receive individual support, often from ESL teachers or bilingual instructional aides in the classroom setting. As districts move away from pull-out programs, or do not have the numbers of students to justify additional ESL teachers, this model is being implemented.

Content-based ESL programs are frequently used in Wisconsin's LEAs serving large numbers of ELLs when bilingual program models are not possible. English is the language of instruction, and is taught through vocabulary related to the content areas of mathematics, English language arts, science, and social studies. The goal is twofold: proficiency in English and academic achievement in the content areas.

Pull-Out ESL programs vary from district to district. Some districts still "pull-out" ELLs from regular classrooms to work on English language skills, and review homework or tests. Other districts, especially those with smaller populations, work with ELLs outside of the regular classroom to review academic content before the regular classroom teacher covers that same content in the classroom. For the latter, both ESL and classroom teachers coordinate lesson plans throughout the year.

Other: In Wisconsin, "Content-Area Tutoring" - teachers providing tutorial support for students in the content areas. This tutorial support is offered in English and, sometimes, the native language (where feasible). Individual language acquisition and content area achievement needs are identified and met on an individual basis or in small groups of ELLs.

1.2 Language Instruction Based on Scientific Research

Title III language instruction educational programs must be based on scientific research and proven to be effective (Section 3115 (c)(1)).

1.2.1 Does the State provide written guidance for selecting a scientifically research based language instruction educational programs? (See SEC. 9101(37) for scientifically based research)

Yes

Comments:

1.2.2 How does the State ensure that subgrantees implement scientifically research based language instruction educational programs?

State response 1.2.2: (Provide narrative here)

All LEAs receiving Title III subgrants sign assurances which include: "(4) The local educational agency shall use curriculum, and instructional approaches and methodologies based on scientifically based research on teaching limited English proficient children and youth and that has been demonstrated to be effective."

LEAs submit consolidated on-line applications and end-of-year reports for all formula-funded titles under NCLB. For the Title III sections, help screens include descriptions of the scientifically based language instruction educational programs. LEAs provide descriptions of the strategies/activities, including program type, through the application process. Applications including program types that are not considered scientifically based and research based are not approved. The SEA then provides technical assistance to the LEA on approvable programs.

In addition, LEAs are scheduled on a cycle for monitoring. Monitoring is done with the consolidated application (see above) in mind. Title I plus two to three other Title programs are monitored for any given LEA each year. Part of the monitoring process consists of reviewing written materials supporting NCLB requirements. LEAs are also required to submit assurances that all requirements of Title III (as well as all other Titles for which the LEA receives an allocation) are being met (copy of assurances is attached).

Finally, through workshops and technical assistance, the SEA works with LEAs so they are aware of which approaches and methodologies are based on scientifically based research on teaching ELLs. This is the same approach used by the SEA since the state bilingual-bicultural statute was written into law in 1977.

2. Critical Synthesis of Data Reported by Title III Subgrantees [Sec. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

2.1 LEP Student Progress in Meeting State Annual AMAOs for English Language Proficiency

Included in this section are several tables that provide evidence of LEP student progress in meeting the Title III State annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for English language proficiency (i.e., AMAO/making progress; AMAO/attainment) and academic achievement (AMAO/AYP).

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

2.1.1 Number of LEP Students

Note: The figures in this item were taken from the last row of question 1.6.3.1 of the CSPR. If the figures shown do not match your expectations, go into the CSPR and modify question 1.6.3.1 to make sure the last row contains the total unduplicated counts. The information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

	2004-2005	2005-2006
Total number of "ALL LEP" students in the State for each year.	39329	40522

Comments:

Note: "ALL LEP" students = All students in K-12:

1. who were newly enrolled in the year of reporting and assessed for English language proficiency using a State selected/approved ELP placement assessment and who meet the LEP definition in section 9101(25), and
2. who were assessed by State annual English language proficiency assessment and achieved below "proficient,"
 - a. in the previous year and continued to be enrolled in the year of reporting, (if the State English language proficiency assessment is at the end of the school year); or
 - b. in the year of reporting, (if the State English language proficiency is at the beginning of the school year).

"All LEP" students should include the newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for each year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.

2.1.2 Number of LEP Students who Received Services

Note: The figures in this item were taken from the last row of question 1.6.3.3 of the CSPR. If the figures shown do not match your expectations, go into the CSPR and modify question 1.6.3.3 to make sure the last row contains the total unduplicated counts.

	2004-2005	2005-2006
Total number of LEP students in the State who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program for each year.	39329	31802

Comments:

2.1.3 Results on Achieving AMAO's in English Language Proficiency

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 2.1

Instructions:

Report **ONLY** the results from State annual English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information that each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time for use in the current Biennial Report to Congress.

