

**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:
Iowa Department of Education

Address:
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Del Hoover
Telephone: 515-281-8402
Fax: 515-281-7700
e-mail: del.hoover@iowa.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Judy Jeffrey

Signature Tuesday, February 27, 2007, 3:26:29 PM
Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

Section 281 of the Iowa Administrative Code, Chapter 12, Division 8 (1)"c"(2) places the responsibility for the development of content standards and benchmarks with local district school boards:

(2) Content standards and benchmarks. The board shall adopt clear, rigorous, and challenging content standards and benchmarks in reading, mathematics, and science to guide the learning of students from the date of school entrance until high school graduation. Standards and benchmarks may be adopted for other curriculum areas defined in 281 - Chapter 12, Division V. The comprehensive school improvement plan submitted to the department shall contain, at a minimum, content standards for reading, mathematics, and science. The educational program as defined in 281 - Chapter 12, Division II, shall incorporate career education, multicultural and gender fair education, technology integration, global education, higher-order thinking skills, learning skills, and communication skills as outlined in subrules 12.5(7), 12.5(8), 12.5(10), and 12.5(11), and subparagraph 12,8(1)"c"(1). Local school districts also have received guidance regarding their responsibilities for adopting standards and benchmarks. Regulatory guidance for meeting accreditation standards can be found at: <http://www.state.ia.us/educate/ecese/asis/csi/sv/c12matrix.pdf>

This guidance serves as a template for LEA site visit teams to determine the extent to which local districts have met their statutory requirements.

Also, all LEAs have submitted assurances to the Iowa DE that they have included the Core standards associated with the Iowa Tests as part of their LEA standards and benchmarks. Districts are required to provide an annual assurance on their web-based annual report.

Core Content Standards and Benchmarks corresponding to the Iowa Tests for Science have been in place since the inception of NCLB.

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

The assessment tools employed to fulfill the accountability provisions for the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 are grade-level forms of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) and the Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED). The Iowa Tests are anchored to the Core Content Standards corresponding to the Iowa Tests:
<http://www.state.ia.us/educate/ecese/nclb/doc/ccsb.pdf>

The content standards were determined through consideration of typical course coverage, current teaching methods, and recommendations of national curriculum groups. Test contents has been carefully selected to represent best curriculum practice, to reflect current performance standards, and to represent diverse populations. The arrangement of items into levels within tests follows a scope and sequence appropriate to a particular level of teaching and cognitive development. Items are selected for content relevance from a larger pool of items tried out with a range of students at each grade level (Hoover et al., 2003).

Efforts have been made to emphasize the functional value of what students learn in school. Students' abilities to use what they learn to interpret what they read, to analyze language, and to solve problems are tested in situations that approximate --- to the extent possible with a paper and pencil test --- actual situations in which students may use these skills. (Hoover et al., 2003).

The Iowa Alternate Assessment (IAA) is for students with significant cognitive disabilities as determined by the IEP team. The IAA is aligned with alternate achievement standards. The first administration of the IAA was during the 2001-2002 school year. Improvements have been made to the system in the areas of training, administration, guidance and scoring. Considerable efforts have been made to improve the technical quality of the IAA. The IAA currently identifies students as proficient or not proficient. The IAA includes three achievement levels, basic, proficient, and advanced, as per regulations.

The ITBS/ITED and IAA were administered in grades 3-8 and 11 in reading and mathematics and in grades 5,8, and 11 in Science.

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

Academic achievement standards were derived from the research conducted at the Iowa Testing Programs office, housed at The University of Iowa. Staff developed an "Achievement Levels Report" to reflect different proficiency levels attained by students who participated in the ITBS/ITED. Descriptive excerpts are included in the body of this response. The test of the full report can be found at:

http://projects.education.uiowa.edu/itap/Introduction/pdf/ITP_AL_Interp_Guide_2003.pdf

pdf

The Achievement Levels Report is a building/system report of achievement based on scores from the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and the Iowa Tests of Educational Development. It is provided as a standard-service report for each of grades 4, 8, and 11 when there are at least 10 students per grade level in the processing order. One report is for mathematics, based on the ITBS Mathematics Total scores or the ITED Math Concepts and Problems scores. A second report, for reading, is based on the ITBS and ITED Science scores. The report also is provided for subgroups of students on the basis of gender, racial/ethnic group, free or reduced-price meal eligibility, migrant status, IEP status, and status as an English Language Learner (ELL).

