

# **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).



**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**

1. The Nebraska State Board of Education directed the establishment of science standards and began this process in January of 1998. The Science Standards Task Force was given the charge to develop state science standards. The Science Standards Task Force consisted of 32 members. The Nebraska Department of Education selected 16 science educators ensuring demographic and geographic representation. Each of the eight State Board Members identified two citizens from their district to serve on the Task Force. The Science

Standards Task Force developed a draft of the science standards during a two-day conference chaired by the Department's Director of Science. The Task Force utilized the National Science Education Standards, the Benchmarks for Science Literacy, and the Nebraska Science Frameworks as resource documents as well as

samples of other states' science standards. The Nebraska Science Standards draft was reviewed for accuracy and clarity by an external panel comprised of five external science education experts.

2. Public input and testimony on the Nebraska Science Standards draft was gathered over a period of three months in 1998. The Department of Education, through its Director of Science, provided opportunities for input by

Nebraska science educators at district, regional, and state science meetings. Additional input came from schools and educators during this time as well. Nebraska citizens had the opportunity to review and offer suggestions to the standards during this time via the Internet and two public hearings.

3. Nebraska Science Standards were adopted by the Nebraska Department of Education on May 8, 1998. They were clarified in 2003. Each school district is required to adopt the state science standards or develop science standards equal to or more rigorous than the state standards. There are NO plans to modify these standards at this time.



**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

Nebraska's original standards were approved in the fall of 1998. At that time a statewide task force began work to correlate curriculum and assessment of students with severe disabilities to the Nebraska state standards. Staff development activities provided through state, Educational Service Units (ESU), and local resources continued to assist local educators in implementing standards and developing assessment processes at grades 4, 8, and 11. The process includes the following components:

\*Curriculum alignment to standards

\*Assessment literacy

\*Identifying and/or constructing assessment items that match standards

\*Pilot assessment items in classrooms

\*Analyze assessment items against the Six Quality Criteria as described in the School-based Teacher-led Assessment and Reporting System(STARS)Evaluation System.

Districts may develop their own criterion-referenced instruments, collaborate with other districts sharing the same standards and the same norm-referenced test, or purchase criterion-referenced instruments tailored to their needs by commercial test publishers. Criterion referenced assessments may include classroom assessments such as teacher observations, portfolios, or rubrics. Progress is reported at Beginning, Progressing, Proficient, and Advanced levels.

In addition to reporting student progress towards the standards, each Nebraska school district receives a rating on the quality of their local assessment process. The quality of the assessments, and the process used in their development or selection, is evaluated by assessment experts based on the following Quality Criteria:

1. The assessments reflect the state or local standards.
2. Students have an opportunity to learn the content.
3. The assessments are free from bias.
4. The level is appropriate for students.
5. There is consistency in scoring.
6. Mastery levels are appropriate.

Every district will have their assessment system peer reviewed on-site during the 2006-07 school year as a final condition of approval of our assessment system.

The Nebraska Department of Education's STARS requires each district to develop and administer science assessments, which may be developed by an individual district or consortium of school districts. During the 2005-06 school year districts were required to assess and report locally on student progress in meeting the science standards in grades 4, 8, and 11. For the 2007-08 school year, in addition to reporting locally, each district is required to report student progress to the Nebraska Department of Education. Science assessment items must meet the six quality criteria listed previously.

STARS requires each public school district to administer norm-referenced and criterion-referenced assessments to determine student progress in achieving state standards. Beginning with the 2005-06 school year, the reports for AYP include STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11.

In the spring of 2005, the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) Special Populations Office and the State Assessment Office began a review and revision of , "A System of Assessment and Accountability for Students with Disabilities," published in 2003. This 18-month process included:

- \* A Connections Study" to identify connections between the 2003 Special Education target behaviors and the Nebraska general education standards.

- \* Development of alternate standards for each content area

- \* On August 8-9, 2005, 30 participants, representing 15 Nebraska School Districts, ESU, the University of Nebraska, and the Nebraska Center for the Blind, met to accomplish two major objectives:

1. Determining developmentally appropriate grade level applications for the newly created alternate standards; and
2. Identifying proficiency levels (Beginning, Progressing, Proficient, and Advanced) for each alternate standard.

