

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



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

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2005-2006

Part II, 2005-2006

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

Address:
165 Capitol Ave.
Hartford, CT

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Barbara Westwater
Telephone: 860-713-6707
Fax: 860-713-7018
e-mail: barbara.westwater@ct.org

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

Signature

Thursday, March 01, 2007, 1:48:33 PM
Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

The State Board of Education, in October 2004, formally approved academic content standards for all students in science. The standards are specific for each grade level, Grades PK-8; and high school standards describe course content in physical sciences, Earth science, biology and related technologies.

The Science Framework describes a coherent, progressive development of essential concepts and skills for Grades PK-12. Correlated to rigorous content standards and abilities described in the National Science Education Standards (NRC, 1996) and Benchmarks for Science Literacy (AAAS, 1993), the framework describes the major science concepts, principles and reasoning skills that all students in Connecticut schools should acquire to become scientifically literate citizens. Critical thinking, problem solving and inquiry process skills are included as an important means for developing deep understanding of science content. Conceptual connections are drawn across life, physical and Earth sciences, and concepts are learned within an applied context of global issues and modern technologies. Further, the framework calls for students to apply language arts and mathematics skills in order to deepen their science knowledge.

The process for the development of the Science Framework involved a range of education stakeholders who served on writing and review committees from October 2002 to October 2004. Writing and review committees were formed with the following representation:

science educators (teachers, district curriculum coordinators, science department chairs, university teacher educators);
corporate scientists;
university science faculty;
national science education experts;
special education teachers;
early childhood education experts;
English language learning experts;
parents;
local education agency administrators;
informal science educators (museums, nature centers, aquariums, etc.); and
professional organizations (CT Academy for Science Education, Project to increase Mastery of Mathematics and Science, CT Science Teachers Association, CT Science Supervisors Association).

Educators in Connecticut were invited to review the draft framework posted on the state's website from November 2003 through April 2004 and to complete a feedback form. Over 350 feedback forms were received, input was analyzed, and revisions were incorporated to create the second draft of the framework that was presented to the State Board of Education in September 2004. Their suggested edits were incorporated into the final edition which was approved in October 2004.

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

Connecticut has more than a two decade history of assessing and reporting on student academic performance and is committed to developing and administering assessments that are valuable to school staff for instructional decision-making, planning and accountability. The state has developed and adopted a set of challenging grade-level academic achievement standards for reading/language arts and mathematics for students in Grades 3-8 who take the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) (science is ready for 2008 administration in Grades 5 and 8), and for students in Grade 10 who take the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) in reading/language arts, mathematics and science. These assessments are administered to all students except those with the most significant cognitive impairments. English language learners (ELL) who have attended schools in the United States for less than one school year are not required to take the language arts assessment. Connecticut has developed an Alternate Assessment for the state's most significantly cognitively impaired students in Grades 3-8 and Grade 10, based on alternate achievement standards but linked to grade-level content standards for reading, writing and mathematics. Grade-level performance level descriptors have been developed for five achievement levels for the CMT and CAPT and for three levels for the Alternate Assessment.

Connecticut's CMT and CAPT have been purposefully designed to measure the extent to which the state's students have mastered the reading/language arts, mathematics and science content standards delineated in the state's Curriculum Frameworks and new generations of the tests reflect higher expectations. Work to align the state's assessments with content standards begins with the creation of the Test Blueprint and Test Specifications, which involves staff from Assessment and Curriculum along with a range of stakeholders. Content knowledgeable teachers and administrators are involved in committees to develop approximately 20 percent of the test items, along with reviewing all pilot test items for content appropriateness, depth and breadth of curricular coverage and non-bias. An independent alignment study was conducted for mathematics and reading/language arts in January 2006 for the CMT, CAPT and Alternate Assessment. A content validation study was conducted in September 2006. An alignment study for science will be conducted in 2007-08.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

The CMT and CAPT are criterion referenced tests. The CMT was first administered in the fall of 1985 and the first form of the Fourth Generation (CMT4) was administered in the spring of 2006. The CAPT was first administered in the spring of 1994 and the first form of the Third Generation (CAPT3) will be administered in spring 2007. The initial development of these programs included defining performance level descriptors and establishing cut scores, the score values dividing academic achievement levels. As the testing program matured through the various generations of the CMT and CAPT, cut scores were adjusted, when appropriate, to reflect new standards and descriptors were revised accordingly. The descriptors have been a component of parent and student reports over the history of CMT and CAPT. The descriptors will be revised to identify outcomes based on content standards once the initial forms of the new generation of each test are pulled and pilot data is examined for those forms and reviewed by a committee of stakeholders. The descriptors will be finalized after the administration of the first operational form and review of census data.