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. **ELP ATTAINMENT** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended. (If the State is tracking true cohorts of LEP students, the number of monitored former LEP students included in the cohorts can be cumulative from year to year for up to two years.)
4. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each of "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
5. **AMAO 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.
6. **Met AMAO Target** = Designation of whether the LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs did or did not meet the AMAO targets for the year.

2.1.3 Title III LEP Student Language Proficiency Results

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

	2004-2005				2005-2006			
	AMAO TARGET	AMAO RESULTS		Met AMAO Target	AMAO TARGET	AMAO RESULTS		Met AMAO Target
	%	#	%	Y/N	%	#	%	Y/N
MAKING PROGRESS	90.00	16712	55.00	N	0.00	0	0.00	Y
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		0				0		
ELP ATTAINMENT	90.00	3997	45.00	N	0.00	0	0.00	Y

Comments:

2.1.4 Monitored Former LEP Students

Check the answer to the following question:

Are **monitored former LEP** students reflected in Table 2.1.3 "Attainment"/"AMAO Results"? (**Note:** ONLY if the State is using true cohort data, i.e., the State tracked the same LEP students in the same groups for progress each year and has longitudinal data available.)

No

Note: Monitored former 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.

State Response 2.1.4: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

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 cohorts of students.

2.1.5 Unduplicated count of Title III LEP students in the State.

Definitions:

1. **# Total LEP Enrolled** = the unduplicated count of LEP students who enrolled in a Title III language instruction educational program in the State.
2. **# Tested/State Annual ELP** = the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the State annual English language proficiency assessment.
3. **# Not Available for State Annual ELP** = the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who were enrolled at the time of testing, but were not available for State annual English language proficiency assessment for an excusable reason, acceptable "excusable reason" being the student was seriously ill, injured or in some way physically incapacitated state, to the point of keeping the student from attending school.
4. **Subtotal** = the sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Available for State Annual ELP."
5. **# LEP/One Data Point** = the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the State annual English language proficiency assessment for the first time. This number should be part of the total number of "Tested/State Annual ELP" in 2 above.

2.1.5 Title III LEP Student/Testing Status

	2004-2005	2005-2006
# Total LEP Enrolled	39255	42727
# Tested/State Annual ELP	39255	40562
# Not Available for State Annual ELP Test	0	0
Subtotal	39255	40562
# LEP/One Data Point	0	0

Comments: 2004-05 data were collected in aggregate as part of the annual LEP census. Through the 2004-05 school year, it was not possible to collect data related to Title III status or availability for the state annual ELP test. Wisconsin is now able to legally collect student-level data, including Title III status. These data are collected through the ELP assessment, ACCESS for ELLs, and are reflected in the totals for 2005-06. Please note that students who completed less than three of the four parts of the ELP assessment did not receive a composite score, and are not included in the "#Tested/State Annual ELP" row. While some of these students had an acceptable "excusable reason," it is not possible to determine for which students this is true.

2.2 Report performance of the LEP subgroup in meeting the State adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets in math and reading/language arts in Table 2.2.

Instructions:

Fill in the number and percentage of LEP subgroup scoring at "Proficient & Advanced" compared to the State's AYP targets for math and reading/language arts, for grades tested in 2004-2005 and for all grades listed in 2005-2006.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Definitions:

1. **Grade** = the grade tested for AYP
2. **3-HS not proficient** = the number of LEP students in all grades 3-8 and the HS grade tested for the year who were below proficient.
3. **Total # Tested** = the number of students in the LEP subgroup in all grades tested for the year. Provide the State aggregate number in the column labeled "Proficient & Advanced #"
4. **Total # 3-HS LEP not tested** = the total number of LEP students not tested and/or not counted as participating for AYP in grades 3-8 and the HS grade for the year
5. **Proficient & Advanced** = the number and the percent of the students in the LEP subgroup that achieved "proficient" and "advanced", in each of the content areas for the year
6. **Target** = the AYP target established by the State for that subject in that year

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time. Note that the information from the CSPR and accountability workbooks shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. Revisions to the accountability workbook information can only be made by working with Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) to submit a revised workbook. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

2.2 LEP Subgroup Content Results								
	2004-2005				2005-2006			
	GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED		TARGET	GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED		TARGET
		#	%	%		#	%	%
MATHEMATICS	3				3	2071	55.48	
	4	1658	47.60	47.50	4	1911	52.35	47.50
	5				5	1744	51.10	
	6				6	1551	51.04	
	7				7	1332	48.09	
	8	1008	41.30	47.50	8	1347	52.47	47.50
	HS	493	26.10	47.50	HS	922	40.32	47.50
	3-HS NOT PROFICIENT				3-HS NOT PROFICIENT	10587		
	TOTAL # TESTED	7830			TOTAL # TESTED	21465		
	TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED	0			TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED	0		
READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	3				3	2141	57.67	
	4	1858	53.60	67.50	4	2063	56.50	67.50
	5				5	2015	59.11	
	6				6	1669	55.85	
	7				7	1452	53.34	
	8	1131	50.30	67.50	8	1457	57.51	67.50
	HS	487	28.20	67.50	HS	804	36.12	67.50
	3-HS NOT PROFICIENT				3-HS NOT PROFICIENT	9650		
	TOTAL # TESTED	7802			TOTAL # TESTED	21251		
	TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED	0			TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED	0		

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, or tested/untested. Such data will be available beginning with 2006-07 reports. The new data collection system will allow us to follow cohorts of students.

