

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 1995, 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:
 California

Address:
 1430 N Street
 Sacramento, CA 95814

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Camille Maben
 Telephone: 916-319-0582
 Fax: 916-322-5092
 e-mail: cmaben@cde.ca.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Camille Maben

_____ Signature	_____ Date
--------------------	---------------

Wednesday, March 28, 2007, 8:24:06 PM

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

The State adopted academic content standards in science on October 9, 1998. The standards are grade-level specific for kindergarten through grade eight and course/discipline specific for grades nine through twelve. To meet the requirements of 1111(b) (1), the State adopted blueprints for California Science Standards Tests for grades five, eight, and ten.

The State Board of Education (SBE) and the state's Academic Standards Commission reviewed the National Science Education Standards, the Benchmarks for Science Literacy, and science standards and frameworks from local California school districts. The Academic Standards Commission held nine community meetings, and the SBE held five public hearings to receive input into and reactions to the standards. Parents/guardians, teachers, school administrators, and business and community leaders participated and helped define key issues. The standards were also submitted to expert reviewers around the nation for input into the final document.

Since the state's academic content standards are course/discipline specific for grades nine through twelve, California Science Standards Test (CST) blueprints were developed for end-of-course tests for grades nine through eleven. To meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1), blueprints were developed for a Grade Eight California Science Standards Test that measures the grade eight science standards and Grade Ten California Life Science Standards Test that includes selected middle school life science and high school biology standards.

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

2005-06 CSPR Correction for 1.1.2

California uses the following assessments in calculating Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):

â€ ELA - CSTs for grades 2-8, CAHSEE for grade 10

â€ ELA alternate assessment - CAPA for grades 2-8 and 10

â€ Mathematics - CSTs for grades 2-8, CAHSEE for grade 10

â€ Mathematics alternate assessment - CAPA for grades 2-8 and 10

â€ Science - CSTs for grades 5, 8, and 10

â€ Science alternate assessment - CAPA for grades 5, 8, and 10

Also note that CST, CAPA, and CAHSEE scores are included in California's calculation of the Academic Performance Index (API) which is also an indicator in AYP.

Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program

The state has Assessment Review Panels (ARPs) for English-language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science that are comprised of teachers, content area specialists, and college/university professors. The ARPs developed blueprints for the California Standards Tests (CSTs) that are aligned with the state's academic content standards. The blueprints were presented to and adopted by the SBE after providing an opportunity for public comment on the proposed blueprints. The blueprints include the standards assessed and the number of questions for each standard. Every CST question is written for a specific academic content standard. The alignment, grade-level appropriateness, and accuracy of every test question are verified by Educational Testing Service (ETS), California Department of Education (CDE) content specialists and the content area ARP. Every question is also reviewed by the Statewide Pupil Assessment Review Panel (SPAR), a panel of parents who have children in California public schools. This panel reviews the questions to ensure that no questions solicit or invite disclosure of a pupil's, or his or her parents' or guardians' personal beliefs.

The CSTs in ELA and mathematics were administered for the first time during spring 1999 and the grade-five CST in science was added to the program during spring 2004. The Grade Eight California Science Standards Test and Grade Ten California Life Science Standards Test were first administered to all grade eight and ten students during spring 2006. Since the state's science academic content standards for grades nine through twelve are course/discipline specific, the science CSTs for grades nine through eleven are end-of-course tests. The Grade Ten California Life Science Standards Test assesses selected middle school life science and selected high school biology academic content standards.

The process that is used to develop the CSTs is also used to develop the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). The CAPA is an alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities who are unable to take the CSTs even with accommodations or modifications. The CDE content specialists provide oversight and monitor the development of both the CSTs and the CAPA. There is a separate CAPA ARP that includes special education teachers and administrators as well as CST ARP representatives who provide continuity between the CSTs and the alternate assessment. The CAPA for ELA and mathematics was administered for the first time during

spring 2003. Science field tests were added for grades five and ten during spring 2003 with grade eight added during spring 2004.

The CAPA ARP has reviewed and revised the assessment blueprints, as well as the assessments to better align CAPA with the grade-level academic content standards. Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams use participation criteria to determine if students will participate in the state's STAR Program by taking the CSTs or the CAPA.