These objectives were met through the following activities:

- \* Contracting with Buros Center for Testing to organize and facilitate a rubric development activity

- \* Providing training for teachers and administrators prior to field testing

- \* Completing a bias review by the Ethnic and Minority Affairs Committee (EMAC)

- \* Examining content by Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center

- \* Revising and clarifying standards and assessments--using feedback and recommendations from pilot schools, bias review panel, and members of the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) Ad Hoc Committee, throughout the summer of 2006.

Throughout the development of "Alternate Standards and Assessments for Students with Disabilities," close attention was given to assessment quality. Higher order thinking skills, consistent scoring procedures and appropriate skill levels for all grades have been addressed. With the exception of Assessment Quality Criterion 2 below, the "Alternate Standards and Assessments for Students with Disabilities," meets all aspects of the Assessment Quality Criteria and the expectations for the Nebraska-led Peer Review of STARS.

1. Each assessment rubric is closely matched to the state alternate standard.

2. Students must be provided ample opportunity to learn the content prior to assessment.

- 2a. Meeting this assessment quality criterion is the responsibility of the local school district using "Alternate Standards and Assessments for Students with Disabilities." Evidence must be provided during the Nebraska-led Peer Review of STARS.

3. Assessments are free from bias. A bias review was conducted by the Ethnic Minority Affairs Committee. Recommendations were considered by members of the SEAC ad hoc committee and revisions and clarifications were made.

4. The assessment levels are developmentally appropriate.

5. There is consistency in scoring. Reliability has been insured through an inter-rater reliability scoring process used throughout the field testing. Teachers were trained in this process before implementation.

6. Mastery levels are appropriate. A panel of educators examined the assessment tasks and determined the level of

performance required to achieve mastery were appropriate.

---

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

#### **State Response**

The Nebraska standards were developed through the combined efforts of educators and patrons throughout the State of Nebraska. Each set of standards was also reviewed by a panel of external consultants and further considered and revised by the State Board of Education. Between January and June 1998, the Nebraska Board of Education adopted academic content standards in the areas of reading/writing, mathematics, science, and social studies for grade ranges of K-1, 2-4, 5-8, and 9-12. The standards indicate what Nebraska students should know and be able to do in these four curricular areas. Students are expected to learn the content at any time during their school experience, but the benchmarking at grades K-1, 4, 8, and 12 establishes a point at which students should achieve the standards. These original standards were intended to guide educators in providing instruction, help students and parents better understand learning goals, and assist policy leaders in establishing a reporting system for public schools. In August 1998, copies of the standards were published and distributed throughout Nebraska. In January 1999, LB 812 was passed. This bill required that measurable, model academic content standards must be adopted by the Nebraska State Board of Education for the purpose of "testing" and reporting student performance in the areas of reading/writing, mathematics, social studies, and science. Since the Nebraska Attorney General originally approved our standards as "guidelines" only, we began the process of clarifying our previously approved standards.

Throughout the summer and fall of 2000, committees were formed which drafted standards with clarified language while maintaining the original intent of the standards. Again, the Nebraska standards were revised through the combined efforts of educators and patrons throughout the State of Nebraska and reviewed by a panel of external consultants. Nebraska's State Board of Education, along with Nebraska's Attorney General, approved the current reading/writing and mathematics standards for use in curriculum planning and assessment in 2001.

During June 2005, 45 participants representing 35 school districts, identified and developed alternate standards for each content area (math, reading/writing, science, and social science). Attention was given to three levels of standards (concept, significant knowledge, and skill based). Each identified standard is reflective of the language used in the state standards. On August 8-9, 2005, thirty participants representing 15 Nebraska school districts, Educational Service Units, the University of Nebraska and the Nebraska Center for the Blind, met to accomplish two major objectives

1. Determine developmentally appropriate grade level applications for the newly created alternate standards
2. Identify proficiency levels (Beginning, Progressing, Proficient, and Advanced for each alternate standard.

NDE contracted with the Buros Center for Testing to organize and facilitate a rubric development activity. Performance levels were defined for each established standard. All levels were designed specifically for the Nebraska Alternate Assessment, taking into consideration the unique characteristics of the assessment and the population for which it was intended. In addition, a bias review was completed by the Ethnic Minority Affairs Committee (EMAC) and content was examined by the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center.

