

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614
Expiration Date: 07/31/2007

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, 2005-2006 Part II, 2005-2006

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Arkansas

Address:
#4 Capitol Mall, Rm 406B
Little Rock, AR 72201

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Janinne Riggs
Telephone: 501-682-4219
Fax: 501-682-5756
e-mail: janinne.riggs@arkansas.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Janinne Riggs

Signature Thursday, February 22, 2007, 1:49:29 PM
Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

Revision of each of the Arkansas curriculum frameworks every six years is required by the State Board of Education (SBE). All curriculum framework documents result from the work of a committee of Arkansas educators representing every facet of Arkansas education, including geographic region, grade, school size and fiscal status, gender, ethnicity, and education experience. The Arkansas SBE rules for framework revision specify that committees rely on a variety of resources to inform their work. This process was done using reviews from nationally recognized content experts, using content standards from the other states, using national content standards documents and other national curriculum documents, using NAEP frameworks, using content standards documents from other countries, and using documents from business and industry on what knowledge and skills are needed in the areas and in technology for the 21st Century. In addition, input from the Department of Higher Education and the Department of Workforce Education was sought. The 2005 revision of the Science Curriculum Framework resulted in a curriculum document that is rigorous, specific to grade levels 3-8, course specific at high school, and congruent and progressive from grade level to grade level. The high school frameworks are specific to the following courses: Anatomy and Physiology; Biology; Chemistry; Environmental Science; Physical Science; and Physics.

The revised Science Academic Content Standards were adopted by the State Board of Education on February 13, 2006 for implementation beginning of the 2007-2008 school year.

The reader may refer to the following web site for a complete review of the Science Content Standards.

<http://arkansased.org/teachers/frameworks2.html#science>

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

Regular Assessments

The following performance assessments are fully developed and are administered annually to all students in Arkansas.

Grade 3 Benchmarks in Literacy and Mathematics

Grade 4 Benchmarks in Literacy and Mathematics

Grade 5 Benchmarks in Literacy and Mathematics

Grade 6 Benchmarks in Literacy and Mathematics

Grade 7 Benchmarks in Literacy and Mathematics

Grade 8 Benchmarks in Literacy and Mathematics

End-of-Course Algebra I

End-of-Course Geometry

High School Literacy

Additional, the following alternate assessments are given for students who cannot complete the regular assessments with or without accommodations. The design of the portfolio and the scoring are based on the regular academic content standards.

Portfolios for Students with Disabilities in Literacy and Mathematics in Grades 3-8

Portfolios for English Language Learners in Literacy and Mathematics in Grades 3-8

Portfolio for Student with Disabilities High School Mathematics (Grade 9)

Portfolio for English Language Learners Algebra I

Portfolio for English Language Learners Geometry

Portfolio for English Language Learners High School Literacy (Grade 11)

Science assessments will be given in the following grade spans in 2006-2007

Grade 5 Benchmark

Grade 7 Benchmark

End-of-Course Biology

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

The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) in consultation with the State Technical Advisory Committee has established specific procedures for determining the academic performance standards for all required Benchmark assessments, high school literacy assessment, and End-of-Course assessments. For each assessment in Literacy and Mathematics, panelists from across Arkansas participated in the standards setting activities. The panelists represented all geographical regions of the state; urban and rural areas; and racial/ethnic and gender diversity are represented. In addition, members are selected for their rich knowledge and experience in teaching diverse student populations: general education students; students with disabilities; and limited English proficient students. Careful consideration is given to the performance level descriptors used by NAEP. The Book Mark method is employed for setting standards in reading and mathematics, and the Body of Work method is employed for writing. All committee work is reviewed for technical quality by the Technical Advisory Committee. The State Board of Education approves all performance levels. The same procedures are used for setting performance standards for the Alternate Portfolio for Students with Disabilities and the Alternate Portfolio for Limited English Proficient Students. The Body of Work method is employed for both of the Alternate Assessments.

The Science Assessments were field tested during the 2005-2006 test administration. Academic achievement standards using the process described above will be set with the 2006-2007 operational administration.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

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

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	275905	100.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1876	100.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	3908	100.00
Black, non-Hispanic	61590	100.00
Hispanic	18784	100.00
White, non-Hispanic	189367	100.00
Students with Disabilities	30682	99.00
Limited English Proficient	11827	100.00
Economically Disadvantaged	146662	100.00
Migrant		
Male	139191	100.00
Female	136714	100.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct. The state is developing a system to track Migrant students starting in 2006-07.