Connecticut currently reports student academic performance on the CMT and CAPT by grade and content area tested in a hierarchy of five performance levels which the state identifies as: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Goal and Advanced. The performance levels for the Alternate Assessment are: Basic, Proficient and Independent. Descriptors on the student and parent reports for each generation of the CMT, CAPT and Alternate Assessment describe what students who score in each level know and can do relative to grade level content.

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	304416	99.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1048	99.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	10613	99.50
Black, non-Hispanic	41509	98.20
Hispanic	45836	97.90
White, non-Hispanic	205140	99.60
Students with Disabilities	37227	98.10
Limited English Proficient	15116	98.10
Economically Disadvantaged	85838	98.30
Migrant	969	98.40
Male	155940	99.00
Female	148236	99.30

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	303849	99.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	1043	98.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	10600	99.40
Black, non-Hispanic	41467	98.10
Hispanic	45698	97.60
White, non-Hispanic	205041	99.60
Students with Disabilities	37148	97.90
Limited English Proficient	15019	97.40
Economically Disadvantaged	85658	98.10
Migrant	966	98.10
Male	155780	98.90
Female	148099	99.20

Comments:

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

1.2.2 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	34747	98.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	2480	100.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.00

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	34668	97.70
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	2480	100.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.00

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	42212	77.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	157	64.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	1664	90.40
Black, non-Hispanic	5884	55.90
Hispanic	6918	57.60
White, non-Hispanic	27589	86.80
Students with Disabilities	4809	43.60
Limited English Proficient	3013	52.50
Economically Disadvantaged	13089	57.70
Migrant	194	54.10
Male	21608	78.10
Female	20607	77.60

Comments:

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	42174	68.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	156	64.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1661	78.80
Black, non-Hispanic	5876	43.30
Hispanic	6891	40.60
White, non-Hispanic	27590	80.20
Students with Disabilities	4807	26.80
Limited English Proficient	2995	30.30
Economically Disadvantaged	13058	41.90
Migrant	195	41.00
Male	21584	66.20
Female	20593	71.10

Comments:

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	42986	79.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	155	69.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1631	91.40
Black, non-Hispanic	5774	56.70
Hispanic	6632	59.90
White, non-Hispanic	28794	88.20
Students with Disabilities	5315	44.30
Limited English Proficient	2663	53.60
Economically Disadvantaged	12806	59.50
Migrant	165	51.50
Male	22119	79.60
Female	20872	79.90

Comments: The numbers reported for this year are accurate; they reflect the continued increase in the participation rate on the state assessments.

- 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	42904	71.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	156	62.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1628	81.80
Black, non-Hispanic	5755	47.20
Hispanic	6601	43.90
White, non-Hispanic	28764	81.50
Students with Disabilities	5281	27.60
Limited English Proficient	2637	30.00
Economically Disadvantaged	12761	45.00
Migrant	164	41.40
Male	22066	68.50
Female	20844	73.90

Comments: The numbers reported for this year are accurate; they reflect the continued increase in the participation rate on the state assessments.