Does the State exercise the LEP flexibility afforded States by the Secretary for recent arrivals in AYP determination? (<http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2006-3/091306a.html>)

Yes

Comments:

2.3 LEP Students in Grades not Tested for AYP

Instructions:

Provide the total number of LEP students in grades that were not tested for AYP. These figures reflect all students in grades K-2 and in the high school grades not tested for AYP.

2.3 LEP Students/Non-AYP Grades		
Grade	2004-2005	2005-2006
# LEP K-2	11479	13073
# LEP HS	5853	5624
# LEP Other Grades	0	0
Comments:		

2.4 Content assessment in Students' Native Language

2.4.1 Does the State offer the State academic content tests in the students' native language(s)?
No

(If no, go to 2.5. If yes, complete Tables 2.4.2 and 2.4.3.)
Comments:

2.4.2 If the answer is **yes to 2.4.1**, list the languages other than English, of the academic content tests provided in the State by the grades for which these native language tests are available, in Table 2.4.2. If more than one language is available for the grade, place a hard return (if electronic) in the row to add more space.

State should only report tests used for AYP purposes in the table.

Definitions:

- Grade** = grades for which the native language version of the academic content test is offered
- Language(s)** = name of the language in which the academic content test is offered

2.4.2 Test in Student's Native Language

	GRADE		LANGUAGE	GRADE		LANGUAGE
	3	4		3	4	
	5			5		
	6			6		
	7			7		
	8			8		
MATHEMATICS	HS		RDG/LANGUAGE ARTS	HS		

Comments:
 State response 2.4.2: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

Instructions:

If State response to 2.4.1 is YES, fill in the number and percentage of LEP subgroup scoring at "Proficient & Advanced" compared to the State's AYP targets for math and reading/language arts, for grades tested in 2004-2005 and for all grades listed in 2005-2006.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

This table is populated only if the state's response to 2.4.1 is YES.

Definitions:

1. **Grade** = grades in which the native language versions of the State academic content assessment is provided for LEP students
2. **Proficient & Advanced** = the number and the percent of students of the LEP subgroup that achieved "proficient" and "advanced", for each year
3. **Total Tested** = total number of ALL LEP students in all grades tested for each year through native language versions of the State academic content assessments

2.4.3 Native Language Version of State Academic Content Assessment Results						
	2004-2005			2005-2006		
	GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED		GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED	
		#	%		#	%
MATHEMATICS	3			3		
	4			4		
	5			5		
	6			6		
	7			7		
	8			8		
	HS			HS		
	TOTAL TESTED			TOTAL TESTED		
		#	%		#	%
READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	3			3		
	4			4		
	5			5		
	6			6		
	7			7		
	8			8		
	HS			HS		
	TOTAL TESTED			TOTAL TESTED		

Comments:

State response 2.4.3: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

2.5 Accommodations on State academic content assessments for LEP students

If the State allows accommodations for academic content assessments, check the accommodations used by subgrantees for LEP students in Table 2.5.

Note: if the State has provided information regarding academic content assessment in the students' native language in Table 2.4, check "Assessment in the native language" in this table.

2.5 Test Accommodations					
Accommodations to Presentation			Accommodations to Response		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Assessment in the native language	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Answers written directly in test booklet
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Text changes in vocabulary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Answers dictated
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Modification of linguistic complexity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Responses in native language
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Addition of visual supports			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Use of glossaries in native language	Accommodations to Timing/Scheduling		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Use of glossaries in English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Extra assessment time
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Linguistic modification of test directions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Breaks during testing
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Additional example items/tasks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Administration in several sessions
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Oral directions in the native language			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Use of dictionaries	Accommodations to Setting		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Reading aloud of questions in English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Small-group or individual administration
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Directions read aloud or explained	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		Separate room administration
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Other (Explain)
<small>Rivera, C. and C. Stansfield (2000). <i>An analysis of state policies for the inclusion and accommodation of English language learners in state assessment programs during 1998-1999</i> (Executive Summary). Washington, DC: Center for Equity and Excellence in Education, The George Washington University.</small>					
State response 2.5: (Provide narrative here if "Other" is checked and/or provide additional information as needed.)					
For guidelines on possible accommodations for Wisconsin students, please see: http://www.dpi.wi.gov/sped/doc/asmt-gd-acm.doc					

3. Academic Content Assessment Results of Monitored Former LEP Students [Sec. 3121(a)(4) p.1701, 3123(b)(8) p1705]

Monitored former 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

Note: Monitoring of these students is required for 2 consecutive years and results must be reported whether or not they are in a grade counted for AYP.