The total number of students tested in mathematics and the total number of students tested in reading/language arts will not equal the same total number of students. This is due to the fact that the state includes end-of-course assessments in mathematics to be taken at the completion of the course. Example: If an eighth grade student was enrolled in Algebra 1 that student would take the end-of-course Algebra I exam and the eighth grade mathematics exam but only take the eighth grade literacy exam.

The total number of students tested in mathematics and reading/language arts will not be of an equal amount because of end-of course testing in Algebra I and Geometry.

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

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	242136	100.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1629	100.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	3372	100.00
Black, non-Hispanic	54681	100.00
Hispanic	16406	99.00
White, non-Hispanic	165738	100.00
Students with Disabilities	30573	98.00
Limited English Proficient	10620	100.00
Economically Disadvantaged	131445	100.00
Migrant		
Male	122768	100.00
Female	119368	100.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct. The state is developing a system to track Migrant students starting in 2006-07. We have verified that these numbers are correct.

See comments above for why the mathematics and reading/language arts totals are not the same.

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

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

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

1.2.2

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	30347	
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4815	
Comments: No Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards but Arkansas Alternate Assessment is aligned to grade-level content standards.		

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	30347	
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2881	
Comments: No Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards but Arkansas Alternate Assessment is aligned to grade-level content standards.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	33626	67.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	245	65.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	375	81.00
Black, non-Hispanic	7914	42.00
Hispanic	1569	67.00
White, non-Hispanic	23426	75.00
Students with Disabilities	3435	33.00
Limited English Proficient	751	68.00
Economically Disadvantaged	19091	56.00
Migrant	349	61.00
Male	17033	66.00
Female	16528	67.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	33626	57.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	245	57.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	375	74.00
Black, non-Hispanic	7914	35.00
Hispanic	1569	55.00
White, non-Hispanic	23426	64.00
Students with Disabilities	3435	16.00
Limited English Proficient	751	54.00
Economically Disadvantaged	19091	45.00
Migrant	349	47.00
Male	17033	51.00
Female	16528	63.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	33712	60.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	63.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	357	74.00
Black, non-Hispanic	7681	35.00
Hispanic	1928	57.00
White, non-Hispanic	23421	68.00
Students with Disabilities	3687	22.00
Limited English Proficient	1094	51.00
Economically Disadvantaged	19122	49.00
Migrant	297	55.00
Male	17031	59.00
Female	16612	62.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	33712	61.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	68.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	357	75.00
Black, non-Hispanic	7681	37.00
Hispanic	1928	52.00
White, non-Hispanic	23421	69.00
Students with Disabilities	3687	15.00
Limited English Proficient	1094	47.00
Economically Disadvantaged	19122	49.00
Migrant	297	51.00
Male	17031	55.00
Female	16612	67.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	33416	51.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	222	52.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	399	65.00
Black, non-Hispanic	7521	24.00
Hispanic	2028	42.00
White, non-Hispanic	23164	60.00
Students with Disabilities	3783	13.00
Limited English Proficient	1180	34.00
Economically Disadvantaged	18719	38.00
Migrant	342	40.00
Male	17051	50.00
Female	16309	51.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	33416	55.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	222	57.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	399	71.00
Black, non-Hispanic	7521	32.00
Hispanic	2028	48.00
White, non-Hispanic	23164	64.00
Students with Disabilities	3783	17.00
Limited English Proficient	1180	38.00
Economically Disadvantaged	18719	43.00
Migrant	342	47.00
Male	17051	49.00
Female	16309	63.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	34346	58.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	63.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	413	71.00
Black, non-Hispanic	7913	34.00
Hispanic	1939	50.00
White, non-Hispanic	23589	66.00
Students with Disabilities	4015	12.00
Limited English Proficient	929	38.00
Economically Disadvantaged	18824	46.00
Migrant	316	45.00
Male	17495	54.00
Female	16615	61.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	34346	59.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	66.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	413	69.00
Black, non-Hispanic	7913	37.00
Hispanic	1939	48.00
White, non-Hispanic	23589	68.00
Students with Disabilities	4015	8.00
Limited English Proficient	929	32.00
Economically Disadvantaged	18824	47.00
Migrant	316	43.00
Male	17494	53.00
Female	16615	66.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	34926	50.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	273	48.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	428	68.00
Black, non-Hispanic	8121	25.00
Hispanic	1956	44.00
White, non-Hispanic	24042	59.00
Students with Disabilities	4160	9.00
Limited English Proficient	843	32.00
Economically Disadvantaged	18708	37.00
Migrant	284	37.00
Male	17776	49.00
Female	17088	52.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	34926	53.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	273	56.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	428	65.00
Black, non-Hispanic	8121	31.00
Hispanic	1956	45.00
White, non-Hispanic	24042	61.00
Students with Disabilities	4160	6.00
Limited English Proficient	843	28.00
Economically Disadvantaged	18708	40.00
Migrant	284	41.00
Male	17776	61.00
Female	17088	45.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	35808	44.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	259	40.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	433	58.00
Black, non-Hispanic	8177	18.00
Hispanic	1853	32.00
White, non-Hispanic	24966	53.00
Students with Disabilities	4363	5.00
Limited English Proficient	759	18.00
Economically Disadvantaged	18253	30.00
Migrant	235	29.00
Male	18050	43.00
Female	17685	44.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	35808	65.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	259	66.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	433	74.00
Black, non-Hispanic	8177	44.00
Hispanic	1853	57.00
White, non-Hispanic	24966	73.00
Students with Disabilities	4363	12.00
Limited English Proficient	759	39.00
Economically Disadvantaged	18253	53.00
Migrant	235	52.00
Male	18050	57.00
Female	17685	73.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	63550	60.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	480	60.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	965	73.00
Black, non-Hispanic	13344	32.00
Hispanic	3112	52.00
White, non-Hispanic	45410	71.00
Students with Disabilities	3703	19.00
Limited English Proficient	1182	38.00
Economically Disadvantaged	26649	49.00
Migrant	266	50.00
Male	30989	61.00
Female	32112	64.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	29649	46.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	254	42.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	472	47.00
Black, non-Hispanic	6295	20.00
Hispanic	1181	27.00
White, non-Hispanic	21371	55.00
Students with Disabilities	3201	2.00
Limited English Proficient	485	13.00
Economically Disadvantaged	11380	29.00
Migrant	87	21.00
Male	14713	38.00
Female	14912	53.00