The State has begun development of an additional alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards, the California Modified Assessment (CMA) in ELA, mathematics, and science. The CMA will be a modified assessment for students with disabilities for whom both the CAPA and CSTs are inappropriate. CMA questions for at least grades two through five are to be field tested during the 2006-07 school year and the assessment for at least grades two through five is expected to be operational during spring 2008. Like the CSTs and the CAPA, there is an ARP for the CMA. The CDE expects to present CMA blueprints to the SBE during spring 2006.

California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE)

At the high school level, California uses results from the CAHSEE administered in grade ten to meet NCLB requirements. The CAHSEE is a standards-based ELA and mathematics exam administered first at grade ten and available in subsequent grades for students who do not initially pass either the ELA portion, the math portion, or both. Since it is a pass-no pass exam, the CAHSEE does not provide a range of performance levels. To meet the requirements of NCLB, therefore, CAHSEE performance levels have been established that equate to CST cut scores for basic, proficient, and advanced performance. The CAHSEE scaled cut point for basic performance has been established as 350 in ELA and mathematics; proficient performance has been established as 380 in ELA and in mathematics; and advanced performance has been established as 403 in ELA and 422 in mathematics. The State Board of Education approved these performance levels at its September 2006 meeting.

The STAR/CAHSEE contractor annually provides CDE with a technical manual that specifies the reliabilities of the STAR and CAHSEE tests. The contractor also ensures that the tests are consistent with relevant, nationally recognized professional and technical standards. Test content validities are confirmed by panels of content experts, who review test items to ensure their alignment with the appropriate content standards. Standards alignments also are reviewed by content experts from the CAHSEE contractor and from CDE. The tests objectively measure student achievement, knowledge, and skills. Items that invite or solicit personal information are prohibited by California Education Code Section 60614. All items proposed for state tests are reviewed by the SPAR Panel to ensure that no item invites or solicits personal information.

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

Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program

The State formally adopted academic achievement standards (performance levels) for English-language arts during February 2001 and for mathematics during November 2001. Academic achievement standards (performance levels) were adopted for the General mathematics CST on March 6, 2002. Academic achievement standards (performance levels) were adopted for the grade five science CST on May 12, 2004 and for the grade eight science CST and grade ten life science CST on May 10, 2006.

Alternate academic achievement standards (performance levels) were first adopted for the CAPA at the July 2003 SBE meeting. A standard setting to determine alternate academic achievement standards (performance levels) for the revised CAPA will be conducted in fall 2007. There are five academic achievement standards (performance levels) for the CSTs and the CAPA: advanced, proficient, basic, below basic, and far below basic.

California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE)

At the high school level, California uses results from the CAHSEE administered in grade ten to meet NCLB requirements. The CAHSEE is a standards-based ELA and mathematics exam administered first at grade ten and available in subsequent grades for students who do not initially pass either the ELA portion, the math portion, or both. Since it is a pass-no pass exam, the CAHSEE does not provide a range of performance levels. To meet the requirements of NCLB, therefore, CAHSEE performance levels have been established that equate to CST cut scores for basic, proficient, and advanced performance. The CAHSEE scaled cut point for basic performance has been established as 350 in ELA and mathematics; proficient performance has been established as 380 in ELA and in mathematics; and advanced performance has been established as 403 in ELA and 422 in mathematics. The State Board of Education approved these performance levels at its September 2006 meeting.

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	3373001	98.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	27883	97.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	395277	99.30
Black, non-Hispanic	265759	97.40
Hispanic	1625082	98.60
White, non-Hispanic	1021737	98.50
Students with Disabilities	340143	94.50
Limited English Proficient	1108571	98.90
Economically Disadvantaged	1806604	98.50
Migrant	90587	99.00
Male	1721079	98.30
Female	1641912	98.80

Comments:

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

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	3366837	98.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	27864	97.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	395196	99.20
Black, non-Hispanic	264915	97.10
Hispanic	1621664	98.40
White, non-Hispanic	1020620	98.40
Students with Disabilities	331752	92.10
Limited English Proficient	1104686	98.60
Economically Disadvantaged	1802296	98.30
Migrant	90322	98.70
Male	1717106	98.10
Female	1640411	98.70

Comments:

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

1.2.2 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	311525	86.43
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	28618	7.94

Comments:

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	303082	84.10
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	28670	7.96

Comments:

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	458688	58.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	3622	52.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	52029	79.60
Black, non-Hispanic	35103	41.80
Hispanic	231544	47.10
White, non-Hispanic	131351	73.10
Students with Disabilities	47108	35.30
Limited English Proficient	170453	46.50
Economically Disadvantaged	263525	46.50
Migrant	12771	39.50
Male	234500	59.50
Female	223411	56.60