- 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	42747	80.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	137	76.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1616	92.10
Black, non-Hispanic	5701	58.00
Hispanic	6593	60.50
White, non-Hispanic	28700	88.50
Students with Disabilities	5532	40.50
Limited English Proficient	2222	51.00
Economically Disadvantaged	12555	60.70
Migrant	192	62.50
Male	21971	79.70
Female	20782	80.90

Comments:

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	42729	72.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	136	58.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1615	83.40
Black, non-Hispanic	5704	45.90
Hispanic	6582	45.30
White, non-Hispanic	28692	82.90
Students with Disabilities	5527	28.90
Limited English Proficient	2204	27.90
Economically Disadvantaged	12540	46.00
Migrant	192	45.80
Male	21954	69.60
Female	20781	74.90

Comments:

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	43658	79.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	157	69.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	1524	91.70
Black, non-Hispanic	6023	55.40
Hispanic	6628	57.40
White, non-Hispanic	29326	88.20
Students with Disabilities	5539	37.10
Limited English Proficient	1973	41.40
Economically Disadvantaged	12791	57.40
Migrant	128	34.40
Male	22426	78.00
Female	21234	80.40

Comments: The numbers reported for this year are accurate; they reflect the continued increase in the participation rate on the state assessments.

- 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	43609	74.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	156	72.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	1525	85.10
Black, non-Hispanic	6005	51.90
Hispanic	6610	48.10
White, non-Hispanic	29313	84.70
Students with Disabilities	5532	30.20
Limited English Proficient	1964	24.70
Economically Disadvantaged	12762	49.70
Migrant	128	21.90
Male	22407	71.80
Female	21204	77.80

Comments: The numbers reported for this year are accurate; they reflect the continued increase in the participation rate on the state assessments.

- 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	44506	77.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	138	72.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1387	91.10
Black, non-Hispanic	6147	51.20
Hispanic	6759	51.50
White, non-Hispanic	30075	87.50
Students with Disabilities	5527	34.20
Limited English Proficient	1876	33.10
Economically Disadvantaged	12585	53.40
Migrant	101	29.70
Male	22818	76.70
Female	21693	77.70

Comments:

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	44435	75.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	136	65.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1382	86.80
Black, non-Hispanic	6147	52.70
Hispanic	6718	49.00
White, non-Hispanic	30052	85.90
Students with Disabilities	5495	31.80
Limited English Proficient	1846	23.60
Economically Disadvantaged	12547	51.40
Migrant	98	21.40
Male	22777	72.30
Female	21664	79.40

Comments:

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	44632	78.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	143	75.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1452	91.90
Black, non-Hispanic	6169	52.00
Hispanic	6622	53.10
White, non-Hispanic	30246	88.20
Students with Disabilities	5474	35.60
Limited English Proficient	1757	39.70
Economically Disadvantaged	12261	54.10
Migrant	98	37.10
Male	22908	77.50
Female	21731	78.90

Comments: The numbers reported for this year are accurate; they reflect the continued increase in the participation rate on the state assessments.

- 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	44565	75.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	141	70.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1449	86.10
Black, non-Hispanic	6160	52.00
Hispanic	6599	49.70
White, non-Hispanic	30216	85.90
Students with Disabilities	5445	33.00
Limited English Proficient	1748	24.10
Economically Disadvantaged	12229	51.00
Migrant	98	21.40
Male	22863	73.10
Female	21708	78.80

Comments: The numbers reported for this year are accurate; they reflect the continued increase in the participation rate on the state assessments.

- 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	43405	76.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	67.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1339	88.50
Black, non-Hispanic	5811	44.40
Hispanic	5684	49.30
White, non-Hispanic	30410	87.10
Students with Disabilities	5031	35.60
Limited English Proficient	1612	39.80
Economically Disadvantaged	9751	49.50
Migrant	91	26.40
Male	22090	76.20
Female	21317	75.90

Comments: The numbers reported for this year are accurate; they reflect the continued increase in the participation rate on the state assessments.

- 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	43433	78.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	162	68.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1340	86.00
Black, non-Hispanic	5820	55.30
Hispanic	5697	54.90
White, non-Hispanic	30414	86.50
Students with Disabilities	5061	35.40
Limited English Proficient	1625	37.20
Economically Disadvantaged	9761	55.10
Migrant	90	23.30
Male	22129	72.30
Female	21305	83.30

Comments: The numbers reported for this year are accurate; they reflect the continued increase in the participation rate on the state assessments.

- 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	989	656	66.30

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	171	139	81.30

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	479	269	56.20

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	141	111	78.70

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.