Comments: We have verified that these numbers are correct.

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1112	674	61.00

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	252	248	98.00

Comments:

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

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	839	629	75.00

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	252	232	92.00

Comments: Title I schools 69 year 1, 63 year 2, 54 year 3, 19 year 4, 3 year 5 and 1 year 6

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

Schools identified for improvement receive priority in participating in all statewide delivered professional development. These schools also receive priority in receiving grants that might be available through the Department.

The Arkansas Department of Education has adopted a comprehensive low performing school turn around model including a scholastic audit for schools in corrective action and restructuring.

The scholastic audit is part of the state's assistance for low performing schools. The audit is a comprehensive review of a school's learning environment, organizational efficiency and student academic performance. Results of the audit will be used to determine revisions to the comprehensive school improvement plan and level of support necessary to improve student academic performance. AR educators have been trained to conduct the scholastic audits.

The low performing turn around model focuses on 5 key areas: standards and assessment; aligned instructional systems; high performance leadership, management and organization; professional learning communities, and parent and community engagement. Highly skilled literacy and mathematics coaches will be assigned to the schools to provide on-going support to classroom teachers. A leadership team will participate in strategic professional development to build leadership capacity. All staff members will participate in specific professional development based on results of the scholastic audit.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

The Department has adopted a comprehensive low performing district/school turn around model including a scholastic audit.

The scholastic audit will form the bases for determining the level of support necessary to improve student academic performance.

The low performing turn around model focuses on five key areas: standards and assessment; aligned instructional systems; high-performance leadership, management and organization; professional learning communities; and parent and community engagement. A leadership team will participate in strategic professional development to build leadership capacity.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	595
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 2005-2006 school year.	2615
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	105211
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: Data for 1.4.5.1.1 is not available	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	32
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	1468
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	49767
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

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

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	91734	77751	84.80
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	4357	3948	90.60
Low-Poverty Schools	5960	5012	84.10
All Elementary Schools	19384	17391	89.70
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	14299	11463	80.20
Low-Poverty Schools	23164	19847	85.70
All Secondary Schools	72350	60360	83.40
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

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

How is a teacher defined?

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

How is a class defined?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	20.00
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	1.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	74.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	5.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	
Comments:	

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	75.50	49.30
Poverty Metric Used	Highest 25% and lowest 25% on free and reduced-price lunch	
Secondary Schools	62.60	38.50
Poverty Metric Used	Highest 25% and lowest 25% on free and reduced-price lunch	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	13.90

Comments: The Department recognizes that this data reported by districts does not represent a true picture of the state's paraprofessional status. Additional efforts will be undertaken to assess the situation and provide additional technical assistance to districts/schools in reporting this information.