3.1 Provide the count of "monitored former LEP students" in Table 3.1 below.

Definitions:

1. **# year one** = number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored
2. **# year two** = number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored
3. **Non-AYP Grades 3+** = Grades 3 and above not tested for AYP.
4. **Total** = The sum of the subtotal of monitored LEP students in grades tested for AYP and the number of former LEP students in grades not tested for AYP.

Table 3.1 Former LEP Student by Year Monitored				
GRADE	2004-2005		2005-2006	
	# YEAR ONE	# YEAR TWO	# YEAR ONE	# YEAR TWO
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
HS				
Subtotal				
Non-AYP Grades 3+				
TOTAL				

Comments: Because we have not legally been able to collect student-level data until 2005-06, we were not yet able to follow cohorts of students, including those newly reclassified as fully English proficient. Beginning in 2006-07, the state data system will have two years of individual student progress, attainment, and achievement. Data will be available as required for subsequent reports.

3.2 Academic achievement results by grade of monitored former LEP students tested for AYP.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Definitions:

1. **Subject** = academic content subject areas in which former LEP student achievements are monitored
2. **Grade** = grade of the monitored former LEP students
3. **# monitored** = number of former LEP students being monitored for each year (year 1 plus year 2)
4. **# Proficient & Advanced** = the sum of the number of monitored former LEP students who achieved the "Proficient" level and the number of monitored LEP students who achieved the "Advanced" level on the State content tests
5. **# Below proficient** = the number of monitored former LEP students who did not achieve proficient level on the State academic content test at grade level
6. **Total** = the total numbers for each column and each subject

3.2 Monitored Former LEP Student Results by Grade

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

SUBJECT	GRADE	2004-2005			2005-2006		
		# MONITORED	# PROFICIENT & ADVANCED	# BELOW PROFICIENT	# MONITORED	# PROFICIENT & ADVANCED	# BELOW PROFICIENT
MATHEMATICS	3		0			192	
	4		419			321	
	5		0			435	
	6		0			541	
	7		0			701	
	8		1061			686	
	HS		993			615	
	TOTAL		2473			3491	
RDG/LANGUAGE ARTS	3		0			230	
	4		419			370	
	5		0			539	
	6		0			653	
	7		0			814	
	8		1062			821	
	HS		993			626	
	TOTAL		2474			4053	

Comments:

3.2.3 Does the State include the students reported in Table 3.2 in the calculations for the LEP subgroup AYP?

No

Comments:

3.2.4 Provide the number of the Year 1 and Year 2 monitored former LEP students in grades not tested for AYP who met grade level academic achievement standards in Math and Reading/Language Arts based on State/local criteria.

3.2.4 Performance of Monitored Former LEP Students /Non-AYP Grades			
2004-2005		2005-2006	
# Achieved Grade Level Standards		# Achieved Grade Level Standards	
Monitored Year 1	Monitored Year 2	Monitored Year 1	Monitored Year 2
0	0	0	0

Comments:

State response 3.2.4: (Describe how the monitored former LEP students in the State are performing at grade level or meeting grade level standards.)

Because we have not legally been able to collect student-level data until 2005-06, we were not yet able to follow cohorts of students, including those newly reclassified as fully English proficient. Beginning in 2006-07, the state data system will have two years of individual student progress, attainment, and achievement. Data will be available as required for subsequent reports.

3.2.5 What percentage of the monitored former LEP students were returned to LEP services, if the State exercise such practice?

State response 3.2.5: (Explain the criteria and process of returning monitored former LEP students to LEP services.)

Unknown: see comment under State response 3.2.4.

Wisconsin is a local control state, so the criteria and process may vary from district to district. The SEA strongly recommends that all districts have a policy and process for returning former LEP students to LEP services whenever it becomes apparent that a former LEP student was prematurely reclassified as fully English proficient.

3.2.6 If monitored former LEP students were returned to LEP services, how does this impact the performance of the subgrantees and the State in meeting Title III AMAO for "Attainment" of English proficiency?

State response 3.2.6:

Unknown: see comment under State response 3.2.4. Because Wisconsin has not been able to follow individual students, or cohorts of students, it is unknown 1) if former LEP students have been returned to LEP services; or 2) how this will impact the performance of the subgrantees and the State in meeting the Title III AMAO for "attainment" of English proficiency. It is believed that there would be little or no impact. The SEA encourages districts tend to have rigorous reclassification criteria in place to ensure this sort of situation occurs rarely, if at all.