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	457139	37.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	3600	32.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	51952	57.90
Black, non-Hispanic	34918	27.40
Hispanic	230825	22.80
White, non-Hispanic	130832	56.20
Students with Disabilities	45400	21.50
Limited English Proficient	169916	20.40
Economically Disadvantaged	262546	22.80
Migrant	12714	13.80
Male	233303	34.30
Female	223071	40.00

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	466213	54.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	3855	46.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	53182	78.50
Black, non-Hispanic	35906	38.40
Hispanic	232197	44.00
White, non-Hispanic	136445	68.80
Students with Disabilities	50718	29.10
Limited English Proficient	174533	44.90
Economically Disadvantaged	265718	43.20
Migrant	12873	37.60
Male	238027	54.50
Female	227462	55.50

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	464441	50.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	3834	44.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	53098	72.20
Black, non-Hispanic	35663	37.60
Hispanic	231239	36.30
White, non-Hispanic	135988	69.50
Students with Disabilities	48805	24.80
Limited English Proficient	173815	34.30
Economically Disadvantaged	264476	35.70
Migrant	12809	26.20
Male	236720	47.00
Female	227004	54.20

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	476156	48.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	4004	40.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	54188	73.20
Black, non-Hispanic	37662	31.70
Hispanic	233893	36.80
White, non-Hispanic	141871	63.40
Students with Disabilities	51695	22.30
Limited English Proficient	165117	35.90
Economically Disadvantaged	269995	36.10
Migrant	13175	29.60
Male	243232	48.40
Female	232141	49.00

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	474597	44.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	3985	39.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	54116	65.20
Black, non-Hispanic	37450	30.60
Hispanic	233082	29.70
White, non-Hispanic	141426	63.20
Students with Disabilities	50020	19.70
Limited English Proficient	164477	25.40
Economically Disadvantaged	268846	29.00
Migrant	13115	19.90
Male	242174	41.20
Female	231637	47.20

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	478812	42.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	3971	35.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	54677	67.40
Black, non-Hispanic	38953	24.00
Hispanic	232832	29.00
White, non-Hispanic	144196	58.70
Students with Disabilities	49725	15.70
Limited English Proficient	162180	26.40
Economically Disadvantaged	268297	28.80
Migrant	13435	23.80
Male	244764	42.50
Female	233295	41.80

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	478115	42.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	3969	38.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	54663	64.60
Black, non-Hispanic	38842	29.50
Hispanic	232435	27.00
White, non-Hispanic	144029	61.70
Students with Disabilities	48659	16.30
Limited English Proficient	161833	21.50
Economically Disadvantaged	267740	26.80
Migrant	13390	18.30
Male	244238	39.60
Female	233120	45.10

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	478871	41.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	3901	33.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	55750	67.60
Black, non-Hispanic	38932	22.60
Hispanic	228346	28.00
White, non-Hispanic	147355	57.90
Students with Disabilities	47178	14.10
Limited English Proficient	155835	25.20
Economically Disadvantaged	252640	28.20
Migrant	12658	24.70
Male	244941	41.70
Female	233075	41.40

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	478817	44.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	3904	38.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	55738	65.30
Black, non-Hispanic	38926	29.40
Hispanic	228223	29.30
White, non-Hispanic	147436	63.30
Students with Disabilities	46583	15.30
Limited English Proficient	155628	22.70
Economically Disadvantaged	252436	28.80
Migrant	12623	21.10
Male	244836	39.70
Female	233123	49.10

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	471389	35.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	3956	26.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	55661	61.90
Black, non-Hispanic	37870	18.60
Hispanic	218052	22.00
White, non-Hispanic	151637	48.90
Students with Disabilities	44471	12.70
Limited English Proficient	146733	20.80
Economically Disadvantaged	236507	22.60
Migrant	12215	20.50
Male	239996	35.10
Female	230572	35.40

Comments: The students with disabilities number is correct. I don't believe there is a big difference. Last years number should have been around 47,710.

Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	478525	42.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	4051	37.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	56166	60.50
Black, non-Hispanic	38746	27.40
Hispanic	221544	26.50
White, non-Hispanic	153657	61.50
Students with Disabilities	45627	14.60
Limited English Proficient	148791	18.10
Economically Disadvantaged	240379	25.90
Migrant	12411	18.40
Male	244100	38.10
Female	233560	46.20

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	478288	46.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	4345	40.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	58524	71.40
Black, non-Hispanic	39148	24.70
Hispanic	203326	31.30
White, non-Hispanic	163571	62.80
Students with Disabilities	44814	14.10
Limited English Proficient	128953	28.60
Economically Disadvantaged	203821	31.60
Migrant	10904	28.60
Male	240842	47.50
Female	232332	46.10

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	475697	51.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	4304	47.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	58534	67.20
Black, non-Hispanic	38709	34.40
Hispanic	201999	35.10
White, non-Hispanic	162856	69.30
Students with Disabilities	43139	16.60
Limited English Proficient	128284	25.50
Economically Disadvantaged	202521	33.70
Migrant	10845	24.20
Male	239537	45.80
Female	231071	56.80

Comments: Question 1.3 - All students that are tested do not receive a performance level. English Learners who have been enrolled in US schools less than 1 year count as tested, but are not assigned a performance level.

- 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	9553	6279	65.70

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	1034	651	63.00

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	6063	3584	59.10

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	961	603	62.70

Comments:

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.

To support an educational system that includes approximately 1,000 school districts, 8,900 schools, and 6.3 million students, the California Department of Education (CDE) has, out of necessity, adopted a multi-pronged approach to support schools identified for Program Improvement (PI), corrective action and restructuring.

There are over 6,000 schools in California that receive Title I funds. Because of California's high expectations for proficiency on its academic standards, 2,253 of these schools have been identified for PI status - California's equivalent to the federal School Improvement designation - in 2006-07. Considering these numbers, the CDE has increasingly focused its efforts on building the local capacity of school districts as a means of providing the essential technical assistance and support for these schools.

The CDE engages in the following measures to address the achievement challenges of these schools:

Development and maintenance of regulations, application review, and approval of supplemental educational service providers.

Coordination of written guidance and recommendations for schools identified for PI, corrective action, and restructuring schools subject to intervention under state reform initiatives. (A majority of Title I schools are also participants in a state school-reform initiative.)

Development and maintenance of State Board of Education standards, application review, and approval of providers of school assistance and intervention teams under the state school-reform initiative.

Development, publication, and training of district office and county office of education staffs in the use of state tools for assessing curricular, instructional, assessment, professional development, and data management needs of schools and student groups. (Copies of these tools are available on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/vl/#aps>.)

Development and training of districts with large numbers of schools identified for PI targeted by their number of years in PI and featuring examples and demonstrations of successful school practices occurring in other districts with large numbers of PI schools. (An annual state symposium entitled *On the Right Track* serves as a showcase of successful practices.)

In addition to state-approved providers, the CDE coordinates technical assistance with its educational partners, which include county offices of education, institutions of higher education, and an array of regional providers. These partners meet regularly to better align services, identify additional resources, and share effective practices across the state designed to help schools make Adequate Yearly Progress.

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.

California supports an educational system that includes approximately 1,000 school districts, 8,900 schools, and 6.3 million students. Considering these numbers, the California Department of Education has increasingly focused its efforts on building the capacity of its county offices of education to help districts in need of improvement (Program Improvement or "PI") or at risk of PI. The counties help districts identify and rectify the reasons they failed AYP and, using state-developed tools and protocols, build their capacity to support their PI schools. To address the achievement problems of these identified districts, the counties engage in the following measures by means of a regional delivery system to increase student achievement benchmarks:

1. Assist identified PI LEAs in their efforts to effectively and successfully meet the requirements of NCLB.
2. Assist LEAs as they address the needs of identified PI schools by providing trainings and technical assistance in the use of state-developed tools and recommended strategies.
3. Assist LEAs at risk of PI identification in the transferring of new knowledge and acquired skills to prevent PI designation.

In addition to fiscally supporting the work of the county offices, the California Department of Education provides funding for PI districts for up to two years in the amount of \$50,000 for each PI district plus \$10,000 for each school in the district.

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.	662
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. How many of these schools were charter schools?	
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.	12482
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.	1397283
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: Items 2, 6, and 7 are not collected.	