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

Arkansas has established, implemented, and operationalized new K-12 English language proficiency standards that are aligned to the State's academic content and student academic achievement standards as described in section 1111(b)(1).

The 2006 Arkansas English Language Proficiency Curriculum Framework aligns with the current Arkansas English Language Arts and Mathematics Curriculum Frameworks. The English Language Proficiency Framework addresses the four literacy domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing.

The new standards were approved by the Arkansas State Board of Education on June 12, 2006, and can be accessed at the following URL:

http://arkansased.org/teachers/word/eng_proficiency_062106.doc

ESL teachers and administrators have been trained in the use of the new standards during workshops held in June 2006, and, subsequently, through a state-wide videoconference. All LEAs have been provided with online access to the new standards.

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

The Arkansas English Language Proficiency Curriculum Framework, K-12, was developed collaboratively by a team of experienced ESL teachers, ESL program administrators, and content area specialists in English Language Arts/Reading/Literacy and Mathematics. Contained within the format of the ELP standards are specific references to linkages with English language arts and Mathematics. The English Language Proficiency Framework includes performance level descriptors that describe the level of language proficiency at each of the five levels of English language development in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

The link/alignment can be referenced at the following URL:

http://arkansased.org/teachers/word/eng_proficiency_062106.doc

LEP students are held to the same rigorous academic achievement standards as native English speakers in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

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

- An independent alignment study No
- Other evidence of alignment No

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

1. The State is in the process of contracting with a new testing company that will administer the annual assessment of an English language proficiency assessment (ELPA) that all all LEP students (K-12) will take in the spring of 2007.
2. The new ELPA was carefully selected by a committee of experienced ESL teachers, ESL program program administrators, and English language arts and mathematics content area specialists administrators representing all regions of the state of Arkansas. This committee selected an ELPA that is closely aligned with the newly revised Arkansas English Language Proficiency Curriculum Framework (2006). The spring 2007 ELPA will address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension.
3. The spring 2007 ELPA meets the requirements of alignment to the ELP Framework.
4. The selected ELPA meets the requirements for technical quality, including vality and reliability. The Arkansas Assessment Technical Advisory Committee will oversee the process to assure that all technical qualities are met.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	17669	88.00
2. Marshallese	705	3.50
3. Laotian	367	2.00
4. Hmong	360	2.00
5. Vietnamese	310	1.50
6. Chinese	109	0.50
7. Arabic	92	0.50
8. Korean	71	0.40
9. Russian	43	0.20
10. Gujarati	40	0.20
Comments:		

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

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

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

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
4348	2506	6

Comments:

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

There has been no sudden change in the number of immigrant students enrolled. The growth has been gradual and steady and commensurate with overall ELL enrollment increases.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

1. No changes have been made in the State's definition of Proficient since the 2004-2005 CSPR submission. The test score range or cut score defined for Proficient on the MAC II are listed below:

Grade Levels Total Battery Proficient

K Above 600

1 Above 600

2 Above 578

3 Above 578

4 Above 582

5 Above 582

6 Above 573

7 Above 573

8 Above 573

9 Above 596

10 Above 596

11 Above 596

12 Above 596

2. The way in which the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of Proficient have not changed since the 2004-2005 CSRSP submission.

The total battery score is a combination of the five domain scores.

Proficient is defined in each of the five domains as follows:

Listening:

Grade Levels Listening Score Range

K Above 204

1 Above 204

2 Above 205

3 Above 205

4 Above 201

5 Above 201

6 Above 210

7 Above 210

8 Above 210

9 Above 216

10 Above 216

11 Above 216

12 Above 216

Speaking:

Grade Levels Speaking Score Range

K Above 225

1 Above 225

2 Above 220

3 Above 220

4 Above 215

5 Above 215

6 Above 211

7 Above 211

8 Above 211

9 Above 225

10 Above 225

11 Above 225

12 Above 225

Reading:

Grade Levels Reading Score Range

K Above 239

1 Above 239

2 Above 230

3 Above 230

4 Above 237

5 Above 237

6 Above 234

7 Above 234

8 Above 234

9 Above 238

10 Above 238

11 Above 238

12 Above 238

Writing:

Grade Levels Writing Score Range

K Above 254

1 Above 254

2 Above 240

3 Above 240

4 Above 233

5 Above 233

6 Above 228

7 Above 228

8 Above 228

9 Above 241

10 Above 241

11 Above 241

12 Above 241

Grade Levels Comprehension Score Range

K Above 257

1 Above 257

2 Above 256

3 Above 256

4 Above 448

5 Above 448

6 Above 440

7 Above 440

8 Above 440

9 Above 443

10 Above 443

11 Above 443

12 Above 443

3. Other criteria used for determining English language proficiency of LEP students: Score of Proficient or Advanced on the criterion-referenced tests (Arkansas Benchmark Examinations or End of Course Exams) or a score at or above the 40th percentile on the norm-referenced test (ITBS).