As part of Connecticut's Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI), personnel from schools identified for improvement, corrective action and restructuring, along with personnel from their respective central offices, are offered basic and certification training in Data-Driven Decision-Making/Data Teams (DDDM/DT): using district and school data for analyzing, setting goals and implementing research-based strategies for improved instruction; Making Standards Work (MSW): aligning school and district assessment and instruction, and developing classroom-based assessments to monitor student progress; and Effective Teaching Strategies (ETS): examining effective ways to deliver effective instruction using Dr. Marzano's nine research-based strategies. Basic training is provided to school personnel in Title I schools identified as being in need of improvement by consultants from Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs), the State Education Resource Center (SERC) and the Center for Performance Assessment (CPA) in the areas of DDDM/DT, MSW and ETS. Certification training was provided by CPA in each area. Currently, the state has 187 DDDM/DT Certified Trainers, 165 MSW Certified Trainers and 82 ETS Certified Trainers.

A RESC/SERC alliance was established to provide schools identified as in need of improvement with technical assistance and in-depth training. RESC/SERC Certified Trainers worked on-site in these schools to provide customized training and support. The certified trainers provided 482 days of technical assistance during the 2005-06 school year.

An executive coaching and technical assistance model was developed to provide support and improve the skills of leaders in low-performing schools. Three highly successful retired principals of urban schools were hired and trained in executive coaching skills and provided support and technical assistance to leaders in eight of the lowest performing schools in Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport.

Schools in corrective action and restructuring are required to have a school status assessment (SSA) conducted by an independent organization with experience in conducting such assessments and in assisting districts to restructure schools. The purpose of the SSA for schools in corrective action is to support schools in accelerating their improvement process and to ultimately become self-reflective improving organizations. The outcomes from an external assessment process will provide detailed information regarding the school's strengths and needs. The school is then able to use this information for the development and refinement of the school improvement plan, and the district is able to use the information as a foundation for planning for restructuring, if needed. The purpose of the updated SSA for schools in restructuring is to provide an update on the impact the school's restructuring plan and the school's improvement plan are having on the learning and development of all students.

Schools in corrective action and restructuring are required to submit a corrective action addendum or restructuring plan to the CSDE for feedback.

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.

Connecticut had no districts in corrective action. For districts in need of improvement, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) has developed and implemented a comprehensive accountability initiative to accelerate the learning of all students, with special emphasis placed on districts with Title I schools that have been identified as "in need of improvement," according to the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

This accountability initiative is based on the findings of nationally recognized researchers including Dr. Douglas Reeves, Dr. Michael Schmoker, Dr. Robert Marzano, Dr. Richard Elmore, Dr. John Simpson and others. Their work provides evidence that schools with student populations with high rates of poverty and high percentages of ethnic minorities can achieve high academic performance. Common characteristics of these high-achieving schools include:

clear focus on achievement;

standards-based curriculum that emphasizes the core subject areas of

reading, math and writing;

frequent assessment of student progress and multiple opportunities for student improvement;

an emphasis on non-fiction writing; and

collaborative scoring of student work.

(Reeves, 2003).

The goal of the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI) is twofold:

1. to develop and implement a systemic and sustainable initiative of district and school improvement that focuses on accountability for student learning to accelerate the closing of Connecticut's achievement gap through district-level reform; and

2. to meet state requirements of Part A, Section 1116, "Academic Assessment and Local Educational Agency School Improvement" and Section 1117, "School Support and Recognition" of NCLB.

This comprehensive improvement initiative:

focuses on the district as the primary change agent;

targets raising student achievement levels in reading and math for all students;

creates a culture of professional learning communities;

builds leadership and training capacity within the state; and
differentiates support based on individual district and school needs.

To advance this work, the CSDE partnered with two entities, The Stupski Foundation and The Center for Performance Assessment (CPA), whose philosophy and approach are well aligned with Connecticut's vision of student achievement. These organizations have taken national leadership roles and have documented success in transforming urban districts with low-performing schools. Through this partnership, the Department is providing district- and school-level support and technical assistance in key areas, which research has shown is essential to implement a results-based district accountability system. These areas focus on:

Data-Driven Decision-Making/Data Teams (DDDM/DT): using district and school data for analysis, goal setting and implementing research-based strategies for improved instruction;

Making Standards Work (MSW): aligning school and district assessment and instruction, and developing classroom-based assessments to monitor student progress;

Effective Teaching Strategies (ETS): examining effective ways to write thorough lesson plans and deliver effective instruction using Dr. Marzano's nine research-based strategies; and

Accountability in District and School Improvement Planning: creating a framework for a new accountability system.