3.3 What is the State's policy on monitored former LEP students when they fail to meet state academic achievement standards? What technical assistance does the State provide to subgrantees whose monitored former LEP students do not meet State academic achievement standards during the 2 years while those students were being monitored?

State response 3.3: (Provide narrative here)

In Wisconsin, there are no separate policies for former LEP students when they fail to meet state academic achievement standards. Such students will be treated in the same manner as all other students in Wisconsin. Technical assistance provided by the State to subgrantees whose monitored former LEP students do not meet State academic achievement standards will be handled in the same way as for any student not meeting the standards. The type of technical assistance provided will be based on the reason for the failure. The State will work with the individual district to determine what is needed.

4. Title III Subgrantee Performance and State Accountability [Sec. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701]

4.1 Provide the count for each year in Table 4.1

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

Table 4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance Information		
	2004-2005	2005-2006
Total number of subgrantees for each year	75	82
Total number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	0	0
Total number of subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs only	0	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	0	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	0	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	0	0
Total number of subgrantees that met 1 AMAO only	0	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress	0	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Attainment of ELP	0	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0	0
Total number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0	0
Total number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0	0
Total number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs		0
Total number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)		

Comments: Unknown: Because Wisconsin was not legally 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.

4.2 Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs in 2005-2006? *

Yes No

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

Comments:

State response 4.2.1: **(Provide narrative here if needed.)**

Unknown: Because Wisconsin has 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.

4.3 Describe the State plan to provide technical assistance in developing improvement plans and other technical assistance to subgrantees that have failed to meet Title III AMAOs for two or more consecutive years.

State response 4.3: **(Provide narrative here.)**

As the second, third, and fourth years of data become available from statewide use of ACCESS for assessing English language proficiency, Wisconsin will be able to identify schools that have failed to meet Title III AMAOs. This will begin with the 2007-2008 school year. A state policy and plan is under development and will utilize the experience gained from the Wisconsin DPI Successful Schools planning tools that help to identify specific local needs for improvement. Implementation of technical assistance and professional development will focus on collaboration with the Wisconsin regional service agencies (CESAs), as well as web based conferences, media presentations, and online learning communities.

5. Programs and Activities for Immigrant Children and Youth [Sec. 3115(e)(1)(A-G) p. 1699]

5.1 Complete Table 5.1

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Definitions:

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

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

Table 5.1 Education Programs for Immigrant Students

2004-2005			2005-2006		
# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants	# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
5587	946	14	5587	939	15

Comments:

State response 5.1: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, or 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 in the State during the two previous years.

5.2 Provide information on the programs or activities conducted by subgrantees for immigrant children and youth.

Instructions: Provide the number of subgrantees who have conducted each of the activities in Table 5.2 for the education enhancement of immigrant children and youth. A subgrantee may conduct more than one such activity. This table requires the aggregated number of activities conducted in the 2 years covered by this biennial report. The State should provide more detailed information for each year in the narrative if needed.

5.2 Subgrantee Activities for Immigrant Youth and Children	
# subgrantees	Activity conducted
7	family literacy, parent outreach, and training
15	support for personnel, including teacher aides, to provide services for immigrant children and youth
12	provision of tutorials, mentoring, and academic career counseling
15	identification and acquisition of curricular materials, software, and technologies
15	basic instructional services
15	other instructional services, such as programs of introduction to the educational system and civics education
12	activities coordinated with community based organizations, institutions of higher education, private sector entities, or other entities to assist parents by offering comprehensive community services
1	Other authorized activities for the education of immigrant children and youth (Describe)

Comments:

State response 5.2: (Summarize the most common activities conducted and discuss the effectiveness of the activities in meeting the needs of the immigrant children and youth and in achieving the goals of this program.)

The most common activities were the implementation of basic instructional programs for English language proficiency (ELP) development, materials to support these instructional programs, and placement of personnel (both instructional/non-instructional) to serve immigrant children and youth. Another area of common activity was parent outreach and training. The majority of the districts allocated services to parent outreach and education as a means of providing acculturation and general support services to these families.

The implementation of these services has supplemented existing programs with the overall goals of enhancing academic achievement for immigrant children and youth. With these added services and restructuring of current service delivery, these districts have accomplished the fundamental goal of enhancing educational opportunities for these immigrant children and youth. These direct activities have increased the districts' ability to better serve the various and unique needs of the LEP population.

5.3 Distribution of Funds

How does the State distribute the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees? (Check those that apply)

Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Competitive	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Multi-year	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Formula	<u>Yes</u>	

Comments:

State response 5.3: (Provide additional information on the State's subgrant process, as needed)

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction has reserved 15 percent of Title III funds for formula grant allocation to eligible local educational agencies (LEAs). A significant increase is defined as an increase of immigrant children and youth in one of the last three school years. This definition allows the DPI to allocate Title III funds to school districts with an increase in any number or percentage. With this definition, the DPI was able to allocate funds to fifteen (15) school districts serving immigrant children and youth for 2005-2006 school year. Each year, a request for proposal (RFP) is posted on the website and sent electronically to all school districts with English language learners in Wisconsin. The allocations were based on the number of eligible immigrant children and youth residing within the district jurisdiction.