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.	1147
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	95731
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.	1174620

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: Item 4 is not collected

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	670618	574710	85.70
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	50785	43765	86.20
Low-Poverty Schools	44724	39545	88.40
All Elementary Schools	183955	161627	87.90
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	99636	79232	79.50
Low-Poverty Schools	128459	114865	89.40
All Secondary Schools	486663	413083	84.90
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	91.00
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	8.40
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.60
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	89.50
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	10.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.50
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments: Estimated distribution of noncompliant classes based on class level data will become official data with the 2006 data with continuing statewide database improvements.	

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	82.10	25.30
Poverty Metric Used	Percent of enrolled students eligible for the Free or Reduced Price Meals Program	
Secondary Schools	70.10	21.10
Poverty Metric Used	Percent of enrolled students eligible for the Free or Reduced Price Meals Program	

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	92.00

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

Education Code sections 60810 and 60811, enacted in 1997 by Assembly Bill 748, require that tests assessing the progress of English learners toward achieving English fluency be aligned with state standards for English-language development adopted by the State Board of Education. An advisory committee of state and national leaders assist in the development of the English-language development (ELD) standards. In July 1999, the California State Board of Education adopted the English Language Development Standards for California Public Schools - Kindergarten through grade Twelve. The ELD standards address four domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). The levels through which English learners progress are identified as beginning, early intermediate, early advanced, and advanced. For each ELD standard the summary indicates the English-language arts substrand associated with it.

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 California Department of Education, under the guidance of the Technical Advisory Group for the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), completed a preliminary study in June 2005, "ELD Standards Linkage and Test Alignment under Title III: A pilot study of the CELDT and the California ELD and content standards." The study was an initial attempt to systematically examine the relationships among the content of the CELDT, ELD Standards, and content-area standards through a review of the standards, curriculum documents, and tests using protocols specifically designed to highlight linkages and alignments.

The research questions were as follows:(1)To what degree are the state ELD standards linked to state academic content and achievement standards in order to ensure that English Learners attain the level or range of English language proficiency needed to facilitate progress in the content areas?(2) To what degree does the CELDT reflect the full range and depth of the ELD standards?(3) To what degree is each of the three protocols used in this pilot study effective in yielding evidence that will help states meet the requirements of the NCLB Act?(4)What considerations and refinements are needed, if any?

Independent consultants from WestEd and UCLA developed an approach appropriate to assessments of ELD to evaluate linkage and alignment based on research in the areas of education and applied linguistics. The alignment and linkage study was completed in June 2006.

For the purposes of the alignment and linkage study, linkage is defined as the relative correspondence between the ELD standards and content standards, and alignment is defined as the relative correspondence between the ELD standards and the ELD assessment. Ratability is defined as whether sufficient evidence exists in the items themselves to rate language demands.

The alignment and linkage study found that linkage was inconsistent across groups of standards. Most ELD and ELA standards were ratable (greater than 90%); however, only 13% to 38% of the math and science standards were ratable using both the standards themselves and accompanying frameworks documents. There were variable degrees of alignment between ELD standards and the CELDT depending on language demands and proficiency levels. Strongest alignment appeared in items in the reading and writing sections on the language-demand dimensions. Reading and speaking items generally showed moderate to strong alignment across sections of the test on all dimensions (i.e., ratability, modality, complexity, and language demands), especially in the lower two grade spans. Items in the writing sections were weakly aligned on the modality and complexity dimensions, and listening items showed the weakest alignment on all dimensions. The 6-8 grade span showed the weakest alignment of the four spans, especially on complexity and language-demands dimensions.

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 Yes

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

1. California law (Education Code sections 313, 60810, 60812) requires that all LEP students (those counted on the Language Census), kindergarten through grade twelve, be assessed annually for English language proficiency using the CELDT.

2. There have been no changes in ELP assessment in California since the original submission. California law requires that the CELDT be the test for ELP assessment. California does not use multiple assessments. In kindergarten and grade one, the CELDT assesses listening and speaking only as required by California law. Over the past two years, the California legislature failed to pass a bill that would add literacy skills in reading and writing for the testing of students in kindergarten and grade one. In grades two through twelve, the assessment addresses the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension. (Comprehension is evaluated through listening and reading.)

3. California's existing ELP assessment, the CELDT, is aligned with the state's English language proficiency standards. California is not developing a new or enhanced ELP assessment.