Summary of Work 2005-2006:

Basic training in the areas of DDDM/DT, MSW and ETS was provided to school and district personnel in title I schools and districts identified as being in need of improvement. Consultants from Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs), the State Education Resource Center (SERC) and the Center for Performance Assessment (CPA) provided the training. Certification training was provided by CPS in each area. Currently, the state has 187 DDDM/DT Certified

Trainers, 165 MSW Certified Trainers and 82 ETS Certified Trainers.

The CSDE has continued to build partnerships with Connecticut organizations that provide ongoing, focused professional development to support the goals of the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative. These organizations include, but are not limited to, Connecticut Association of Schools, Connecticut Association of Boards of Education, Center for School Change, SERC, Connecticut Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, RESCs and Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents.

Two district cohorts of leadership teams met regularly throughout the year

with CSDE consultants and CPA consultants to develop district improvement/accountability plans. The purpose of the cohorts has been to help districts develop plans with clear measurable goals and targets, with high leverage strategies to close achievement gaps and a clear method to monitor implementation and results on a frequent basis. Follow-up, on-site technical assistance was provided to these districts.

The Stupski Foundation trained state consultants and other state educational leaders to conduct district organizational assessments so that the Department will have the capacity to offer this support to districts identified for improvement. This organizational assessment is based on the Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence and is designed to help districts identify their strengths, their opportunities for improvement and to measure the organization's growth over time. The assessment encompasses seven components: leadership; strategic planning; curriculum and instruction; stakeholder focus and engagement; capacity building/professional learning; effective and efficient systems and processes; and accountability and organization results. These components are assessed through data and document review, interviews and information comparison. At the districts' request, organizational assessments were conducted in four districts during the 2005-06 school year.

The CSDE held the first annual statewide Data Showcase in April 2006. Four hundred educators from districts and schools across the state attended this conference. Student achievement data was displayed on science fair boards and served as the centerpiece for knowledge sharing and professional dialogue. The conference was an overwhelming success and provided an opportunity for educators to talk about district and school successes, struggles and strategies for continuous improvement of student achievement.

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.	104
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.	64
How many of these schools were charter schools?	3
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	697
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.	65264
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.	0
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.	0
Comments: #6 - Data not available	
#7 - Data not available	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	80
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	1402
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.	44869
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.	0
Comments: #4. Not Available	

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	128318	124208	96.80
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	11233	10675	95.00
Low-Poverty Schools	10744	10618	98.80
All Elementary Schools	39221	38322	97.70
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	15692	14476	92.30
Low-Poverty Schools	24754	24218	97.80
All Secondary Schools	90012	86780	96.40

Comments: The total number of core academic classes includes teachers reported from LEA's central offices and special programs who work in an itinerant capacity. These teachers are not classified specifically as elementary or secondary teachers. Therefore, the sum of only elementary and secondary schools will be less than the state total since it does not include those teachers working out of central office or in special programs. The large discrepancy between 2004-05 and 2005-06 data is due to the fact that CSDE reported full-time equivalent (FTE) data in 2004-05, and was able to report classroom level data for the first time in 2005-06.

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	18.00
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	42.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	40.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	23.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	9.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	68.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	50.00	5.40
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals	
Secondary Schools	41.70	5.60
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals	

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	89.20

Comments: *The CSDE cannot exclude paraprofessionals who are solely translators and parental involvement assistants using its current data collection methodology. The design of the collection has been changed for 2006-2007 in order to exclude translators and parental involvement assistants.

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

The ELP standards, referred to as the English Language Learner Framework, were developed by a committee which was comprised of administrators, teachers and higher education faculty many of whom were members of the professional organization the Connecticut Administrators of Programs for English Language Learners (CAPELL). There were CSDE representatives including the English language learner consultant, the language arts consultant, an assessment consultant, the Bureau Chief of Curriculum and Instruction and the Associate Commissioner for the Division of Teaching, Learning and Assessment. The framework has a strong literacy component and contains academic language indicators that will ensure LEP students possess the ability to access all other content areas. The frameworks were posted on the State Department of Education web-site for public comments. Comments were received from mainstream educators, administrators and ESL/Bilingual professionals. A subcommittee of the original ELP standards committee was formed and met to review the comments that were received. A summary was compiled of each comment and recommendation that was made. In addition, feedback was received when the state ELL/Bilingual Consultant provided professional development to a variety of groups throughout the state and also, when a presentation on the English Language Learner Framework was made to the Connecticut Association of Supervision and Curriculum. The committee reviewed all the responses and incorporated many of the suggestions. The English Language Learner (ELL) Framework was officially adopted by the State Board of Education in October 2005.

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 original framework committee membership had representation from many professionals in the educational community. A language arts consultant and the ELL/Bilingual education consultant served for the entire duration of this committee to ensure that the frameworks were aligned with the state academic content standards in English language arts/reading, mathematics and science. These content area consultants provide ongoing supports and input and guidance to the ELL consultant to ensure the alignment exists. There are links to these other academic frameworks within the ELL frameworks. There is also a web link to the ELL frameworks in the math/science frameworks.

A new committee has been formed in September 2006 to continue to re-examine the English Language Learner Framework and its indicators and review its alignment to the CT academic frameworks. Model examples for use by mainstream teachers will be developed in math and science to demonstrate alignment between the ELL frameworks and the academic frameworks. A continued roll-out plan to districts will also be developed for the coming year.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

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

- An independent alignment study Yes
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

1. The CSDE sent out letters to superintendents of all LEAs and to the English

as a Second Language contacts throughout the state advising them of the

Connecticut State Board of Education's adoption of the revised language

Assessment Scales now called the LAS Links and that districts are required

to annually assess all English language learners, K-12 to determine their

progress in English language acquisition using the revised LAS Links.

2. Statewide training was provided introducing the LAS Links. The training

sessions also included training in scoring. Ten sessions were offered in

different regions of the state. A CTB/McGraw-Hill representative and

trainer were present along with a state consultant for all sessions to

ensure that all questions were answered. Assessment and scoring for all

five domains including listening, speaking, reading, writing and

comprehension were reviewed.

3. CTB/McGraw-Hill compared the English Language Learner Frameworks to the LAS

Links. The results of the review indicate that the indicators within the

frameworks are aligned with the LAS Links.

4. The technical quality of the LAS Links has been reviewed by CTB/McGraw-

Hill. The state consultant went to CA to the CTB headquarters to review and

recommend appropriate cut scores for the proficiency levels. These were

adopted by CTB. Two representatives from CT school districts also went to CA to review and recommend appropriate cut scores for the proficiency levels based on the definitions.

5. CTB representatives work closely with districts and the state department.

They will be presenting at the first CAPELL meeting to update individuals on the LAS Links and respond to questions as the state moves forward using this protocol for the annual assessment.

6. The Connecticut State Department of Education will continue to offer training to new teachers and additional training to veteran administrators of this assessment tool in the area of scoring to ensure inter-rater reliability.

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)	
				#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
LAS Links English Language Proficiency Assessment	0	27678	4.90	4873	18.10	4133	15.30	7123	26.40	9185	34.00	1667	6.20

Comments: CT doesn't require that specific assessment instruments be used for identifying LEP students and does not collect the results of the initial assessment. Thus the information reported in this table reflects the LEP population at the time of the annual spring assessment. The sum of the counts in columns 4-8 is less than the count in column 3 for the following reason. Column 3 shows the count of students who were already identified as LEP at the time of the spring assessment. The information in columns 4-8 is the performance of those students on the spring assessment. CT's test has multiple parts and it is possible for one or more parts of a student's test to be missing or invalid. Common reasons for this are student mobility and extended absences. All parts of the test are need to determine proficiency so LEP students with incomplete test scores are not counted in columns 4-8.

(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	20741	69.70
2. Portuguese	1258	4.20
3. Polish	821	2.80
4. Chinese	694	2.30
5. Haitian Creole	595	2.00
6. Albanian	586	2.00
7. Vietnamese	431	1.50
8. Serbo-Croatian	430	1.50
9. Arabic	372	1.30
10. Urdu	360	1.20
Comments:		

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

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

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

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
15813	2693	12

Comments:

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

No major changes have occurred.

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

The Connecticut State Department of Education has submitted an amendment to the Consolidated State Plan of September 2003 in a letter to Raymond Simon on May 19, 2006, and an additional copy was sent to Kathleen Leos on September 22, 2006. We are awaiting a response.

An Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) Committee was established in September 2005 and meets quarterly. The members of this committee are representatives from the professional ESL field and are working with state consultants to implement the requirements of Title III under NCLB. Previously, input was sought from the organization, The Connecticut Administrators of Programs for English Language Learners (CAPELL), and a subcommittee of CAPELL comprises the AMAO Committee. The Department has taken the suggestions and comments from the AMAO Committee and drafted the amendment that was submitted in the May 2006 letter. This committee will continue to meet and analyze student data and use the information to inform instruction for ELL in CT.

The English language proficiency assessment being used is the revised LAS now referred to as LAS Links. The State Board of Education adopted this test as the ELP annual assessment for LEP students in CT. The test was chosen to allow for the assessment of listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension. The State Board of Education has also adopted the definition of proficient in English as a student who achieves an overall proficiency score of 4 or 5. A student who attains an overall composite score of a 4 or 5 on the LAS Links communicates effectively in English across a range of grade-level appropriate demands in the school context. The student will exhibit productive and receptive control of lexical, syntactic, phonological and discourse features when addressing new and familiar topics. The amendment officially proposes using the proficiency level of a 4 or 5 in CT. The cut scores are those recommended by the publisher.

Other criteria considered prior to deeming a student as meeting the English mastery standard include: scoring at grade level on the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) for Grades K-2; scoring at the proficient level or above on the mathematics and reading subtests and at the basic level on the writing subtest of the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) for students in Grades 3-9. For students 10-12 the student must score at or above the basic level in reading, writing and mathematics as measured by the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT).

Details regarding proficiency and progress have been included in the amendment request sent to Raymond Simon. CT proposes that students who achieve an overall proficiency score in the Level 4 or 5 range be considered proficient. The state is also proposing the calculation of the percent proficient be revised to include only students who have had three years or more of English language services or who, in the previous year, obtained an overall proficiency level at least mid-way in the Level 3 (Intermediate) overall proficiency range.

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 LAS Links has a 5-level scale for listening, speaking reading, writing, comprehension, oral and overall proficiency scores. Making progress for purposes of AMAOs will be defined as increasing the scale score in one or more of the areas.

For each domain, a raw score is converted to a scale score. LAS Links provides both a common and vertical scale. Progress can be monitored within a grade level as a student grows in proficiency and across grade levels as students improve over a period of years.

CT revised its data collection system for English language learners in a manner that will allow the state to gather more specific and discrete data. The state will be able to take into account how long students have been receiving English language services when data are collected. We have assigned a unique state-assigned student identification number which will allow the state to track students who change school districts. The state will define progress as an increased scale score in any of the four skill areas: listening, speaking, reading or writing to give a much more sensitive measure. The state plans on reviewing current targets after two years of LAS Links data are collected.

The state will assess progress by comparing oral, reading and writing scores with previous year's scores. Progress will be defined as an increase in any of the three areas. The AMAO Committee will continue to work with the state as this process moves forward and will also help to analyze student data to inform instruction.

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

In the past, it was not possible to track the length of time that an LEP student was in a program. The state did not have a student identification number. The state has developed a system that will allow for data to be collected with a unique state-assigned student identification number. This will allow the state in subsequent years to track students who change school districts. The state will also be collecting the date the student began to receive English language services in a district. These new elements in the state data collection system will allow for noting progress more efficiently from year to year.

The state has proposed that calculation of the percent proficient will be revised to include, in the analysis only, students who have had three years or more of English language services or those who, for the previous year, obtained an overall proficiency level at least mid-way in the level 3 (intermediate) overall proficiency range.

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								

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.

All LEP students are tested annually with the same assessment tool (LAS Links). The non-Title III districts are not held to the progress and proficiency percentage targets established by the state for accountability purposes. The state uses the same definition of progress and proficiency for all LEP students. All LEP scores are reported to the state including the scores for non-Title III students. The results are listed in the following table:

Actual Percent and Actual Percent and
 Number of ALL LEP Number of ALL LEP
 Students in the State Who Students in the State Who
 English Language Made Progress in Attained English
 Proficiency Learning English Proficiency
 Percent Number Percent Number
 2005-2006 School Year 67.12 11,011 40.22 10,852

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	64.00	10896	67.10
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		5336	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	16.00	10662	40.20
TOTAL		26894	

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	49
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	34
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	49
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	16
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	12
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	26
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	11
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	17
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	15
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments:

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

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

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

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

Comments: CT cannot report on monitored students this year. Up to this point, we have not had a system in place that would allow us to reliably track individual students, and follow them after they have exited Title III services. Students now have state-assigned identification numbers that will, beginning in spring 2007, allow us to track students from year-to-year, and to relate information about their LEP status to their performance on the state language arts and mathematics tests.

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

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

Comments: CT cannot report on monitored students this year. Up to this point, we have not had a system in place that would allow us to reliably track individual students, and follow them after they have exited Title III services. Students now have state-assigned identification numbers that will, beginning in spring 2007, allow us to track students from year-to-year, and to relate information about their LEP status to their performance on the state language arts and mathematics tests.

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	91.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	87.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	94.10
Black, non-Hispanic	87.30
Hispanic	82.40
White, non-Hispanic	93.30
Students with Disabilities	0.00
Limited English Proficient	0.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	89.70
Female	93.00

Comments: Beginning in school year 2006-07, Connecticut will begin using individual student data in its calculation of a graduation rate. In the fall of 2010, we will be able to calculate a graduation rate for the required sub-groups using individual student data.

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

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

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

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	1.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.10
Black, non-Hispanic	2.80
Hispanic	4.00
White, non-Hispanic	1.10
Students with Disabilities	5.60
Limited English Proficient	3.80
Economically Disadvantaged	3.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	2.00
Female	1.40

Comments: CT's electronic data collection form currently does not contain the migrant information for the year 2004-05. However, in 2005-06 CSDE will program the data collection to obtain the migrant information.
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.

1.9.1.1 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

In Connecticut, the fiscal and school year commences July 1 and ends June 30. Each school district provides in each school year no less than 180 days of actual school sessions for Grades K-12.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	167	63
LEAs with Subgrants	15	15

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	85	167
1	65	145
2	54	152
3	36	122
4	43	122
5	33	124
6	<n	118
7	33	99
8	46	110
9	23	124
10	21	90
11	<n	92
12	<n	86

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	183	778
Doubled-up	171	469
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	<n	34
Hotels/Motels	59	35
Unknown	65	235

Comments:

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

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	171
1	139
2	138
3	106
4	96
5	100
6	99
7	99
8	108
9	115
10	85
11	80
12	65

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

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

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

47

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

218

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)

32

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)	122
English Language Learners (ELL)	40
Gifted and Talented	<n
Vocational Education	<n

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	11
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	6
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	11
Transportation	12
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	10
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	7
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	11
Coordination between schools and agencies	12
Counseling	8
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	7
Clothing to meet a school requirement	10
School supplies	13
Referral to other programs and services	11
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional)	2

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School selection	2
Transportation	4
School records	4
Immunizations or other medical records	3
Other enrollment issues	4

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
Transportation for preschoolers	1
Shelters not informing schools when students leave	1
Lack of cooperation by another school district re: transportation	1

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

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

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	24	<n
Grade 4	Yes	43	20
Grade 5	Yes	28	<n
Grade 6	Yes	25	<n
Grade 7	Yes	20	<n
Grade 8	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 11	N/A	0	0
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	25	<n
Grade 4	Yes	42	22
Grade 5	Yes	28	<n
Grade 6	Yes	24	<n
Grade 7	Yes	20	<n
Grade 8	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 11	N/A	0	0
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

Comments:

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