During the summer of 2006, the standards and assessments were revised and clarified using feedback and recommendations from the pilot schools, the bias review panel, and members of the SEAC (Special Education Advisory Committee) Ad Hoc Committee.

The entire process was monitored by the Nebraska Department of Education's Special Education Advisory Committee.

**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	134322	98.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	1972	97.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2379	98.60
Black, non-Hispanic	9188	99.30
Hispanic	14283	98.50
White, non-Hispanic	106500	98.10
Students with Disabilities	19627	96.70
Limited English Proficient	6553	98.80
Economically Disadvantaged	46800	97.90
Migrant	1660	97.50
Male	68545	98.20
Female	65777	98.40

**Comments:** 02.26.07 Two sources of data, which are not the same, have been used for completing sections 1.2.1.1 and 1.2.2.1. One uses a Full academic year and the other counts students that were enrolled any portion of the school year. Section 1.2.1.1 includes students in grades 4, 8, & 11, while Section 1.2.2.1 includes students in grades 3-8, and 11.

- 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	134298	98.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	1985	97.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2409	99.00
Black, non-Hispanic	9177	99.30
Hispanic	14247	98.50
White, non-Hispanic	106480	98.50
Students with Disabilities	19682	97.10
Limited English Proficient	6534	98.60
Economically Disadvantaged	46934	98.20
Migrant	1645	97.30
Male	68571	98.40
Female	65727	98.60

**Comments:**

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

## 1.2.2 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	7400	
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	619	
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	366	

**Comments:** 02.26.07 Two sources of data, which are not the same, have been used for completing sections 1.2.1.1 and 1.2.2.1. One uses a Full academic year and the other counts students that were enrolled any portion of the school year. Section 1.2.1.1 includes students in grades 4, 8, & 11, while Section 1.2.2.1 includes students in grades 3-8, and 11.

Data is not available for cells left blank. DS 12.01.06

#### 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	7955	
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	600	
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	297	

**Comments:** Data is not available for cells left blank. DS 12.01.06

### **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.



<b>1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics</b>		
	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

**Comments:** AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06

- 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.

<b>1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts</b>		
	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

**Comments:** AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06

- 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	64808	87.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	901	77.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1170	91.30
Black, non-Hispanic	5348	78.10
Hispanic	7820	82.90
White, non-Hispanic	49569	89.30
Students with Disabilities	10474	67.90
Limited English Proficient	4229	81.50
Economically Disadvantaged	25217	81.50
Migrant	903	79.20
Male	33122	87.00
Female	31686	88.00

**Comments:** AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06

- 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	64714	87.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	896	78.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1201	88.40
Black, non-Hispanic	5325	76.00
Hispanic	7804	80.00
White, non-Hispanic	49488	89.70
Students with Disabilities	10525	64.30
Limited English Proficient	4236	72.00
Economically Disadvantaged	25273	80.00
Migrant	903	74.90
Male	33066	85.20
Female	31648	89.40

**Comments:** 02.26.07 See explanation below. DS

AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06

- 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.

<b>1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics</b>		
	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		
<p><b>Comments:</b> AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, &amp; 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

<b>1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts</b>		
	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		
<p><b>Comments:</b> AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, &amp; 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

<b>1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics</b>		
	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		
<p><b>Comments:</b> AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, &amp; 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

<b>1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts</b>		
	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		
<p><b>Comments:</b> AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, &amp; 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>		

<b>1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics</b>		
	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

**Comments:** AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06

- 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.

<b>1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts</b>		
	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

**Comments:** AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06

- 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	51757	84.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	863	68.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	878	90.60
Black, non-Hispanic	2976	73.80
Hispanic	5359	76.90
White, non-Hispanic	41681	86.70
Students with Disabilities	7568	57.40
Limited English Proficient	2021	71.50
Economically Disadvantaged	17626	76.10
Migrant	658	74.00
Male	26474	83.60
Female	25283	85.90

**Comments:** 02.26.07 See explanation below. DS

AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06

- 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	51701	86.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	863	70.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	868	90.20
Black, non-Hispanic	2963	79.10
Hispanic	5340	77.50
White, non-Hispanic	41667	88.80
Students with Disabilities	7543	61.30
Limited English Proficient	1998	67.00
Economically Disadvantaged	17658	78.70
Migrant	649	66.30
Male	26430	84.30
Female	25271	89.30

