

**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 – *21<sup>st</sup> 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:  
Minnesota Dept of Ed

Address:  
1500 Highway 36 W  
Roseville, MN 55113

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Greg Marcus  
Telephone: 651-582-8454  
Fax: 651-582-8727  
e-mail: greg.marcus@state.mn.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jessie Montano

Wednesday, February 28, 2007, 5:06:39

PM  
Signature

Date

## **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2005-2006**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006**

## **1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

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

**State Response**

The Minnesota legislature adopted final science standards during the 2003-2004 legislative session. The legislature's adoption of the standards was the culmination of the work of the department and 41 academic standards committee members. These members represented K-12 teachers, parents, business leaders, and higher-education faculty. Individuals interested in serving on a committee submitted an online or phone application. Applicants were chosen based on several criteria, with the goal being to provide a balanced committee based upon geography, grade-level interest, content expertise, gender, and ethnicity that represented the state demographics. The final committee members were selected by then Commissioner Yecke.

The Science Specialist of the Minnesota Department of Education developed a conceptual framework that divided the area of science into 4 strands and 20 substrands. The arrangements of the NSES Science Standards, the AAAS Benchmarks for Science Literacy and the McREL Compendium of science standards were used as a guide. This conceptual framework provided the committee with an organizing scheme. The work proceeded in large and small groups, both across the framework and down a single strand. The framework facilitated discussion and was used by all of the groups with small modifications.

The Minnesota Academic Science Standards Committee met at the department from July through November 2003, and conferred in subcommittees by grade bands. The committee was charged to produce standards and benchmarks for K-12 science. All committee members were actively involved in the discussions. The grade bands used for initial development purposes were: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. The committee also met in strand subcommittees, according to their content expertise or interest. One K-12 group met for each strand: Life Science, Earth and Space Science, Physical Science, and History and Nature of Science. Grade-level standards were produced for each grade K-8 and by strand for grades 9-12. Discussion outside of meeting times was facilitated by using an online, threaded discussion operated by the University of Minnesota's Information Technology department. The record has been archived at MDE. At this point the first draft went out for public and expert review.

The committee's work was subject to a series of 14 public hearings throughout the state. The commissioner and several representatives from the committee attended the meetings. The public was invited to provide oral and/or written comments to the committee. Approximately 2,000 people attended the public hearings. A record was kept of the comments and archived at MDE. They were also posted on the MDE web site and citizens could contribute comments online as well. Local and national science experts were engaged to review the drafts of the standards. Their comments were also posted on the web site and archived at MDE.

The feedback from the experts and citizens resulted in a dramatic reduction in the number and scope of the science standards as produced by the committee. After the hearings were over and the comments were recorded, the committee met several more times and produced a second draft of the science standards.

This draft was further refined by a group of 14 members of the original committee selected as the writing group. They produced the final draft on December 19, 2003. A minority report was produced and signed by four members of the original committee of 41. That report objected to the treatment of evolution and other topics in the report and offered alternative language. The Minnesota Academic Standards in Science draft was sent to the legislature for approval.

After extensive discussion and deliberation, the science standards were passed by both the Minnesota House of Representatives and the Minnesota Senate. The standards draft, dated December 19, 2003, was signed into law by Governor Tim Pawlenty.

[http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Academic\\_Excellence/Academic\\_Standards/index.html](http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Academic_Excellence/Academic_Standards/index.html)



**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**

Minnesota administered operational tests of reading and math in grades 3-8 and once in high school and field test science tests in grades 5, 8, and once in high school in the spring of 2006. These tests have been developed with teachers in the field during all aspects of test development, including content standards development, test specifications, new item review, bias review, data review, range finding, and standards setting.

Minnesota has a two-tiered alternate assessment system that was created prior to the authorization of NCLB. The middle tier was aligned to the state content standards and the third tier was based on alternate achievement standards. Although these alternate measures in reading, mathematics and writing were a valiant start, Minnesota has begun the process to identify the key elements required for an upgraded two-tiered system.

In 2006, MDE led teacher committees in creating extended standards based on empirical research in reading, mathematics and science and aligned to state grade level content standards. In addition, the alignment to grade level standards of alternate achievement standards in reading, mathematics and science for the most severely cognitively delayed will be developed.

For reading and mathematics, MDE will develop pilot performance tasks and instructionally embedded assessments for alternate assessments based on extended standards and pilot performance tasks and instructionally embedded assessments for alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards. Technical assistance and training will be provided. Data will be collected and feedback will be incorporated into item revisions. These will be ready for implementation in the spring of 2007.

For science, an alternate assessment, based on the achievement goals included in the IEP, will be used to build a customized form for each student. The purpose of this assessment will be to measure student achievement with respect to the extended academic achievement standards, aligned to grade level and informed by the students' individualized goals. The alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards will be a series of performance tasks and instructionally embedded assessments that will be initially ready in spring of 2008.

**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**

Because of the creation of new content standards in 2003, Minnesota created new test specifications for grades 3-8 and 10 and 11 in reading and mathematics. This set of grade level content standards were operational for the first time in spring of 2006. Minnesota set new achievement level standards with teachers in the field on all its reading and mathematics tests in the early summer of 2006. Achievement level descriptors and interpretive guides for teachers and parents followed. The science tests are currently under development, based on test specifications that were approved in June of 2005, and teachers and psychometricians will set achievement level standards on those tests in the summer of 2008, after the first operational administration.

Minnesota has not formally approved extended or alternate content standards in mathematics, reading and science. In 2005, the Department began work to articulate extended standards aligned to the State's academic content standards and alternate achievement standards for the most severely cognitively delayed students in reading, math and science. These extended and alternate academic content standards will be used as the basis of a future battery of alternate assessments that will be revised for the spring of 2007 in reading and mathematics and in 2008 for science.

After the pilot phase and initial implementation of alternate assessments in spring 2007 for reading and math, MDE will set standards on the assessments and provide summary and individual student reports and achievement level descriptors to students, districts and parents on both sets of alternate assessments. Initial technical information will eventually be documented in a technical manual by fall of 2007. Science will follow suit in the spring of 2008 for those grades assessed, with a technical manual describing the technical aspects of that process later on that same year.

**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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	435611	99.35
American Indian or Alaska Native	9206	97.52
Asian or Pacific Islander	24932	99.45
Black, non-Hispanic	36356	98.65
Hispanic	22165	99.11
White, non-Hispanic	339378	99.49
Students with Disabilities	62347	98.62
Limited English Proficient	32226	99.28
Economically Disadvantaged	137544	99.03
Migrant	1253	98.90
Male	223420	99.33
Female	212148	99.38

**Comments:**

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

**1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	439227	99.41
American Indian or Alaska Native	9400	98.46
Asian or Pacific Islander	25221	99.11
Black, non-Hispanic	37157	98.64
Hispanic	22433	98.49
White, non-Hispanic	341440	99.63
Students with Disabilities	63266	98.87
Limited English Proficient	32592	98.32
Economically Disadvantaged	140400	98.95
Migrant	1241	96.35
Male	225388	99.37
Female	213792	99.47

**Comments:**

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

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

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

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

#### 1.2.2

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	55410	98.76
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	6937	100.00

**Comments:**

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	55806	99.10
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	7460	100.00

**Comments:**

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

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

**1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	59576	77.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1291	59.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	3567	69.70
Black, non-Hispanic	5300	49.80
Hispanic	3817	53.50
White, non-Hispanic	44726	84.40
Students with Disabilities	8938	54.10
Limited English Proficient	5699	50.10
Economically Disadvantaged	20412	60.90
Migrant	221	41.60
Male	30558	78.10
Female	29012	77.60

**Comments:** Minnesota implemented new 3-8,10 and 11th grade testing this year. Students did not test as proficient on the the tests (MCA II) as they did in the final year of the previous test.

Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	59183	81.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1289	67.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	3452	75.10
Black, non-Hispanic	5220	58.50
Hispanic	3607	66.30
White, non-Hispanic	44714	85.50
Students with Disabilities	8881	51.70
Limited English Proficient	5256	55.50
Economically Disadvantaged	20026	67.60
Migrant	207	61.10
Male	30323	78.00
Female	28855	85.40

**Comments:** Minnesota implemented new 3-8,10 and 11th grade testing this year. Students did not test as proficient on the the tests (MCA II) as they did in the final year of the previous test.

Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	58947	69.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1277	48.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	3549	58.60
Black, non-Hispanic	5168	37.70
Hispanic	3505	42.70
White, non-Hispanic	45066	75.90
Students with Disabilities	9375	43.40
Limited English Proficient	5334	36.50
Economically Disadvantaged	19947	49.40
Migrant	215	34.20
Male	30191	68.80
Female	28740	69.20

**Comments:** Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	58941	76.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1283	56.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	3538	66.90
Black, non-Hispanic	5157	49.50
Hispanic	3486	58.30
White, non-Hispanic	45095	81.40
Students with Disabilities	9394	47.80
Limited English Proficient	5285	42.20
Economically Disadvantaged	19915	59.40
Migrant	211	54.40
Male	30182	74.60
Female	28743	78.90

**Comments:** Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	60734	58.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1294	34.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	3509	50.40
Black, non-Hispanic	5323	27.50
Hispanic	3386	31.20
White, non-Hispanic	46342	65.70
Students with Disabilities	9509	29.90
Limited English Proficient	4924	26.70
Economically Disadvantaged	20075	37.70
Migrant	200	23.70
Male	31193	58.60
Female	29538	59.20

**Comments:** Minnesota implemented the new MCA II assessment this year to align with our new standards. Students did not perform as well on this new assessment as they performed in the final year of the previous assessment (MCA I)

Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	60749	76.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1299	58.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	3505	69.00
Black, non-Hispanic	5331	49.70
Hispanic	3357	60.80
White, non-Hispanic	46380	81.30
Students with Disabilities	9540	43.50
Limited English Proficient	4892	46.20
Economically Disadvantaged	20067	59.90
Migrant	197	55.40
Male	31191	73.50
Female	29555	80.50

**Comments:** Minnesota implemented the new MCA II assessment this year to align with our new standards. Students did not perform as well on this new assessment as they performed in the final year of the previous assessment (MCA I)

Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	61432	59.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1338	32.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3576	50.30
Black, non-Hispanic	5361	25.80
Hispanic	3254	30.10
White, non-Hispanic	47654	66.20
Students with Disabilities	9129	25.40
Limited English Proficient	4728	24.90
Economically Disadvantaged	20214	36.70
Migrant	186	19.70
Male	31613	58.70
Female	29813	59.80

**Comments:** Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	61451	71.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1349	50.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	3576	65.90
Black, non-Hispanic	5355	45.60
Hispanic	3230	53.90
White, non-Hispanic	47691	75.80
Students with Disabilities	9158	33.00
Limited English Proficient	4683	42.30
Economically Disadvantaged	20192	53.60
Migrant	182	43.00
Male	31616	68.00
Female	29829	75.30

**Comments:** Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	64361	57.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1377	27.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	3656	49.70
Black, non-Hispanic	5273	23.40
Hispanic	3135	27.20
White, non-Hispanic	50440	64.20
Students with Disabilities	8847	20.20
Limited English Proficient	4401	21.82
Economically Disadvantaged	20516	34.70
Migrant	184	16.60
Male	33146	58.30
Female	31210	56.80

**Comments:** Minnesota implemented the new MCA II assessment this year to align with our new standards. Students did not perform as well on this new assessment as they performed in the final year of the previous assessment (MCA I)

Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	64367	66.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1394	41.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	3644	57.80
Black, non-Hispanic	5279	34.40
Hispanic	3101	43.90
White, non-Hispanic	50472	71.80
Students with Disabilities	8872	24.90
Limited English Proficient	4356	30.30
Economically Disadvantaged	20509	45.80
Migrant	178	29.50
Male	33125	61.90
Female	31237	71.60

**Comments:** Minnesota implemented the new MCA II assessment this year to align with our new standards. Students did not perform as well on this new assessment as they performed in the final year of the previous assessment (MCA I)

Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	65526	56.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1469	26.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	3606	52.20
Black, non-Hispanic	5421	22.30
Hispanic	2973	28.00
White, non-Hispanic	51604	63.00
Students with Disabilities	8855	16.20
Limited English Proficient	4065	23.50
Economically Disadvantaged	20493	33.70
Migrant	158	16.70
Male	33657	55.50
Female	31865	57.90

**Comments:** Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	65551	64.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1492	39.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	3599	58.30
Black, non-Hispanic	5409	36.00
Hispanic	2965	43.70
White, non-Hispanic	51631	69.20
Students with Disabilities	8903	22.50
Limited English Proficient	4018	32.20
Economically Disadvantaged	20490	44.60
Migrant	158	22.20
Male	33688	59.60
Female	31859	69.80

**Comments:** Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	65035	29.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1106	9.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	3469	24.20
Black, non-Hispanic	4510	4.50
Hispanic	2095	10.20
White, non-Hispanic	53546	33.40
Students with Disabilities	7694	4.10
Limited English Proficient	3075	6.60
Economically Disadvantaged	15887	11.80
Migrant	89	2.40
Male	33062	31.80
Female	31970	27.70

**Comments:** Minnesota implemented the new MCA II this year to align with our new standards. Students did not test as well on this new test as they had tested in the final year of the existing test (MCA I).

Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	68985	65.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1294	38.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	3907	53.80
Black, non-Hispanic	5406	32.60
Hispanic	2687	41.00
White, non-Hispanic	55457	70.00
Students with Disabilities	8518	19.60
Limited English Proficient	4102	26.00
Economically Disadvantaged	19201	42.00
Migrant	108	34.60
Male	35263	59.90
Female	33714	70.80

**Comments:** Minnesota implemented the new MCA II this year to align with our new standards. Students did not test as well on this new test as they had tested in the final year of the existing test (MCA I).

Minnesota's "Total number of students tested" under CSPR 1.3 includes all test-takers whose test codes are valid, not valid, not complete and etc.

Minnesota's "Percentage of students proficient or advanced" includes the test-takers whose test codes are valid.



- 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	2023	1405	69.40
<b>Comments:</b>			
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	513	278	54.10
<b>Comments:</b> Minnesota moved; from testing grades 3,5,7,10 and 11 in 2005; to testing grades 3,4,5,6,7,8,10 and 11 in 2006. Minnesota also implemented the MCA II in 2006 this new assessment is aligned to Minnesota's new standards. A result was that more schools and districts made cell size - and fewer schools tested as well as they had in the final year of the previous test (MCA I).			

**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	846	671	79.30
<b>Comments:</b>			
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	407	232	57.00
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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.

Minnesota's School Improvement Process

MDE identifies schools not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) through MCA II scores in reading and math, the rate of participation on those assessments, and measures of either attendance or graduation. Schools identified in the same subject area (reading or math) or the same secondary indicator (attendance or graduation) for two consecutive years are deemed schools in need of improvement. These schools remain on the improvement list until they have posted two consecutive years of making AYP.

MDE released results from the new MCA-II tests and AYP data on November 15, 2006. A district or school's identification of Needs Improvement or Corrective Action (also referred to as stages or consequences) is based on two things: 1) not making adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years, and 2) status as a Title I-eligible district. Once identified, schools and districts are required by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) to develop/revise and implement an improvement plan outlined by NCLB Section 1116(b)(3)(A). MDE staff will use a rubric to evaluate each plan to ensure that the components have been adequately addressed.

MDE will implement a regional intensive and sustained statewide system of support for identified schools and districts order to build capacity throughout the state. This regional model will ensure consistency in technical assistance and allow MDE, districts and schools to network and minimize travel issues. The technical assistance takes the form of high quality professional development, ongoing evaluation to inform continuous improvement; and other administrative and instructional coaching will be included as needed. The regional support model allows the MDE School Improvement Division to develop support teams of experts in a way that is efficient and sustainable.

Identified schools and districts are required to attend regional service cooperative meetings to learn about the regional model, review the reason for identification, review the expectations for revising or developing the improvement plan and learn of the services they will be provided with. Each school and district will be assigned an AYP improvement coordinator. An AYP Support Team is formed, and includes (at a minimum) an AYP improvement coordinator, district leadership, and MDE education specialist. The AYP Support Team reviews AYP data for the district and school(s), reviews existing school improvement plan(s), and determines a preliminary technical assistance structure. The AYP improvement coordinator then supports the improvement process at the school(s) and facilitates the planning process with the School Leadership Teams at the identified schools. The improvement process will be implemented as follows:

FALL:

â€¢ MDE School Improvement Division will initiate contact with districts to discuss improvement process for districts and their schools in Needing Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring

â€¢ Professional Development Training: A day-long training sessions with modules covering topics of relevance to school improvement are made available

â€¢ District leadership and/or Regional Service Cooperatives select/hire AYP Improvement Coordinators. AYP Support Teams are formed (including the AYP improvement coordinator, district leadership, MDE education specialist), and other experts as needed. AYP data and existing improvement plans are reviewed to determine initial framework for planning and technical assistance decisions. AYP improvement coordinator then facilitates the improvement process with School Leadership Teams.

â€¢ The AYP improvement coordinator supports implementation of the improvement plans using the quality framework; implementation is monitored by MDE evaluation specialists.

â€¢ Evaluation planning starts (description/context analysis)

â€¢ 2006-07 School Improvement Plan submitted to MDE for review and approval of grant contract (pending district peer review of school plans)

## WINTER

â€¢ The AYP improvement coordinator continues to support implementation of the improvement plans using the quality framework; implementation is monitored by MDE evaluation specialists.

â€¢ Ongoing professional development training: day-long training sessions with modules covering topics of relevance to schools and districts; attendance is dependent upon need

â€¢ AYP Support Teams meet - Implementation checkpoint conversations

## SPRING

â€¢ The AYP improvement coordinator continues to support implementation of the improvement plans using the quality framework; implementation is monitored by MDE evaluation specialists.

â€¢ Ongoing professional development training: day-long training sessions with modules covering topics of relevance to schools and districts; attendance is dependent upon need

â€¢ MCA II Testing

â€¢ AYP Support Teams review evaluation results, reflect on progress, and formulate initial recommendations as needed.

---

**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.

Minnesota's School Improvement Process for Identified Districts:

MDE identifies districts not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) through MCA II scores in reading and math, the rate of participation on those assessments, and measures of either attendance or graduation. Districts identified in the same subject area (reading or math) or the same secondary indicator (attendance or graduation) for two consecutive years are deemed schools in need of improvement. These districts remain on the improvement list until they have posted two consecutive years of making AYP.

MDE released results from the new MCA-II tests and AYP data on November 15, 2006. A district's identification of Needs Improvement or Corrective Action (also referred to as stages or consequences) is based on two things: 1) not making adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years, and 2) status as a Title I-eligible district. Once identified, schools and districts are required by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) to develop/revise and implement an improvement plan outlined by NCLB Section 1116(c)(7)(A). MDE staff will use a rubric to evaluate each plan to ensure that the components have been adequately addressed.

MDE will implement a regional intensive and sustained statewide system of support for identified schools and districts order to build capacity throughout the state.

Refer to 1.4.3.2 above for details

**1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services**

<b>1.4.5.1 Public School Choice</b>	
	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.	34
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year. How many of these schools were charter schools?	25
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.	108
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.	27967
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
<b>Comments:</b>	



<b>1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services</b>	
	<b>Number</b>
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.	33
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2334
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.	9924
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>School Type</b>	<b>Total Number of Core Academic Classes</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>
<b>All Schools in State</b>	88635	86562	97.70
<b>Elementary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	7898	7593	96.10
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	7608	7508	98.70
<b>All Elementary Schools</b>	31077	30444	98.00
<b>Secondary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	8776	8254	94.00
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	21710	21395	98.60
<b>All Secondary Schools</b>	57558	56118	97.50
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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).

<b>Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
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	41.96
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	38.36
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.67
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
<b>SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
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)	11.95
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	46.97
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	41.06
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 %)
<b>Elementary Schools</b>	51.20	20.90
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Percent of students that qualify for free or reduced lunch	
<b>Secondary Schools</b>	53.70	19.70
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Percent of students that qualify for free or reduced lunch	

**Comments:**

### Definitions and Instructions

*How are the poverty quartiles determined?*

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	95.00

**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**

Minnesota's ELP standards were described in the September 1, 2003 and April 15, 2005 Consolidated State Application submission with respect to their four levels and the process of linking the ELP standards to Minnesota content standards in language arts and math. Since then, Minnesota has met the NCLB requirements in developing and linking ELP standards to science content standards following a similar process. Specifically, benchmarks from science Minnesota content standards that are related to the ELP

standards for beginning through transitional levels are listed in one of three categories: Minimal Language Requirement, Foundations of Language in Science, and Science Content Accessible Through Foundations of Language. Teachers may refer to these benchmarks to identify content area tasks that intersect with language learning for a specified language level. The Minimal Language Requirement category contains benchmarks for which English language skill is not a significant requirement. The Foundations of Language in Science Category requires pre-teaching of terms and science language in order to make these benchmarks accessible to ELL. The benchmarks listed under Science Content Accessible Through Foundations of Language are those for which language is a prerequisite to investigating the concept and/or meeting the benchmark. Further, some minor adjustments have been made to the ELP standards, primarily intended to more accurately describe the four proficiency levels.



**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**

TEAE is a reading and writing test for ELL designed to demonstrate growth in English language acquisition for ELL from year to year. Under NCLB, the ELP standards were developed in 2003.

In 2004 an alignment study of the TEAE and Minnesota's ELP Standards was conducted. The alignment study was conducted to compare test items from the TEAE with Minnesota's English Language Proficiency Standards. The index for alignment was the percent of test items sorted into the four levels of English language proficiency and four categories of language use that are identified in the ELP standards.

A panel of five educators served as raters over a two-day session. Candidates for the panel were screened by MDE staff, with selections based on expertise and experience in teaching reading, familiarity with state assessments, and instructional experience with English language learners. All raters were persons not employed by MDE.

An MDE staff member recorded raters' comments about the standards. Their suggestions for revisions and additions to the standards were noted. These comments, where appropriate, are to be incorporated into the ELP standards revisions currently underway. This study indicated that the TEAE satisfactorily aligned to state academic benchmarks [1]. A second study underscores a "plausible triangulate inference that the TEAE and ELP standards have common ground" Further, of "500 item ratings covering all test versions [there were] only 5 instances where the expert raters did not unanimously agree (99% concurrence)." [2] The TEAE is therefore adequately aligned with the ELP standards, although MDE will improve the alignment based on the 2004 alignment study during the 2005-2006 school year.

New ELP assessments are currently being developed to measure the progress and proficiency of ELL. New assessments include the TEAE II, the TEAELS and the TEAEM.

MDE will ensure the alignment of ELP standards and ELP assessments by applying the ELP test specifications, which were aligned to the state ELP standards by teacher committees, to the test item development. Items are then reviewed by additional teacher committees prior to field test administration for content alignment to the standards and again afterward during the data reviews for each test. In addition, formal alignment studies are conducted to ensure content validity and item level alignment to the standards after full administrations in a cyclical review.

Therefore, these studies will be scheduled after the spring of 2007 for TEAELS and the spring of 2009 for TEAE II, as alignment of test items to standards is an ongoing process.

TEAE II. The TEAE II will be field tested in 2007-2008, and ready for full implementation in the 2008-2009 school year. The TEAE II will be designed to align with the academic reading and writing standards of the ELP standards. It is expected that the ELP standards will be revised after further programmatic review and needs assessment taking place in 2006-2007.

The Test of Emerging Academic English - Listening and Speaking (TEAELS) is a computer-delivered assessment of listening and speaking. The TEAELS was piloted with high school ELL in 2003-2004 and with all grade levels in 2004-2005. The TEAELS had a statewide field test in 2005-2006 and is scheduled to become operational in 2006-2007. The academic listening and speaking ELP standards have been used since the beginning of the development of the TEAELS to identify targeted language functions for tasks. The relevant standards are:

1.1 The student will understand spoken English to participate in academic (formal) contexts.

1.2 The student will produce spoken English to participate in academic (formal) contexts.

Four performance levels are identified within each of the standards. The levels are beginning, intermediate, advanced, and transitional. All items in TEAELS are aligned to a performance level and Standard 1.1 or 1.2.

Mathematics Test for English language Learners (MTELL) is a new series of online assessments that shall serve as an alternate assessment for the math MCA II for English language learners in grades 3-8 and 11. The items were written with a reduced language load so ELL can demonstrate what they know and can do to meet grade level math standards. The MTELL items were field tested in fall 2006 and will be operational in spring 2007. MTELL is aligned with the MCA II in mathematics - not with the ELP standards, which do not address mathematics other than the established links completed in 2003-2004.

The ELP standards were revised slightly in 2005-2006. MDE incorporated recommendations from 2004-2005 alignment studies as described above.

[1] An Alignment Study of the Test of Emerging Academic English and Minnesota's Grade level Expectations for Reading, Grades 3,5,7, and

10 (2004). The complete report can be found at <http://education.state.mn.us/mde/static/000415.pdf>

[2] An Alignment Study of the Test of Emerging Academic English and Minnesota's English Language Proficiency Standards (2004). The

complete report can be found at <http://education.state.mn.us/mde/static/000417.pdf>

See also: <http://education.state.mn.us/mde/static/008542.pdf>

**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**

The current status of Minnesota's progress in developing and implementing ELP standards is consistent with the timeline outlined in the September 1, 2003 and April 15, 2005 Consolidated State Application submission.

The current ELP assessments in Minnesota consist of grades K-2 reading and writing observation matrix, grades K-12 speaking and listening Minnesota Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (MN SOLOM) and grades 3-12 Test of Emerging Academic English (TEAE).

New ELP assessments are being developed to measure the progress and proficiency of ELL. These assessments are developed to align with the ELP standards. In addition, formal alignment studies will be conducted to ensure content validity and item level alignment to the standards after full administrations in a cyclical review. The TEAE will be modified to be operational in 2009. The MNSOLOM may be replaced by a

computer-based test (TEAELS) and an alternate math test (TEAEM) is under development, to be operational in 2007.

The new TEAE is being developed to align with the academic reading and writing of the ELP standards. It will be field tested in spring 2008 and administered in spring 2009. TEAELS is a K-12 computer-delivered assessment of listening and speaking. It was piloted with high school ELL in 2003-04, field tested statewide in 2005-06, and will be operational in 2006-07. The MN SOLOM will be used for AMAO calculations for one final year in 2006-07, as TEAELS is phased-in.

**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)	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
TEAE (R)	59197	40331	68.10	3460	8.60	8428	20.90	19539	48.50	8904	22.10	0	0.00
TEAE (W)	59197	40306	68.10	3852	9.60	2703	6.70	7882	19.60	11350	28.20	14519	36.00
SOLOM (L)	59197	58727	99.20	4667	8.00	5715	9.70	14281	24.30	19703	33.60	14361	24.50
<b>Comments:</b>													

- (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.

<b>1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State</b>		
<b>2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs</b>		
<b>Language</b>	<b>Number of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>	<b>Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>
1. Spanish	22571	38.00
2. Hmong	17569	29.00
3. Somali	5867	10.00
4. Vietnamese	1728	3.00
5. Russian	1295	2.00
6. Lao	1084	2.00
7. Cambodian	1037	2.00
8. English (creolized)	813	1.00
9. Cantonese	642	1.00
10. Arabic	630	1.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

- 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.

<b>1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data</b>														
<b>2005-2006 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III</b>														
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 <b>Level 1</b> (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or <b>Level 2</b> (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or <b>Level 3</b> (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or <b>Level 4</b> (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or <b>Level 5</b> (7)			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
TEAE (R)	38216	68.30	3260	8.50	7961	20.80	18488	48.40		22.30				
TEAE (W)	38190	68.30	3628	9.50	2539	6.70	7435	19.50	10757	28.20	13831	36.20	7634	20.00
SOLOM (L)	55531	99.30	4305	7.80	5464	9.80	13536	24.40	18625	33.50	13601	24.50	7634	13.80
<b>Comments:</b>														

(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**

<b># Immigrants enrolled in the State</b>	<b># Immigrants served by Title III</b>	<b># Immigrant subgrants</b>
14922	5013	3

**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.)**

**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 state of Minnesota has made not changes to our definition of "proficient in English" since the September 1,2003 Consolidated State Application submission. Please refer to that document for our response.



**1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress**

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

Please include the following in your response:

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

The State of Minnesota has made no significant changes to its definitions of "making progress in learning English" since the submission of its September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission. In addition, the April 15, 2005 Consolidated State Application submission provided detailed business rules use for producing data about students "making progress." Please refer to these documents for our response.

**1.6.7 Definition of Cohort**

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

The State of Minnesota has made no significant changes to its definitions of "cohort" since the submission of its September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission. Please refer to that document for our response.

**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	% 67.30	# 54249	% 84.70	# 68347	% 2.60	# 580	% 15.70	# 3549

**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.

cohort Projected% ProjCount ActualAttain% ActualCount

PROFICIENCY A 1.69 74 10.62 465

PROFICIENCY B 2.78 254 17.26 1577

PROFICIENCY C 2.76 252 16.5 1507

PROGRESS A 65.92 8521 89.08 19348

PROGRESS B 69.43 8920 85.92 26802

PROGRESS C 65.85 6191 79.98 22197

\*The number reflects the total number of matched test scores, not the number of

LEP students. A test score is considered matched if the student took the same test (reading, writing, or speaking/listening) in the same district the previous year.

### 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	
	%	#	%
<b>MAKING PROGRESS</b>	67.20	65557	84.70
<b>DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS</b>		11834	
<b>ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>	2.50	3413	15.70
<b>TOTAL</b>		21722	

**Explanation of data for Table**

**Check the answer to the following question.**

Are monitored\* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"?  Yes  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**

	<b>2005-2006</b>
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	115
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>making progress</b>	106
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>attaining</b> English proficiency	93
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>AYP</b>	95
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	85
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	27
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	2
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet <b>any</b> AMAO	1
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	11
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	11
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the <b>State</b> meet <b>all</b> three Title III AMAOs? *	Yes

**Comments:**

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

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

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	668	78.10
4	678	72.60
5	836	68.50
6	818	61.60
7	842	49.50
8	764	48.00
H.S.	900	34.70

**Comments:**

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	673	75.90
4	687	68.60
5	843	50.80
6	836	50.80
7	846	45.40
8	773	45.00
H.S.	757	9.60

**Comments:**

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

**Comments:**



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

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

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

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

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

<b>1.8.1 Graduation Rates</b>	
<b>High School Graduates</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>2004-2005 School Year</b>
All Students	90.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	70.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	86.50
Black, non-Hispanic	67.30
Hispanic	60.00
White, non-Hispanic	93.60
Students with Disabilities	82.10
Limited English Proficient	67.80
Economically Disadvantaged	79.60
Migrant	42.90
Male	88.20
Female	92.10
<b>Comments:</b> No prepared explanation at this time.	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rate

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

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

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	3.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	10.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.90
Black, non-Hispanic	8.80
Hispanic	10.90
White, non-Hispanic	1.90
Students with Disabilities	4.60
Limited English Proficient	8.70
Economically Disadvantaged	5.30
Migrant	7.50
Male	3.40
Female	2.70

**Comments:** The previous drop-out rate submission was reported as the inverse of the graduation rate. 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**

The state defines the school year as July 1 through June 30

**1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:**

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	491	116
LEAs with Subgrants	8	8

**Comments:** 491 includes charter schools

**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	160	413
1	202	393
2	201	360
3	184	335
4	162	315
5	184	327
6	163	313
7	171	394
8	178	419
9	212	522
10	240	448
11	157	342
12	169	333

**Comments:**

**1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth**

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

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>without</b> subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>with</b> subgrants
Shelters	0	5051
Doubled-up	0	1400
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	0	15
Hotels/Motels	0	535
Unknown	0	191

**Comments:** 0 above indicates "not collected". Data from LEA without subgrants came only from the state student finance reporting system - and that data system does not collect primary night-time residence.

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

**1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**

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

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	450
1	453
2	445
3	395
4	409
5	361
6	409
7	416
8	483
9	498
10	492
11	462
12	412

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children**

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

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

342

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths**

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

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

710

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served**

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

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

29

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services**

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

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	1015
English Language Learners (ELL)	690
Gifted and Talented	79
Vocational Education	158

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services**

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

<b>Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program</b>	<b>Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	8
Expedited evaluations	8
Staff professional development and awareness	8
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	8
Early childhood programs	8
Assistance with participation in school programs	8
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	8
Counseling	8
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	8
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	8
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional)	1

**Comments:** Other:

- 1 Free community meals
- 1 Food shelf vouchers
- 1 Clothing vouchers
- 1 Laundry vouchers

**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.

<b>Barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School selection	1
Transportation	5
School records	4
Immunizations or other medical records	2
Other enrollment issues	3

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)**

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

<b>List other barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Resource for tutoring and enrichment activities	

	1
No shelter available	
	1
Scheduling of interpreters for enrollment of ESL families students	
	1
<b>Comments:</b>	



**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	193	87
Grade 4	Yes	177	52
Grade 5	Yes	202	81
Grade 6	Yes	187	77
Grade 7	Yes	213	55
Grade 8	Yes	232	84
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	161	46
Grade 11	N/A	0	0
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

**Comments:** \* The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) data was not release to school until November 15th. Therefore only 7 sub-grantee school districts were able to provide data on Section (C). Also some of this data includes preliminary data.

**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	205	66
Grade 4	Yes	207	48
Grade 5	Yes	211	36
Grade 6	Yes	197	43
Grade 7	Yes	217	33
Grade 8	Yes	225	35
Grade 9	N/A	18	<n
Grade 10	N/A	79	20
Grade 11	Yes	131	19
Grade 12	N/A	<n	<n

**Comments:** \* The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) data was not release to school until November 15th. Therefore only 7 sub-grantee school districts were able to provide data on Section (C). Also some of this data includes preliminary data.

\* 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.