The achievement levels that form the basis for this report were developed using an approach called "achievement level benchmarking." This approach involves partitioning the score scale from a norm-referenced test like the ITBS and ITED into achievement regions that, altogether, cover the entire achievement continuum. Then, actual test-item responses of students in the national standardization sample are used to describe the specific achievement of students who scored within each region. Benchmarking of this type involves establishing a baseline of performance and using it as a basis for comparing student performance in subsequent years. Such comparisons show whether student groups in successive years are gaining, remaining steady, or losing ground relative to the baseline performance. The baseline performance also can be used along with long-term goals to help establish annual improvement expectations. Then year-to-year changes can be interpreted in light of the expectations that had been established for reaching the long-term goals.

The national percentile rank score scale was partitioned in two ways to create two sets of achievement levels. For the first set, achievement levels were defined by the percentile-rank groupings 1-40, 41-89, and 90-99. The use of these three regions meets the reporting requirements of Title I, as described by current federal guidelines and Iowa code (Chapter 12): achievement should be reported as Less-than-Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced as defined by state ("local" in the case of Iowa) performance standards. For the Achievement Levels Report, these three regions were labeled by Iowa Testing Programs as Low Performance, Intermediate Performance, and High Performance.

The national percentile rank groupings formed in this was were:

Levels NPR Ranges Levels NPR Ranges

Weak 1-9 Skilled 76-89

Marginal 10-40 Accomplished 90-94

Moderate 41-75 Distinguished 95-99

The same general procedures were used in mathematics, reading, and science to create performance descriptions for each achievement level in the grades included. For the sake of brevity, only the mathematics procedures for grades 4 and 8 will be detailed here. Within each of the nine groupings of students noted above (the three original ones and the six formed by subdividing them), the proportion (p) of students correctly answering each question was computed. Then within each grouping, these p-values were clustered according to the content skill measured by the item. (For example, all geometry items were grouped together, all singlestep problem solving items were grouped

together, and so on.) The median p-value was calculated for each skill cluster, and then a judgment was made about each skill according to the following guide:

Median p Code Descriptors

.00-.39 N Can't do the skill, rarely can do, or seldom can do

.40-.69 B Beginning to develop; sometimes can do; does some

.70-.89 D Is developing skill; usually or often can; does most

.90-.99 Y

Iowa has academic achievement standards in reading and mathematics for each of grades 3 through 8 and 11. The academic achievement standards (cut scores) have been in use in Iowa since 1999, and were approved by USED as part of compliance with ESEA-1994 requirements.

As part of a periodic review for the academic achievement standards used for AYP purposes, Iowa convened a group of educators and parents to review the academic achievement standards that have been operative since 1999. After review of the process of development and definition of the achievement levels, the committee unanimously determined that the academic achievement standards continued to be appropriate for the students of Iowa and encouraged their continued use.

For the alternate academic achievement standards, the Department, with the consultative assistance of ILSSA (Inclusive Large Scale Standards & Assessments, University of Kentucky) convened a group of educators and parents to review the proposed rubric to be used for the Iowa Alternate Assessment. This was done prior to the enactment of NCLB. The group agreed that the rubric was appropriate for the students of Iowa who would be participating in the Iowa Alternate Assessment.

During the summer of 2005, a group of stakeholders, including general and special educators, DE staff, AEA representatives, and parents, was convened to review/revise the alternate academic achievement standards, within the context of NCLB. This process resulted in alternate academic achievement standards with three achievement levels, reflecting student achievement toward grade level benchmarks. This was done for grades 4, 8, and 11 in reading and mathematics. Since the 2005-2006 school year added grades 3, 5, 6, and 7, the standards setting process, replicated during the summer of 2006 for reading and mathematics, added the additional grades, using grades 4, 8, and 11 as anchor points, and also added the content area of science for grades 5, 8, and 11. This process is currently being implemented statewide.

The achievement standards in Iowa are the same as the cut scores.

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	245830	99.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1450	98.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	4726	99.10
Black, non-Hispanic	12504	98.50
Hispanic	13767	99.10
White, non-Hispanic	213383	99.60
Students with Disabilities	34892	99.00
Limited English Proficient	7863	98.50
Economically Disadvantaged	79853	99.10
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Comments: Includes all students that were tested.

- 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	246145	99.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	1449	98.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	4731	99.20
Black, non-Hispanic	12563	98.90
Hispanic	13738	99.00
White, non-Hispanic	213664	99.60
Students with Disabilities	34960	99.10
Limited English Proficient	7816	98.10
Economically Disadvantaged	80004	99.30
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Comments: Includes all students that were tested.

- 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	33294	94.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	1598	4.50
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards		

Comments: Includes all students tested.

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	33361	94.60
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	1599	4.50
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards		

Comments: Includes all students tested.