**Comments:** AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06

- 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	20135	83.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	255	57.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	365	88.00
Black, non-Hispanic	925	81.50
Hispanic	1319	69.30
White, non-Hispanic	17271	85.30
Students with Disabilities	2263	48.20
Limited English Proficient	381	60.60
Economically Disadvantaged	4947	73.30
Migrant	142	68.30
Male	10230	82.30
Female	9905	85.30

**Comments:** AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06

- 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	19910	87.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	280	68.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	364	90.10
Black, non-Hispanic	951	79.20
Hispanic	1313	74.70
White, non-Hispanic	17002	89.70
Students with Disabilities	2217	60.10
Limited English Proficient	390	58.00
Economically Disadvantaged	4935	77.60
Migrant	139	61.90
Male	10162	84.90
Female	9748	91.00

**Comments:** AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11 until our Student Record System is operational. DS 11.29.06

- 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	807	659	81.70

**Comments:** AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11. Because of the additional grades reporting assessment data, more schools now meet the minimum "N" for reporting AYP results. DS 12.01.06

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	260	184	70.80

**Comments:** AYP includes STARS assessment data (grades 4, 8, & 11) and progress on reading and mathematics standards in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Assessment and reporting of all STARS data will continue to be reported by each standard at grades 4, 8, and 11. Because of the additional grades reporting assessment data, more schools now meet the minimum "N" for reporting AYP results. DS 12.01.06

**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	514	449	87.40

**Comments:**

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	260	184	70.80

**Comments:**



### **1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

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

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

Each school that is identified for Improvement is required to develop an action plan focusing on the area(s) in which the school missed AYP. Many schools across the state (both Title I and non-Title I) have participated in data retreats which have provided the tools for analyzing and using assessment results to guide instruction and curriculum improvement. Nebraska Department of Education provides technical assistance in the areas of assessment development and curriculum focus through on-site visits.

**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.

Nebraska had no districts identified for being in need of school improvement for the 2006-07 school year (based on AYP Data from 2005-06).

**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.	0
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.	0
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
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.	546
<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.	
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.	
<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.	5
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
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.	1034
<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.	
<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>	56883	55560	97.70
<b>Elementary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>			
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>			
<b>All Elementary Schools</b>	10277	10196	99.20
<b>Secondary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>			
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>			
<b>All Secondary Schools</b>	46606	45366	97.30

**Comments:** Data for the cells left blank are not yet available.

**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	6.20
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	
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	
<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)	93.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.80
d) Other (please explain)	
<b>Comments:</b> Data for Sections b in the Elementary and Secondary School Classes is not available. These teachers are included with general education teachers in Section a for each. DS 3/7/07	

**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>	51.10	11.50
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	(free lunch + reduced lunch) / membership	
<b>Secondary Schools</b>	42.80	21.30
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	free lunch + reduced lunch) / membership	

**Comments:** The staff member who usually compiles the data for Teacher and Paraprofessional Quality has been out of the office on medical leave since November. We have completed the data in Section 1.5 as best we could. DS 3/7/07

### 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	83.00

**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	<u>Yes</u>
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	<u>No</u>
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	<u>Yes</u>

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**

\* Nebraska does not require that the State Board of Education adopt or approve the ELP standards under NCLB.

During 2002-2003, twenty-one districts participated in developing the ELL standards for Nebraska. The committee had representation from:

â€ All geographic areas across the state

â€ Districts with large and small numbers of ELL students

â€ Teachers and administrators specifically from ELL/bilingual programs

â€ Teachers with extensive experience in working with ELL students and those who are relatively new in the field.

The standards are organized as follows:

â€ Grade clusters - K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12

â€ Within each grade cluster, the language domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing are addressed separately.

â€ Each standard is also linked to the Nebraska reading and math standards

â€ Science is in the process of being added and reviewed.

During the summer of 2004, a subcommittee of the original standards writing committee met to review comments received from school districts regarding suggested changes. The subcommittee implemented those changes that were seen as necessary. In addition, the subcommittee ensured the alignment of standards between the grade clusters within each language domain and made any additional editing changes.