4. The reliability of the CELDT meets industry standards for a test of this length and content. The test contractor produces technical reports following each test administration year. See the Technical Reports for detailed information on reliability coefficients and standard errors of measurement. The validity of the test also meets industry standards. For more detailed information on the test development process see the Technical Reports. Technical Reports may be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/el/techreport.asp>

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2005-2006** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

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

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data													
2005-2006 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State													
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP (3)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency									
				Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (4)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (5)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (7)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5 (8)	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
California English Language Development Test	1326625	1571463	24.90	85560	6.40	178080	13.40	442360	33.30	433060	32.60	187565	14.10
Comments: The total number and percentage of students at the proficiency levels includes only those students who were previously identified as EL and who took the CELDT during the 2005-06 annual assessment window (July 1, 2005 to October 31, 2006). These figures do not include those who took the CELDT for initial identification purposes in 2005-06.													

(1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
 (2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
 (3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
 (4-8) In columns four-eight, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-8 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in

column 3.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
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	1341369	85.40
2. Vietnamese	34263	2.20
3. Cantonese	22756	1.40
4. Hmong	21907	1.40
5. Filipino (Pilipino or Tagalog)	20556	1.30
6. Korean	16091	1.00
7. Mandarin (Putonghua)	12452	0.80
8. All other non-English languages	11368	0.70
9. Punjabi	9138	0.60
10. Armenian	8655	0.60
Comments:		

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data**Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth****Definitions:**

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

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

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
255731	220624	288

Comments:

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

The number of immigrant students in California has decreased by 21,361 from 2004 to 2005. However, the number of immigrant students served by Title III immigrant programs has increased by 9,682 over the same time as more local educational agencies have requested assistance.

The largest immigrant group in California is from Mexico representing 59 percent of California's immigrant students in 2005. Other large groups of immigrants in California include those from the Philippines, El Salvador, China, and South Korea.

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

English language proficiency is defined as an Overall Proficiency Level of Early Advanced or above with no sub skills below Intermediate. Currently, the CELDT provides scores for the skill areas of listening and speaking, reading and writing as well as an overall score. The overall score for grades two through twelve is derived from weighting the skill areas as follows: 50% listening and speaking, 25% reading and 25% writing. Students in kindergarten and grade one are currently assessed in listening and speaking; therefore, their listening/speaking scores are the overall score.

The CELDT is being modified to comply with NCLB requirements for English language proficiency assessment. In 2005-06, (Form E), CDE added a comprehension score that is a valid and reliable measure of comprehension (understanding of written and oral language) as it relates to English proficiency. The score is designed to permit uses similar to those of existing CELDT scores, as stated in the California Education Code 60810(d) (to identify pupils who are limited English proficient, to determine the level of English language proficiency, and to assess the progress of pupils in acquiring English proficiency skills).

â€¢The comprehension score does not require any additional testing burden for schools or examinees.

â€¢The comprehension score combines results from the reading and listening sections of the CELDT, and will be reported as a combination.

â€¢The comprehension score supplements existing reporting and should not change procedures for computing or reporting the overall score (no double counting of items).

â€¢For the 05-06 year, reporting of the comprehension score should be described as a pilot. Based on the first year's experience, needed adjustments can be made for operational reporting in the second year. Use of the comprehension scores for Title III accountability would follow the second year of reporting.

The State Board of Education has established four reclassification criteria, based on Education Code Section 313(d), for school districts to use in reclassifying students from English learner to fluent English proficient. The Guidelines for Reclassification of English Learners are assessment of English proficiency, which in California is the CELDT; teacher evaluation of a student's academic performance, which can be based on the student's report card grades, grade point average, or other measure that school districts use to determine students' academic performance; parent opinion and consultation, which involves parents, if possible, in a discussion about their student's English proficiency and meeting the guidelines for reclassification; and a comparison of performance in basic skills, which should be based on results of the student's latest California English-Language Arts Standards Test.

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

The state has made no changes in the definition of making progress in AMAO 1 since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission for 2004-05. The annual growth targets are described in the Title III Accountability Report Information Guide available on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/acct.asp>.

There are three ways for English learners to meet the annual growth target on CELDT depending upon what level they were at on the previous CELDT. Those who were at the Beginning, Early Intermediate, and Intermediate level the prior year are expected to gain one proficiency level. Those at the Early Advanced or Advanced level overall who were not yet English proficient are expected to achieve the English proficient level on CELDT. That is, these students are expected to bring all of their subskills (Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking) up to the Intermediate level. Those students that were at the English proficient level the prior year are expected to maintain that level.