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	31152	75.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	59.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	648	80.90
Black, non-Hispanic	1719	51.70
Hispanic	2051	58.70
White, non-Hispanic	26573	78.70
Students with Disabilities	3795	45.40
Limited English Proficient	1430	52.80
Economically Disadvantaged	10953	62.70
Migrant	268	57.46
Male	16037	76.94
Female	15121	74.71

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	31268	74.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	160	69.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	655	78.80
Black, non-Hispanic	1728	52.40
Hispanic	2049	54.20
White, non-Hispanic	26676	77.20
Students with Disabilities	3799	35.00
Limited English Proficient	1431	44.70
Economically Disadvantaged	10996	60.70
Migrant	267	48.31
Male	16100	71.37
Female	15173	77.45

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	31369	79.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	175	58.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	614	84.00
Black, non-Hispanic	1573	55.50
Hispanic	1905	63.80
White, non-Hispanic	27102	82.30
Students with Disabilities	4254	49.80
Limited English Proficient	1210	57.30
Economically Disadvantaged	10758	67.50
Migrant	216	55.56
Male	16148	80.75
Female	15237	78.60

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	31398	77.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	175	60.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	616	81.00
Black, non-Hispanic	1584	56.20
Hispanic	1904	57.90
White, non-Hispanic	27119	80.00
Students with Disabilities	4253	39.60
Limited English Proficient	1209	44.90
Economically Disadvantaged	10778	64.00
Migrant	216	46.30
Male	16162	75.06
Female	15253	79.79

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	31597	79.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	171	62.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	609	86.90
Black, non-Hispanic	1566	53.80
Hispanic	1819	63.20
White, non-Hispanic	27432	81.90
Students with Disabilities	4578	47.10
Limited English Proficient	1116	57.10
Economically Disadvantaged	10517	66.80
Migrant	236	55.51
Male	16259	80.30
Female	15344	78.40

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	31622	76.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	171	64.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	609	80.60
Black, non-Hispanic	1568	54.10
Hispanic	1821	55.80
White, non-Hispanic	27453	79.40
Students with Disabilities	4589	37.60
Limited English Proficient	1119	43.20
Economically Disadvantaged	10531	62.80
Migrant	235	45.11
Male	16278	75.03
Female	15350	78.46

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	32369	75.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	62.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	597	78.40
Black, non-Hispanic	1593	44.90
Hispanic	1766	52.80
White, non-Hispanic	28232	78.10
Students with Disabilities	4773	36.00
Limited English Proficient	934	43.40
Economically Disadvantaged	10522	58.50
Migrant	229	40.17
Male	16569	75.54
Female	15814	74.31

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	32412	68.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	60.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	600	72.80
Black, non-Hispanic	1602	40.60
Hispanic	1767	44.90
White, non-Hispanic	28262	71.80
Students with Disabilities	4790	25.30
Limited English Proficient	935	32.50
Economically Disadvantaged	10537	51.60
Migrant	228	30.26
Male	16585	66.31
Female	15842	71.18

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	33921	74.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	54.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	644	82.10
Black, non-Hispanic	1680	42.60
Hispanic	1741	53.10
White, non-Hispanic	29642	77.90
Students with Disabilities	5219	31.70
Limited English Proficient	815	42.80
Economically Disadvantaged	10773	57.50
Migrant	187	39.57
Male	17516	75.04
Female	16440	74.55

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	33945	70.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	60.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	643	76.10
Black, non-Hispanic	1685	44.30
Hispanic	1737	49.50
White, non-Hispanic	29666	72.60
Students with Disabilities	5232	25.10
Limited English Proficient	809	33.30
Economically Disadvantaged	10792	52.30
Migrant	186	38.17
Male	17535	67.19
Female	16445	72.95

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	35224	74.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	187	56.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	645	81.20
Black, non-Hispanic	1669	41.20
Hispanic	1701	53.70
White, non-Hispanic	31022	77.80
Students with Disabilities	5279	30.00
Limited English Proficient	801	43.30
Economically Disadvantaged	10799	57.80
Migrant	208	42.79
Male	17889	74.97
Female	17384	74.60

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	35281	70.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	188	56.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	645	73.00
Black, non-Hispanic	1671	43.90
Hispanic	1702	48.50
White, non-Hispanic	31075	73.60
Students with Disabilities	5298	26.80
Limited English Proficient	801	28.70
Economically Disadvantaged	10828	54.00
Migrant	208	35.58
Male	17920	68.98
Female	17412	72.73