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

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

Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

1. Making progress means moving from one level to a higher level on the Maculaitis II.

2. No changes have been made in the criteria that students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next since the 2004-2005 CSPR.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

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

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have been made since the 2004-2005 CSPR.

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? Yes

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 60.00	# 12192	% 56.00	# 9083	% 10.00	# 2032	% 41.00	# 8426

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

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	60.00	4698	56.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		3676	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	10.00	7420	42.00
TOTAL		15794	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? No Yes

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	27
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	7
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	27
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	24
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	7
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	24
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	20
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	24
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments:

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

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

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

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

Comments: The State is developing a system to track monitored former LEP students starting in 2006-2007.

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

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

Comments: The State is developing a system to track monitored former LEP students starting in 2006-2007.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	81.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	76.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	87.70
Black, non-Hispanic	75.90
Hispanic	73.00
White, non-Hispanic	83.30
Students with Disabilities	85.90
Limited English Proficient	79.00
Economically Disadvantaged	84.10
Migrant	78.20
Male	79.10
Female	83.60
Comments:	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

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

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

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	3.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.60
Black, non-Hispanic	4.40
Hispanic	4.30
White, non-Hispanic	2.70
Students with Disabilities	3.20
Limited English Proficient	4.70
Economically Disadvantaged	4.30
Migrant	4.90
Male	3.60
Female	2.70
Comments: Information is correct.	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

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

STATE RESPONSE

Arkansas defines the period that constitutes a school year to be a total of 178 instructional days.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	233	233
LEAs with Subgrants	12	12

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

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

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	783	267
1	828	225
2	709	259
3	706	240
4	709	222
5	622	226
6	607	189
7	584	210
8	628	181
9	683	237
10	559	150
11	414	133
12	462	101

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	1296	452
Doubled-up	3529	1374
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	150	24
Hotels/Motels	328	224
Unknown	3144	590

Comments: Reasoning for the high volume of "Unknown" primary nighttime residence reported: The Arkansas Public School Computer Network is experiencing difficulties in pulling the "type of homelessness" data required to complete this report. The data collected for "type of homelessness" originated from an End of the Year Data Collection Survey conducted by the Arkansas Dept. of Education Office of Homeless Education.

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

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

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

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	267
1	225
2	259
3	240
4	222
5	226
6	189
7	210
8	181
9	237
10	150
11	133
12	101

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

154

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

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

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

114

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

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

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

60

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

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

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	297
English Language Learners (ELL)	57
Gifted and Talented	33
Vocational Education	36

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	10
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	10
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	11
Transportation	10
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	11
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	12
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	7
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	12
Coordination between schools and agencies	10
Counseling	7
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	8
Clothing to meet a school requirement	10
School supplies	12
Referral to other programs and services	10
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional)	0

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School selection	1
Transportation	3
School records	2
Immunizations or other medical records	3
Other enrollment issues	0

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Regular attendance	1
Community donations	1
High Mobility	1

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

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

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	127	50
Grade 4	Yes	100	29
Grade 5	Yes	111	33
Grade 6	Yes	75	25
Grade 7	Yes	87	26
Grade 8	Yes	75	32
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 11	Yes	30	12
Grade 12	Yes	<n	<n

Comments: Arkansas Statewide Testing: All third-through eighth-graders take the State Benchmark Exams in math and literacy. Arkansas students also take an 11th-grade literacy exam (applicable to 10th - 12th grade students taking the related course). Also, end-of-course exams in Algebra I and Geometry (applicable to 9th - 12th grade students taking the related course).

Mathematics Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	126	55
Grade 4	Yes	100	32
Grade 5	Yes	111	32
Grade 6	Yes	75	25
Grade 7	Yes	87	21
Grade 8	Yes	78	18
Grade 9	Yes	28	19
Grade 10	Yes	25	12
Grade 11	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 12	Yes	<n	<n

Comments: Arkansas Statewide Testing: All third-through eighth-graders take the State Benchmark Exams in math and literacy. Arkansas students also take an 11th-grade literacy exam (applicable to 10th - 12th grade students taking the related course). Also, end-of-course exams in Algebra I and Geometry (applicable to 9th - 12th grade students taking the related course).

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