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

The state has not made changes in the definition of the cohorts for AMAOs 1 and 2 since the last Consolidated State Performance Report for 2004-05. Definitions of the cohorts are available in the 2004-05 Title III Accountability Information Guide on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/acct.asp>.

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? No

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	% 52.00	#	% 62.40	# 806260	% 31.40	#	% 40.30	# 247155

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.

Title III Accountability Reports are provided for those LEAs receiving Title III funding or those LEAs receiving Title III services through a consortium.

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	52.00	804255	62.40
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		485527	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	31.40	246301	40.30
TOTAL		1565675	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

Title III Subgrantee Information	
	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	876
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	756
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	764
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	653
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	568
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	189
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	843
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	33
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	104
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	179
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	Yes

Comments: The number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan is from the cohort of the Title III LEAs that did not meet AMAOs in 2003-04 and 2004-05.

* 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	837	10.70
4	1149	15.90
5	659	10.30
6	528	8.90
7	460	7.80
8	295	6.20
H.S.	1022	32.20

Comments:

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	2552	32.40
4	2139	29.80
5	1487	23.10
6	1050	17.60
7	963	16.50
8	788	16.50
H.S.	1306	40.90

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

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

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

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

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	85.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	81.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.20
Black, non-Hispanic	73.70
Hispanic	79.10
White, non-Hispanic	91.20
Students with Disabilities	61.20
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	82.50
Female	87.30

Comments: Not available for some subgroups. Will have for next year.
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 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	4.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.50
Black, non-Hispanic	5.50
Hispanic	4.00
White, non-Hispanic	2.00
Students with Disabilities	2.50
Limited English Proficient	5.40
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	2.00
Male	3.50
Female	2.70

Comments: Not available for Economically Disadvantaged.
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

A total of 180 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	1382	1225
LEAs with Subgrants	70	70

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	10683	6900
1	9827	7227
2	9270	6867
3	9293	6677
4	8999	6700
5	8748	6583
6	8075	5824
7	7268	5385
8	6759	4681
9	6619	4771
10	5668	3707
11	4400	2927
12	3628	2236

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	11483	7038
Doubled-up	63954	35935
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	2831	2587
Hotels/Motels	7438	4566
Unknown	13531	20359

Comments:

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

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

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

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	6122
1	6935
2	6463
3	6409
4	6218
5	5941
6	5520
7	4901
8	4357
9	4433
10	3454
11	2408
12	2025

Comments: State Coordinators were also asked to collect data for the number of identified homeless students served by subgrants in grade level Pre-K and Other (i.e., Adult Education.) California's subgrants reported 4305 Pre-K served and 485 Other.

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

2608

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

1501

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)

2192

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)	5566
English Language Learners (ELL)	17336
Gifted and Talented	1773
Vocational Education	654

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	61
Expedited evaluations	48
Staff professional development and awareness	70
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	70
Transportation	68
Early childhood programs	49
Assistance with participation in school programs	68
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	62
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	66
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	68
Coordination between schools and agencies	69
Counseling	52
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	57
Clothing to meet a school requirement	69
School supplies	70
Referral to other programs and services	69
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	57
Other (optional)	27

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	23
School selection	25
Transportation	44
School records	28
Immunizations or other medical records	23
Other enrollment issues	15

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
Affordable Housing	7
Homeless Awareness among staff	10
Lack of parental educational commitment and understanding	6

Comments: Subgrants listed 24 more barriers that they faced during the 2005-06 school year.

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	4722	1016
Grade 4	Yes	4749	1378
Grade 5	Yes	4682	1213
Grade 6	Yes	4376	923
Grade 7	Yes	3516	814
Grade 8	Yes	3207	661
Grade 9	Yes	2543	503
Grade 10	Yes	1819	285
Grade 11	Yes	1357	265
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

Comments: 4 out of 70 subgrants are High School Districts, 11 out of 70 subgrants are Elementary School Districts, and 16 out of the 70 subgrants are county offices of education. This information effects the data collection.

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	4681	1766
Grade 4	Yes	4728	1731
Grade 5	Yes	4672	1397
Grade 6	Yes	4370	988
Grade 7	Yes	3501	760
Grade 8	Yes	3128	542
Grade 9	Yes	2475	235
Grade 10	Yes	1564	124
Grade 11	Yes	1090	89
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

Comments: Also, some subgrants were not able to obtain any of this data (DNA), and the State Coordinator is not able to report that information.

* 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.