6. Title III Programs or Activities (as described in Section 3115 (c, d & e)) Conducted by Subgrantees Terminated for Failure to Reach Program Goals During the Two Preceding Years [Sec. 3123(b)(7) p.1705]

6.1 Programs/Activities for Immigrant Children and Youth Terminated for Failing to Reach Program Goals
Were any Title III language instruction educational programs OR programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals during the two preceding years in the State?
<u>No</u>
(If NO, proceed to 7. If YES, provide the number in 6.1.2.)
Comments:
6.1.2 Number of terminated programs or activities
State Response 6.1.2: (Provide a summary explaining why these programs or activities did not reach program goals.)

7. Teacher Information and Professional Development Activities Conducted by Subgrantees [Sec. 3115(c)(1)(B) p. 1698, Sec. 3116 (c) p.1701, 3123(b)(5) p. 1705]

7.1 Provide the number of teachers in the State who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in SEC. 3301(8) and reported in Table 1.1.

Note: Section 3301(8) - The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course -- (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency, and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.)

Total number of certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs in the State.	3358
Total estimated number of additional certified/licensed teachers that the State will need for the Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years *	1800

* This number should be the total **additional** teachers needed for the next five years. **Do not** include the number of teachers **currently** working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

State response 7.1: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

The total number of teachers noted in the above chart represents the number of licensed teachers reported by Wisconsin LEAs for the 2005-06 ESEA End-of-Year Report for districts serving ELLs through Title III programs.

To calculate the total number of additional teachers that the state will need in 5 years, the SEA used the current total reported and, adjusting for a current lack of sufficient numbers of teachers available, multiplied the expected number of ELLs by the current pupil/teacher ratio assuming rate of growth for ELLs remains the same in coming years (about 8%/year).

7.2.1 Does the State require special certification/licensure/endorsement for teachers who teach in language instruction educational programs (Section 3301(8))?

Yes

If **yes**, describe the eligibility requirements for teachers to teach in language instruction educational programs in the State.

If **no**, does the State plan to develop eligibility requirements for teachers to teach in language instruction educational programs?

State response 7.2.1: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

Wisconsin requires that all teachers hold a current license for the program type in which they are teaching. For most teachers in language instructional education programs in the state, the license will be bilingual or ESL. This holds true for all teachers and for all programs. For example, in a smaller district, in which the classroom teacher provides the language instructional education program, the appropriate license for the grade and/or content area is required. In addition, all LEAs receiving subgrants under Title III sign the following assurance: "(11) the local educational agency shall certify that all teachers in any language instruction education program for limited English proficient children that is, or will be, funded under this part are fluent in English and any other language used for instruction, including having written and oral communication skills."

7.2.2 Does the State have specific qualification requirements in addition to those cited in Section 1119(3)(g) for paraprofessionals who assist teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs?

No

State response 7.2.2: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

7.3 How is teacher language fluency determined for English and any other language of instruction used in Title III language instruction educational programs? (SEC. 3116(c))

Instructions:

Fill in the number of subgrantees that use each of the following methods. This table requires the aggregated data for the 2 years covered by this biennial report. The State should provide additional information for each year in the narrative response, if needed.

7.3 Methods of Determining Language Fluency	
# of Subgrantees	Methods
82	State required English fluency exam for oral and written skills
0	State required exam for fluency in another language for oral and written skills
82	State certification/recertification/licensing requirement
0	LEA required English fluency exam for oral and written communication skills
0	LEA required fluency exam for another language for oral and written skills
0	LEA testing/interview during hiring
0	LEA endorsed, based on professional development and other training
0	LEA determined other evidence of language fluency (explain)
0	Other (explain)

State response 7.3: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

Some of the data in this section are new since the previous report. Additionally, the previous report did not ask for the number of subgrantees for each method, rather, from a list of five options, we were to check how teacher fluency in English and in any other language used for instruction in Title III programs were determined in the State.

Beginning with the end-of-year report for the 2006-07 school year, the LEA-level data will be collected from districts and compiled at the subgrantee level.

Finally, fluency in other languages is determined by the individual college/university granting a degree. Also, because Wisconsin is a local control state, how LEAs assess teacher language fluency in either English or another language is determined by local policy and is not currently reported to the SEA. However, all LEAs receiving subgrants under Title III sign the following assurance: "(11) the local educational agency shall certify that all teachers in any language instruction education program for limited English proficient children that is, or will be, funded under this part are fluent in English and any other language used for instruction, including having written and oral communication skills."