The Nebraska Department of Education Consultant for Reading/Language Arts also reviewed the linkage between the ELP standards and the content standards.

Training has been conducted on the ELP standards and they are also on the NDE home page.

**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**

After the initial development, a subcommittee of the ELL standards committee met during the summer of 2004 to determine if any revisions needed to be made. At that time, the subcommittee ensured the alignment of standards between the grade clusters within each language domain and made any additional editing changes. The Nebraska Department of Education Consultant for Reading/Language Arts also reviewed the linkage between the ELP standards and the content standards.

In December 2004, the Nebraska Department of Education conducted a correlation study of the ELL standards, the ELP assessment (which is the English Language Development Assessment-ELDA) and the state's academic content standards. Teams of ELL practitioners and district administrators participated in the connections study. Documentation forms were then developed that allowed for the identification of the item, connection to standard, proficiency level, and review comments. To ensure continuity, the facilitators led a discussion regarding the format and intent of the state standards. This was followed by a discussion of the depth and breadth of correlating the ELL standards and ELDA items to state standards.

The participants clearly identified a correlation between the ELL standards, assessment tool and the state standards.

**1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments**

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

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

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

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

1. All orders for testing materials are cross-referenced with this list of districts with LEP students to ensure that they are assessed for language proficiency.

2. ELDA is K-12 test developed for grades K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12 with subtests for listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Comprehension is computed from the reading and listening subtest scores.

3. As part of the CCSSO consortium, ELDA was aligned to state ESL standards through an analysis of the ESL standards of consortium states that were available to the project at the outset. From an analysis of state ESL standards for each of the four skills domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), the consortium constructed a set of core ESL standards which formed the basis for the item design. In turn, when the Nebraska ELL Standards committee developed the state ELP standards, the ELDA standards were used as the foundation in order to ensure complete alignment.

4. During the process of the development of ELDA 3-12, technical data and studies have been conducted by C-SAVE at the University of Maryland and the American Institute for Research (AIR). Jamal Abedi has conducted the program evaluation of the process of test development. All test items have been reviewed by outside consultants as well. The American Institutes for Research (AIR) has conducted an extensive technical manual that accompanies the ELDA. Test form reliability has been consistently high across all skill domains and grade clusters. A complete copy of the technical manual is available upon request. For ELDA K-2, Measurement Incorporated has conducted the initial validity and reliability studies. A complete copy of the K-2 technical manual is available upon request.





<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	13402	78.00
2. Vietnamese	919	5.00
3. Nuer	537	3.00
4. Arabic	426	2.00
5. Native American languages	260	2.00
6. Kurdish	153	1.00
7. Russian	127	0.70
8. Ukranian	103	0.60
9. Chinese/Cantonese	97	0.50
10. Serbo-Croatian (Bosnian)	86	0.50
<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.



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

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

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

<b># Immigrants enrolled in the State</b>	<b># Immigrants served by Title III</b>	<b># Immigrant subgrants</b>
5018	799	12

**Comments:** \*12 subgrants were issued; 8 districts qualified for single grants due to their large numbers of students; the remaining 5 subgrants were issued to consortia which represented 19 school districts.

**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.)**

School districts who received immigrant funds for 2005-2006 were generally those that had less experience in working with education services for immigrant students. However, the 8 districts that qualified for single grants saw an increase in the number of immigrant children and youth.

**1.6.5 Definition of Proficient**

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

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

1. In Nebraska, students are considered fluent at levels 4 and 5. The following charts indicate the proficiency levels for "fluent" by domain and grade cluster

K-2 Listening Reading Speaking Writing

Level K 1-2 K 1-2 K 1-2 K 1-2

4 15 16 36 31 18 18 21 21

5 19 19 40 39 22 22 26 25

K-2 represents raw score points.

Grades 3-5 Reading Listening Speaking Writing

Level 4 648-769 645-724 668-808 669-933

Level 5 770-950 725-950 809-950 934-950

Grades 6-8

Level 4 691-828 718-868 719-824 722-896

Level 5 829-950 869-950 825-950 897-950

Grades 9-12

Level 4 718-849 729-849 765-849 719-849

Level 5 850-950 850-950 850-950 850-950

Grades 3-12 represent scale scores.