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	34333	78.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	182	61.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	570	79.10
Black, non-Hispanic	1176	46.40
Hispanic	1138	57.90
White, non-Hispanic	31267	80.40
Students with Disabilities	4408	34.60
Limited English Proficient	499	39.90
Economically Disadvantaged	7663	61.00
Migrant	137	45.99
Male	17566	78.28
Female	16815	78.39

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	34348	77.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	181	65.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	569	81.00
Black, non-Hispanic	1182	51.70
Hispanic	1141	55.90
White, non-Hispanic	31275	79.50
Students with Disabilities	4411	35.10
Limited English Proficient	496	30.90
Economically Disadvantaged	7668	61.30
Migrant	137	34.31
Male	17574	74.39
Female	16824	81.07

Comments: Note= All AYP data (all students,ethnic/race, students with disabilities and students economically disadvantaged)are based on the 10/15/06 counts; migrant, male and female data are base on the December 2006 counts

- 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	1494	1244	83.80

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	365	350	95.90

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	559	490	87.70

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	365	350	95.90

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.

Title I Schools in Need of Assistance

The Iowa Department of Education has established a Statewide Support System for Schools in Need of Assistance. While many stakeholders are involved, consultants from the Area Education Agencies (AEA) play the most vital role in assisting identified schools. Each AEA has provided at least three consultants that helped develop the five step process that was outlined by the original design team. Each year quarterly support team meetings are held to provide training and further develop the knowledge and skills of the team. During the Audit Phase, a vast array of data is compiled and reviewed. The Diagnosis Phase provides an opportunity for school leadership teams to dig deeper and discover the root causes for specific academic issues. In the Design phase, schools develop an action plan that has potential to effect positive change in the building. The Implementation Phase finds all members of the staff invested in following through with the actions of the previous phase. Finally, the Evaluation Phase provides an opportunity to measure the effectiveness of the plan. Schools often discover that the phases overlap and spiral rather than being a distinct linear process. Throughout each phase the SINA support team members are active partners with the identified schools.

At present, no schools have progressed in the identification process to the level of corrective action or restructuring. On the contrary, schools that have successfully implemented plans that have resulted in removal from identification, often provide support and mentoring to newly identified schools.

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.

Districts in Need of Assistance complete addendums to the District Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP). These addendums focus on the scientifically based research strategies that strengthen the core academic program in the schools within the district. They also address actions that would have the greatest likelihood of improving the achievement of participating children in meeting academic achievement standards. In addition, professional development needs of the instructional staff serving throughout the district are articulated. The CSIP includes specific measurable goals and targets for each of the groups of students identified in the disaggregated data provided in the district annual progress report and the addendums provide additional detail relative to these groups.

No Iowa Districts in Need of Assistance were designated in Corrective Action or Restructuring for the 2005-2006 school year

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.	11
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.	14
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
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.	27
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.	4911
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.	27
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.	27
Comments:	

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.	5
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	51
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.	1798
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: The State choose not to report the optional information	

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	37090	36205	97.60
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	2672	2632	98.50
Low-Poverty Schools	3015	2980	98.80
All Elementary Schools	16243	15987	98.40
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	5605	5438	97.00
Low-Poverty Schools	7063	6902	97.70
All Secondary Schools	20847	20218	97.00
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

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

How is a teacher defined?

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

How is a class defined?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.00
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	0.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	28.90
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)	0.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	71.10
d) Other (please explain)	0.00

Comments: Data is reported above as it is available. Notes regarding Section C & F: All teachers are fully licensed; however they may be working toward licensure in a second area for which they have a teaching assignment that is in one of the core academic areas. Note regarding Section E: Iowa is in the process of collecting this data. Please note that the percent of elementary school classes and secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) do equal 100 percent.

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	48.00	24.20
Poverty Metric Used	The poverty metric used is the number of students at this level who qualify for free or reduced price lunches as of October 1, 2005.	
Secondary Schools	36.00	19.30
Poverty Metric Used	The poverty metric used is the number of students at this level who qualify for free or reduced price lunches as of October 1, 2005.	

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	100.00

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

Iowa English language proficiency standards were in place during 2005. Those standards are in the document: Guidelines for Developing English Language Proficiency Standards in Iowa. The document is available on the Iowa Department of Education web page. <http://www.state.ia.us/educate/ecese/is/ell/doc/gdelps.pdf>

Part of this document includes a table in which a judgment alignment was conducted with the four language proficiency assessments that were used at the time (old versions of the LAS and IPT for grades K-2, ITELL and ELDA for grades 3-12), the core content standards (corresponding to the Iowa Tests, Appendix J of the Guidelines document) for math and reading and the TESOL standards.

Iowa's ELP standards (Appendices E, F, G, and H of the Guidelines document) were developed with oversight from the state ELL Assessment committee. The standards are based on the general TESOL standards and a review of other state standards. These standards include those that were used in the development of the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) and were included as part of the ELDA standards. Iowa is a member of the LEP CCSSO-SCASS and has participated in the ELDA consortia since its inception.

Approved, adopted, sanctioned:

The process used by LEAs for adopting ELP standards is the same as the one used for the adoption of content standards (math, reading, and science). Iowa uses the Iowa Tests (Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and Iowa Tests of Educational Development) for accountability. All local education agencies signed assurances in which they agreed to incorporate the core content standards and benchmarks corresponding to the Iowa Tests into their standards and benchmarks sets. Adoption of standards is done at the local level. All subgrantees and their consortia members signed assurances in 2003 for participation in Title III. Those assurances addressed compliance with Title III requirements. To the extent that the ELDA standards link with the academic core content standards, the ELP standards are being implemented (see Appendix M in the Guidance document). All subgrantees selected the ELDA as their ELP assessment. Implicit in their selection was the acceptance of the standards provided in the guidelines.

The guidelines for the implementation of ELP standards are being revised to reflect the alignment with the new TESOL national standards, the ELDA standards and the Iowa Core Content Standards for Reading, Math, and Science. The guidelines have a description of language ability in each of the 4 domains, the description of the language ability necessary to participate in content area classes, achievement descriptors and for language ability and content-related ability described by increasingly difficult abilities (lowest to highest) at they progress for each grade level/cluster.

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 guidelines for the implementation of ELP standards are being revised to reflect the alignment with the new TESOL national standards, the ELDA standards and the Iowa Core Content Standards for Reading, Math, and Science. The guidelines have a description of language ability in each of the 4 domains, the description of the language ability necessary to participate in content area classes, achievement descriptors and for language ability and content-related ability described by increasingly difficult abilities (lowest to highest) at they progress for each grade level/cluster.

Iowa plans to conduct an external alignment study with the Buros Institute for Mental Measurement, at the University of Nebraska. The study will evaluate the alignment between:

- a) the standards used for ELDA and the new TESOL standards
- b) the ELDA standards and the academic core content standards and benchmarks corresponding to the Iowa Tests in reading, math, and science
- c) the alignment between the new TESOL standards and the academic core content standards. Timeline: In place by April 30, 2007

To verify subgrantees assurances the state plans to add to the AYP electronic form a request of consortia members to confirm their assurances of the adoption of ELP standards available for implementation in their schools.

Time line: In place by October 30, 2007.

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. An internal alignment study has been conducted with the revision of the Guidelines for Implementation of the ELP Standards. This study is being replicated with the new TESOL standards for 2006-07. The state plans to also conduct a formal alignment study. Please see response to 1.6.1. Prior to 2006-07 revisions of the guidelines the state used a table with the 4 assessments and corresponding standards previously used.

2.1 Annual Assessment of ELL:

Prior to 2005-06 Iowa's subgrantees were using four different assessments because no single assessment was available at the time for grades K-12. The LEAs used old versions of LAS and IPT for grades K-2 and the Iowa Test of English Language Learning (ITELL; Iowa Testing Programs) and the ELDA for grades 3-12. In the fall of 2005, the state ELL Assessment Committee evaluated the new assessments available from various vendors: new IPT and LAS, ACCESS (WIDA Consortium), ITELL, and ELDA. All the assessments were evaluated with a rubric, matched with Iowa's needs and population. The result of that evaluation was a recommendation to offer the subgrantees three assessments to select one. The process of evaluating the assessments was explained to the subgrantees. As a group, all subgrantees came to consensus and selected the ELDA as the assessment to be used to assess English language proficiency. All subgrantees selected the ELDA as their ELP assessment. Implicit in their selection was the acceptance of the ELDA standards provided in the guidelines. Thus, in 2005-2006, all LEAs in the state used the ELDA as a voluntary common measure of English language proficiency. The ELDA will continue to be used by all LEAs. Subgrantees are responsible for the assessment of all their ELL in their local education agencies. Students are assessed and that number is compared with the students first identified as limited English proficient. Explanations are required if there are significant differences.

2.2 ELP Assessment:

The ELDA is designed to measure the annual growth of English language development in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing of limited English proficient students. In addition, it also yields a score for comprehension. The comprehension score is derived from the combining of the reading and listening scores. The ELDA is vertically aligned across clusters to measure growth in proficiency.

The ELDA has five levels of performance standards, with a rigorous definition of full English proficient (FEP) at Level 5 and a realistic definition for beginners at Level 1. The listening, speaking, reading, and writing tests of ELDA are designed around four topic areas (three academic and one social): math, science, technology; English language arts; social sciences; and school environmental. This design helps schools determine if ELL students are linguistically prepared to function in mainstream content classrooms. ELDA is a test of four language skills, not of academic content, and therefore, there are no content area prior knowledge requirements to score well on ELDA.

The ELDA assessment has two operational forms for each of three clusters [3-5, 6-8, 9-12] and four domains [listening and speaking, reading, writing,]. At the K-2 level it has one form for K and one for grades 1-2.

3. ELP Assessment and Standards:

Iowa English language proficiency standards were in place during 2005. Those standards are in the document: Guidelines for Developing English Language Proficiency Standards in Iowa. The document is available on the Iowa Department of Education web page.

Part of this document includes a table in which a judgment alignment was conducted with the four language proficiency assessments that were used at the time (old versions of the LAS and IPT for grades K-2, ITELL and ELDA for grades 3-12), the core content standards (corresponding to the Iowa Tests, Appendix J of the Guidelines document) for math and reading and the TESOL standards.

Iowa's ELP standards (Appendices E, F, G, and H of the Guidelines document) were developed with oversight from the state ELL Assessment committee. The standards are based on the general TESOL standards and a review of other state standards. These standards include those that were used in the development of the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) and were included as part of the ELDA standards. Iowa is a member of the LEP CCSSO-SCASS and has participated in the ELDA consortia since its inception.

The guidelines for the implementation of ELP standards are being revised to reflect the alignment with the new TESOL national standards, the ELDA standards and the Iowa Core Content Standards for Reading, Math, and Science. The guidelines have a description of language ability in each of the 4 domains, the description of the language ability necessary to participate in content area classes, achievement descriptors and for language ability and content-related ability described by increasingly difficult abilities (lowest to highest) at they progress for each grade level/cluster.

4. Technical quality:

The Center for the Study of Assessment Validity and Evaluation at the University of Maryland designed and analyzed two sets of studies investigating the validity of the ELDA. The first set of studies was designed to investigate whether the items were addressing the intended knowledge and skills, that is, to assess the construct integrity of the items. The second set of studies investigated the validity of interpretations and decisions based on the ELDA assessments. Researchers concluded that the various analyses conducted provide evidence that Item difficulty in ELDA, for the most part, is not an artifact of minute, unimportant details, but rather the measurement of relevant, ever increasing, complex skill sets of language proficiency; and

The complexity analyses and the teacher rating findings lend credence to the validity of the items, in general, as they discriminate in difficulty. They also provide solid evidence of the validity of the ability of the ELDA test to generally discriminate by the specified performance levels.

In addition to the study mentioned, Iowa has an ELL Assessment Committee that evaluates and provides recommendations for assessment issues of ELLs.

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)	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ELDA	14742	14742	100.00	1997	13.50	3269	22.20	4270	29.00	4005	27.20	1201	8.10

Comments: 2005-06 is the first year ELDA was administered state wide.

- (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	12374	73.80
2. Bosnian	866	5.20
3. Vietnamese	675	4.00
4. Lao	452	2.70
5. Serbian	263	1.60
6. Arabic	242	1.40
7. Chinese	192	1.10
8. Other Languages	179	1.10
9. Russian	167	1.00
10. Korean	126	0.80
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.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data															
2005-2006 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III															
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency										Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (8)		
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5 (7)				
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
ELDA	14742	100.00	1997	13.50	3269	22.20	4270	29.00	4005	27.20	1201	8.10	1757	100.00	
Comments:															

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year.
- (3-7) In columns three-seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2005-2006 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (8) In column eight, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

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
4652	2645	13

Comments:

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

The state of Iowa is experiencing a very slow increase in the number of immigrant students.

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 ELDA is the test used for English language proficiency. The state definition of proficient is a score of 5 in each of the 4 domains (reading, writing, listening, and speaking). In order for student to be classified as proficient he or she needs to score a 5 (the highest level on the ELDA) on the four subtests. This definition is more stringent than the LEP SCASS consortium's definition. Iowa believes that in order to increase the probability of future success, students should score at the highest level on all subtests. Proficiency is defined using Comprehension (listening and reading subscores on the ELDA).

Iowa has differentiated between "scoring proficient" in the ELDA and exiting from program and/or services (language proficiency). The decision of exiting from program/services student' is made at the LEA level with guidance from the state. Districts follow the guidelines that provide descriptions of the different levels and reasonable expectations at each level of language proficiency. LEAs establish their exit criteria based on evidence of language proficiency as demonstrated by the ELDA, the academic performance of the students and any additional criteria (such as teacher/team recommendations, etc).

Subgrantees recognize that scoring "proficient" on a test is not enough evidence to exit a student from programs and/or services and classify him/her as proficient in general terms. Therefore, a student may score proficient but still be considered ELL. A student is exited from program/services when there is strong evidence of the probability of success, not only when there is a score of proficient. This allows the student a higher probability of success in his or her education.

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

In the submission of the Consolidated State Application (September 1, 2003), "making progress" was defined as "improvement in a score." However, 2005-06 is the first year in which the ELDA was used state-wide. One year of data is not enough to define "making progress." For the progress comparison from 04-05 to 05-06, examining the level-placement of the results, if a student did not score level 1 as "non-proficient," they were included in the "making progress" category.

The state plans to contact experts in the field to provide technical assistance in order define "making progress" based on data. In the mean time Iowa will use the ELDA levels to measure progress in general, but not at the student level (because a matched sample using the same test is not available). After 2006-07 administration of the ELDA, the state will be able to have two years of matched data to provide more accurate results regarding "making progress."

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

Cohort is defined as the same group of students over a period of time. The AYP requirement for Title I is based on a status model at grades 4, 8 and 11 (same grade over time), setting a cohort for Title III will be based on the same student two years in a row (longitudinal), either 4th- 5th, 8th-9th, and 10th-11th or 3rd-4th, 7th-8th, and 9th-10th.

The state data system currently will allow a comparison of the cohort group. However, the state only has one year of data with the same assessment (ELDA), at least two years of data is necessary to validly reflect cohort results. Iowa will continue to collect and report by grade levels.

The state plans to revisit the operationalization of cohort based on recommendations from experts in the field. Revised definition of cohort will be set as soon as the statistically sound information is available to set accurate targets now that the state is using an assessment that measures academic language.

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

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

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

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 90.00	# 13421	% 86.50	# 12745	% 20.00	# 2948	% 8.10	# 1201

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.

Prior to 2005-06, Iowa did not have in place a system that would allow for the collection of individual student data nor did Iowa have a single test for English language proficiency. The system now utilizes Project EASIER (Electronic Access for Iowa Education Records) to collect Title III reportable variables for individual English language learners. 2005-06 is the first year of data with the ELDA and with a system in place.

Because Iowa did not have a unified ELP assessment for 2005-06, the determination of progress was made by sorting student scores into levels of achievement: non-proficient, limited-proficient, and proficient. These comparisons were done to categorize student achievement for 2004-05. For the 2005-06 administration of ELDA, students scoring at the lowest level (1) were classified as non-proficient, students scoring at the highest level (5) were classified as proficient, and students scoring in the middle three levels (2, 3, and 4) were classified as limited-proficient. Thus comparisons could be made between results from 2004-05 and 2005-06.

Based on these level comparisons, and under the assumption that students assessed in 2004-05 continue to attend Iowa schools in 05-06, the only students remaining in the non-proficient category are those students who can be presumed to not have made any progress. All other students scored at a level that is higher than "non-proficient", and are thus included in the "progress" category. The indeterminates are the students who moved down in levels between levels 2, 3, and 4. Thus, the numbers provided for table 1.6.8 can be considered as "upper-bound" estimates of student progress. It important to keep in mind that, at the time that AMAOs were established, the targets in table 1.6.8 were based on student data from assessments that were not measuring proficiency in academic language. Thus the comparison of results from a test measuring academic language with targets based on a test not measuring academic language might be considered to be an invalid comparison.

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	90.00	11544	78.30
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		1997	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	20.00	1201	8.10
TOTAL		14742	

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	14
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	9
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	9
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	5
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	5
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: Because 4 different assessments were used in 2004-05 and one assessment was used in 2005-06 it is not possible to compare for progress. Therefore no data is available. The use of single assessment, two years of data, and the state data collection system will allow for reporting on progress in 2006-07. All subgrantees submit plans for report and continuation. Iowa is also revisiting the AMAOs with the new data.

* 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	26	57.80
4	55	83.30
5	96	76.20
6	124	68.10
7	146	66.10
8	165	63.50
H.S.	91	71.70

Comments: H.S. includes Grade 11.

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	31	68.90
4	49	74.20
5	104	82.50
6	138	75.80
7	164	74.20
8	177	68.10
H.S.	80	63.00

Comments: H.S. includes Grade 11

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	90.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	77.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.90
Black, non-Hispanic	76.50
Hispanic	74.10
White, non-Hispanic	92.00
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	89.70
Female	91.70

Comments: American Indian Graduation Rate is correct. Couldn't calculate graduation rate for Students with Disabilities, Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged, and Migrant in 2004-2005. 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	1.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.20
Black, non-Hispanic	3.90
Hispanic	3.90
White, non-Hispanic	1.20
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	1.60
Female	1.30
Comments: All students, American Indian, White, Male, and Female rates correct. Couldn't calculate dropout rate for Students with Disabilities, Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged, and Migrant in 2004-2005. Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

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

STATE RESPONSE

Iowa defines a school year as beginning the first day of July continuing through June 30th. Each elementary and secondary school shall begin no sooner than a day during the calendar week in which the first day of September falls but not later than the 1st Monday in December. School shall continue for 180 days and may be maintained during the entire calendar year. (IA Code, 279.10)

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	354	354
LEAs with Subgrants	11	11

Comments: Numbers include preschool homeless children and are generated through the states student level data collection - Project EASIER. The numbers may not represent out of school homeless youth because Project EASIER data is collected only for students attending Iowa school districts.

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	304	236
1	331	311
2	278	276
3	267	261
4	279	244
5	215	244
6	188	210
7	200	158
8	215	167
9	161	161
10	176	139
11	184	168
12	273	173

Comments: These numbers do not include Preschool.

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	666	744
Doubled-up	2004	1384
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	37	21
Hotels/Motels	87	79
Unknown	277	520

Comments: Included in "Unknown" is the data collected through Project EASIER for "Unknown" and "Other".

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

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

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	95
1	163
2	137
3	139
4	136
5	131
6	62
7	62
8	71
9	53
10	53
11	77
12	71

Comments: Homeless student data was collected through Project EASIER, then distributed to the subgrantees. Subgrantees indicated which students were served by McKinney-Vento.

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

27

Comments: The LEA's with subgrants reported 27 total PK students. Of the 27 total, 18 were served by McKinney-Vento.

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

358

Comments: Some districts indicated they do not have a system in place to accurately report unaccompanied youth and some estimating was completed. The number of unaccompanied youth was collected by surveying the districts and may include additional homeless youth.

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)

35

Comments: The number of students served by McKinney-Vento was matched with the students on Project EASIER to collect the migrant status.

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)	331
English Language Learners (ELL)	103
Gifted and Talented	38
Vocational Education	120

Comments: The number of students served by McKinney-Vento was matched with the students on Project EASIER to collect data on Educational and school related activities and services.

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	9
Expedited evaluations	7
Staff professional development and awareness	9
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	10
Early childhood programs	2
Assistance with participation in school programs	9
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	10
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	10
Coordination between schools and agencies	6
Counseling	7
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	11
Clothing to meet a school requirement	11
School supplies	10
Referral to other programs and services	8
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	1
Other (optional)	0

Comments: The services provided via Title X, NCLB are commonly complemented by state funding for dropout prevention (Chapter 257.38, Iowa Code) to enable services for greater numbers of homeless children and youth.

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	3
School selection	0
Transportation	7
School records	4
Immunizations or other medical records	5
Other enrollment issues	2

Comments: One school district reported that providing community-based services for homeless children and their families was very difficult because of limited availability in a rural area. Another district reported that school staff need to be continually reminded that homeless children and youth need to be immediately enrolled. Scheduling students was sometimes delayed for a day or so.

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
Coordination with community-based services in a rural area	1
Immediate enrollment of students-need to remind staff	1

Comments: The primary barrier to enrollment and success of homeless students continues to be transportation.

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	111	56
Grade 4	Yes	117	52
Grade 5	Yes	112	57
Grade 6	Yes	49	14
Grade 7	Yes	54	26
Grade 8	Yes	61	22
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	50	31
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments: All homeless children enrolled in districts do not participate in standardized assessments. Students who are enrolled for a full year (Date of testing for one year to date of testing for the following year) are tested and reported on the annual reporting to the Iowa Dept. of Education. Many of the homeless children are highly mobile and are not enrolled for a full academic year. Although they may be tested at the local level, the results of testing are not reported to the Iowa Dept. of Education for analysis.

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	112	56
Grade 4	Yes	117	59
Grade 5	Yes	112	58
Grade 6	Yes	47	13
Grade 7	Yes	54	24
Grade 8	Yes	61	22
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	50	30
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments: All homeless children enrolled in districts do not participate in standardized assessments. Students who are enrolled for a full year (Date of testing for one year to date of testing for the following year) are tested and reported on the annual reporting to the Iowa Dept. of Education. Many of the homeless children are highly mobile and have not been enrolled for a full year. Although they may be tested at the local level, the results of testing are not reported to the Iowa Dept. of Education for analysis.

* 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.