Wisconsin also requires that all teachers hold a current license for the program type in which they are teaching. This holds true for all teachers and for all programs.

7.4 Provide information on the subgrantees that conducted professional development activities that met Title III requirements (SEC. 3115 (c)(2 A-D)) in Table 7.4.

Instructions:

Report professional development activities that are funded under Title III and/or related to Title III required activities ONLY. The table covers the period of this report.

Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Activity** = subgrantee activities for professional development required under Title III [SEC. 3115(c)(2)(A-D)]
2. **# subgrantees** = the number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity.
3. **Total Number of Participants** = the total number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities

7.4 Subgrantee Professional Development Activities		
Type of PD Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	80	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	86	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	63	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	19	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	14	
Other (Explain)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	Total Number of Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	57	3993
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	54	1655
PD provided to principals	37	390
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	52	278
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	48	711
PD provided to community based organizational personnel	11	309

Comments:

7.4 State response: (Explain what the State did to ensure that PD activities conducted by subgrantees meet the Title III requirements under Section 3115 (c)(2)(A-D), including how the PD activities were based on scientific research and were effective in enhancing teacher knowledge and skills in teaching LEP students.)

The Wisconsin SEA provided professional development activities related to serving ELLs that could be applied for license renewal.

From assurances: "(10) The local educational agency shall conduct professional development activities under Title III of sufficient intensity and duration (which shall not include activities such as one-day or short-term workshops and conferences) to have a positive and lasting impact on the teachers' performance in the classroom. Professional development activities may not include a component(s) of a long-term, comprehensive professional development plan established by a teacher and the teacher's supervisor based on an assessment of the needs of the teacher, the supervisor, the students of the teacher, and any local educational agency employing the teacher."

Part of the Title III LEA application includes a description of the activities proposed, including topics, and evidence of a long-range professional development plan to provide teachers with knowledge of second language acquisition and assessment of both language proficiency and academic achievement of ELLs.

The SEA does not collect evidence of the effectiveness of these approaches. Because the format of, and data required for, this table are new since the previous report, the SEA conducted a survey of all Title III districts to collect the requested data for the past two school years. The data presented here are a result of that survey. Please note: Some districts receiving Title III allocations through a consortium submitted their individual district data. Therefore, rather than the number of actual subgrantees, the column so labeled is the number of respondents to the survey.

Beginning with the end-of-year report for the 2006-07 school year, the data will be collected from districts and compiled at the subgrantee level.

8. State Level Activities Conducted and Technical Assistance Provided to Subgrantees [Sec. 3111(b)(2)(A-D) p.1691-2, 3123(b)(4) p. 1705]

8.1 Technical Assistance Provided by the States

During the two preceding years, what technical assistance was provided by the State to subgrantees?

(Check all that apply)

The State provided technical assistance to subgrantees in:

<u>Yes</u>	1. Identifying and implementing English language instructional programs and curricula based on scientific research
<u>Yes</u>	2. Helping LEP students to meet academic content and student academic achievement standards expected of all students
<u>Yes</u>	3. Identifying or developing and implementing measures of English language proficiency
<u>Yes</u>	4. Promoting parental and community participation in programs that serve LEP children

Comments:

State response 8.1: (Describe how the State evaluates the effectiveness of State level technical assistance (TA), including how the TA has improved subgrantees' performance in assisting LEP students to achieve English proficiency and academic standards.)

The Wisconsin SEA provides professional development and technical assistance on the above noted topics. The major focus of technical assistance and professional development during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years was English language proficiency (ELP) standards and assessment of ELLs, especially standards-based, classroom-based assessment and how it relates to curriculum and instruction.

The SEA uses a standardized evaluation form with a Lickert scale (quantitative evidence) and a section for narrative comments (qualitative evidence). These evaluations indicate high levels of satisfaction of participants and an appreciation of hands-on learning that they can take back to their districts.

8.2 Other State activities conducted during the two preceding years, and the effectiveness of such activities.

Check all that apply

8.2.1 Professional development and other activities to assist personnel in meeting certification requirements	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Increased the number of certified/licensed/endorsed teachers for language instruction educational programs in the State
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Increased the number of teachers trained in teaching LEP students by course credits or professional development points towards certification/endorsement
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Increased teacher knowledge and ability in using State ELP standards and assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Other (explain)
Comments:	

8.2.2 Planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination related to subgrants	
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Planning: facilitated comprehensive services for LEP students
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Planning: facilitated utilizing all professional development resources for the training of all teachers on the teaching and learning of LEP students
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Evaluation: informed improvement of Title III program implementation
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Interagency Coordination: facilitated establishing State level standards and/or guidelines for instructional and other educational services for LEP students
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Consolidating Title III SEA Administrative Funds: provided additional resources for Title III program implementation/administration
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Other (explain)
Comments:	