2. During standard setting for ELDA 3-12, business rules were established for how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English. The following charts show how these decisions are made:

Combining Listening and Reading for Comprehension Level

Listening Levels

Reading Levels 1 2 3 4 5

1 1 1 1 2 2

2 2 2 2 2 3

3 2 3 3 3 3

4 3 3 4 4 4

5 3 3 4 5 5

Combining Speaking and Writing for Production Level\*

Speaking Levels

Writing Levels 1 2 3 4 5

1 1 1 1 2 2

2 2 2 2 2 3

3 2 3 3 3 3

4 3 3 4 4 4

5 3 3 4 5 5

\*Production Levels are not reported but are an intermediate step to determine Composite Levels.

Combining Comprehension and Production for Composite Level

Production Levels

Comprehension Levels 1 2 3 4 5

1 1 1 2 2 3

2 1 2 2 3 3

3 2 2 3 3 4

4 2 3 3 4 4

5 3 3 4 4 5

3. The tables above show how the cut points and levels from ELDA are used to determine language proficiency. Proficiency decisions should include data from multiple sources. Districts can determine the other criteria used to determine when student attain proficiency. Districts are encouraged to use other district assessments (objective data) that will enable them to compare the performance of their ELL students to their non-ELL students, including performance on state content standards, performance on the state writing assessment, and other district assessments that can determine how ELL students are performing compared to non-ELL students. Districts can also use informal data (such as teacher recommendation) but students may not be identified as proficient based solely on informal data.

AMAO II (increasing the percent proficient) defines proficient as levels 4 and 5 on the ELDA and looks at the status in the current year compared to the previous year for all students assessed. Increases of 2.5 percentage points are expected each year. These increases are based upon a value reflecting true improvement by ensuring the value exceeds the confidence interval's upper boundary and are included in the business rules below.

---

**1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress**

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

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

1. Performance level descriptors (PLDs) have been developed for each of the four language skills tested in the ELDA battery - listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In addition, a fifth PLD has been developed for the composite skill of comprehension. The PLDs are intended to describe threshold points rather than the full range implied by a level; that is, each description characterizes what is minimally required for entry into a level. The PLD for the bottom level (Level 1) is an exception as it is a description of a range, from zero knowledge and ability to just below what is minimally required for entry into level 2.

The labels used are as follows:

Level 5 - Full English Proficiency

Level 4 - Advanced

Level 3 - Intermediate

Level 2 - Beginner

Level 1 - Prefunctional

2. AMAO I (measurement of making progress) uses an index to award points for making progress at all levels based on the time the student has been served (duration). Years of service form three cohorts - short term (0 to 2.00 years); typical (2.01 to 5.00 years) and long term (over 5 years). The model rewards improvement at the lower skill range for new students but does not do so for students who have been receiving services for several years, thus eliminating an unintentional consequence of lowering performance expectations. The starting point for setting the annual goals and the trajectory for future goals were established using the Title I requirements for State goals and objectives. The improvement needed to show progress is based on State data and fixed at 3.533 points for entities below 100 points. Entities above 100 points are expected to maintain or show positive improvements from the prior year.

**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 definition of cohort has changed since the 2004-05 submission. The cohort is ALL LEP students in grades K-12 resulting in a single cohort.

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

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

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? No Response

**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	% 78.30	# 8791	% 77.00	# 8791	% 22.80	# 8791	% 23.70	# 8791

**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.

Percent and number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English.

Projected AMAO Target: 78.25% index points (8,791 points)

Actual: 77.0% index points (8,791 points)

Any non-participant in the ELDA was recorded as non-proficient in school and district aggregation. This parallels Title I requirements.



### 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.

<b>1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants</b>			
	<b>2005-2006</b>		
	<b>AMAO TARGET</b>	<b>ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS</b>	
	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>MAKING PROGRESS</b>	78.20	8054	78.00
<b>DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS</b>		533	
<b>ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>	22.50	1979	24.60
<b>TOTAL</b>		10566	

**Explanation of data for Table**

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

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

\* 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	96
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>making progress</b>	92
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>attaining</b> English proficiency	94
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>AYP</b>	92
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	91
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	93
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	95
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	2
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the <b>State</b> meet <b>all</b> three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments:** Data Unavailable. Nebraska is implementing a student record system during the 2006-07 school year. These data are unavailable until the system has been fully implemented.

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

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

**Comments:** Data Unavailable. Nebraska is implementing a student record system during the 2006-07 school year. These data are unavailable until the system has been fully implemented.

**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	88.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	59.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.00
Black, non-Hispanic	63.00
Hispanic	67.00
White, non-Hispanic	91.00
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	85.00
Female	89.00

**Comments:** Data not available for cells left blank. DS 11.30.06  
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.

<b>1.8.2 Dropout Rate</b>	
<b>Dropouts</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	1.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.70
Black, non-Hispanic	4.20
Hispanic	4.40
White, non-Hispanic	1.30
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	2.10
Female	1.50
<b>Comments:</b> Data not available for cells left blank. DS 11.30.06	
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**

Each school system shall provide at least the following instruction annually between July 1 and June 30 for the grades it offers: (a) for grades up through grade eight, the time equivalent to 1,032 hours, (b) for grades nine through twelve, the time equivalent to 1,080 hours; and (c) for kindergarten, the time equivalent to 400 hours. (Nebraska Rule 10, Section 003.06)

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

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	442	426
LEAs with Subgrants	7	7

**Comments:**

**1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State**

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

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K		197
1		157
2		167
3		162
4		197
5		167
6		155
7		146
8		149
9		193
10		162
11		126
12		76

**Comments:** The number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public schools in LEAs without subgrants is not available at this time. Nebraska has an online application for federal programs. In this consolidated application, the number of homeless children and youth, by district, is reported. By the beginning of the 2007-2008 school year Nebraska intends to have established a statewide Student Record System in which every student who is homeless will be counted and therefore grade level information will be established. There have been some delays in putting this system into use; however Nebraska is currently testing the system and has high hopes of the system being fully operational next school year. This will eliminate duplicate counts due to each student receiving a unique identifying code. Due to the extra requirements we have already required of schools, we did not send out an individual instrument for the information above.



**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		1008
Doubled-up		436
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)		34
Hotels/Motels		169
Unknown	548	407

**Comments:** Data is not available for cells left blank. Nebraska has an online application for federal programs. In this consolidated application, the number of homeless children and youth, by district, is reported. A total of 548 students were reported. By the beginning of the 2007-2008 school year Nebraska intends to have established a statewide Student Record System in which every student who is homeless will be counted and therefore grade level information will be established. There have been some delays in putting this system into use; however Nebraska is currently testing the system and has high hopes of the system being fully operational next school year. This will eliminate duplicate counts due to each student receiving a unique identifying code. Due to the extra requirements we have already required of schools, we did not send out an individual instrument for the information above.

\* 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	197
1	157
2	167
3	162
4	197
5	167
6	155
7	146
8	149
9	193
10	162
11	126
12	76

**Comments:**

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

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

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

47

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths**

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

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

386

**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)**

76

**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)	281
English Language Learners (ELL)	287
Gifted and Talented	12
Vocational Education	<n

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services**

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

<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	7
Expedited evaluations	6
Staff professional development and awareness	5
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	5
Assistance with participation in school programs	7
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	7
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	5
Coordination between schools and agencies	7
Counseling	6
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	6
School supplies	7
Referral to other programs and services	7
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional)	0

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

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

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

**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>

**Comments: None reported.**

**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:**

<b>School Grade Levels *</b>	<b>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>	<b>b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.</b>	<b>c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.</b>
Grade 3	DNA	115	92
Grade 4	DNA	165	126
Grade 5	DNA	96	70
Grade 6	DNA	80	61
Grade 7	DNA	77	55
Grade 8	DNA	113	84
Grade 9	DNA	<n	<n
Grade 10	DNA	<n	<n
Grade 11	DNA	78	31
Grade 12	DNA	<n	<n

**Comments:****Mathematics Assessment:**

<b>School Grade Levels *</b>	<b>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>	<b>b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.</b>	<b>c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.</b>
Grade 3	DNA	104	78
Grade 4	DNA	166	123
Grade 5	DNA	86	63
Grade 6	DNA	82	62
Grade 7	DNA	78	52
Grade 8	DNA	112	75
Grade 9	DNA	<n	<n
Grade 10	DNA	<n	<n
Grade 11	DNA	64	24
Grade 12	DNA	<n	<n

**Comments:**

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