8.2.3 Recognition of subgrantees that exceeded AMAOs	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Comments:	

8.2.4 Other state level authorized activities	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Comments:	

State response 8.2: **(Describe how the State evaluates the effectiveness of State level activities conducted, including how these activities have improved subgrantees' performance in assisting LEP students to achieve English proficiency and academic standards.)**

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

8.2.1. Professional development and other activities to assist personnel in meeting certification requirements

At times the Wisconsin SEA may arrange for college credit for participants in professional development activities on topics related to English language acquisition and academic achievement of ELLs. The SEA provided a unique opportunity for credit toward licensing beginning the summer of 2004, and that continues. As part of the WIDA Consortium's work developing English language proficiency standards and a standards-based English language proficiency assessment, teachers earned college credit through an on-line course in which they write/develop draft test items. Because one-third of test items will be renewed each year, this opportunity continues.

The major focus of professional development during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years was English language proficiency (ELP) standards and assessment of ELLs, especially standards-based, classroom-based assessment and how it relates to curriculum and instruction. All teachers who administered the state's English proficiency assessment, ACCESS for ELLs, received professional development from one or more options: training-of-trainers; one-day workshops; or on-line course. Most, if not all, completed the on-line course.

8.2.2. Planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination related to subgrants

Planning activities by SEA staff were centered on four processes: updating the ESEA consolidated application; the approval process for LEA applications; developing a monitoring process; and reporting. The workgroup that updated the consolidated application scheduled several teleconferences to alert LEAs of changes. These were well-received by the LEAs, especially because staff did not incur travel expenses and the time commitment was small.

Monitoring was piloted during the 2003-2004 school year. LEAs compiled evidence they were complying with NCLB requirements for the various titles from which they received funding. The actual monitoring included review of the evidence, but focused on a discussion with LEA staff on their successes and areas for which they needed assistance. LEA staff indicated they liked the format and learned much

about their various title programs and accomplishments from pulling together the evidence required as well as the time spent outlining their programs for SEA staff.

The Wisconsin SEA worked with other agencies to ensure the needs of ELLs were met during the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 school years. Cooperation was between the Wisconsin SEA and such agencies as CESAs, the Title III National Professional Development (NPD) projects, School of Education in the UW System, community-based organizations, and Refugee Resettlement.

Title III reports and requirements were outlined at annual state meetings for state program administrators and Title III coordinators; ESEA consolidated application rollout presentations; and meetings with CESA (Cooperative Educational Service Areas) staff serving as fiscal agents for Title III and other NCLB title programs.

8.3 Compliance with parental notification and parental participation requirements under Section 3302. Describe how the State ensured that subgrantees:

1. complied with parental notification provisions for identification and placement. Ensured that parents were informed on all the requirements specified in [SEC. 3302(a)(1-8) p. 1732]
2. complied with parental notification when the LEA failed to meet Title III annual measurable achievement objectives each year within prescribed time frame [SEC. 3302(b) p. 1732]
3. provided parental notifications in an understandable and uniform format, and, to the extent practical, in a language that the parent could understand. [SEC. 3302(c) p. 1732-3]
4. fulfilled the parental participation and outreach provisions. [SEC. 3302(e) p. 1732-3]

State response 8.3: (Address each of the items above.)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

All LEAs receiving subgrants under Title III sign the following assurance: "(1) The local educational agency shall comply with the provisions of section 3302 related to parental notification prior to, and throughout, each school year."

The SEA provides resources mostly through information/documents posted on the bilingual/ESL program web page and technical assistance (telephone, e-mail, in person). Technical assistance on all Title III requirements, including parental notification are reviewed at annual statewide meetings for Title III program coordinators.

Other evidence is largely anecdotal. For example, LEAs contact the SEA with questions when they are in the process of implementing local policy and for parental notification as required under Title III. The goal of the SEA is to share examples/models of communications (in English and target languages) as resources on the bilingual/ESL program web page. Toward that goal the SEA has begun to collecting and posting samples of letters to parents in English, Spanish, and Hmong (the two largest language populations in the state) related to the instruction, assessment, and programs available to their child.

9. Optional Questions

RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE NOT REQUIRED, BUT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO THE DEPARTMENT IN UNDERSTANDING SERVICES TO LEP STUDENTS IN THE STATE.

9.1 Do LEAs provide information to the State on mobility rates for all students? (Mobility rate has been collected by NCES. It is defined in the Common Core of Data collection and in the national education data dictionary.)

Yes No

(If yes, please provide that rate.)

Comments:

9.2 Does the State calculate a State LEP mobility rate?

Yes No

(If yes, please provide that rate.)

Comments:

9.3 Does the State calculate the difference between the LEP subgroup AYP status with or without the inclusion of monitored former LEP students' achievement results?

Yes No

(If yes, what is the difference?)

Comments: