

# **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 2004-2005**



**PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006  
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006**

**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 is 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:

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

### **PART I**

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 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:

- o **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- o **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.
- o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- o **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 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 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 "2004-2005 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 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614  
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:  
 Part I, 2004-2005                       Part II, 2004-2005

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:  
Oklahoma State Department of Education

Address:  
2500 North Lincoln Blvd  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Cindy Koss  
Telephone: 405-521-4514  
Fax: 405-521-2971  
e-mail: cindy\_koss@sde.state.ok.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Cindy Koss

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

10/2/2006 4:41 PM EST  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

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

For reporting on  
**School Year 2004-2005**



**PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006**

## **1.1. STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

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

The state of Oklahoma has had Science standards in place for grades 1-12 since 1993. The Oklahoma *Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS)* document is based on National Science Standards. General Science knowledge is targeted in the standards for grades 1-8, while standards for grades 9-12 are written for specific Science courses including Physical Science, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. In July, 2002, *PASS* was revised from the previous grade cluster standards to specific standards for each grade level in order to meet requirements of the No Child Left Behind legislation. Revision of *PASS* occurs pursuant to state statute with committees composed of representatives from state Science teachers, Science Curriculum Specialists, University Science educators, and Oklahoma State Science Teachers Association reviewing all standards. Recommendations for revision are then sent to the State Superintendent and the Oklahoma State Board of Education for public hearings and approval. State statute also requires review of state standards during a Science textbook adoption year.

Science process skills and content standards are addressed in separate sections of the *PASS* document. In addition to the core content knowledge base at each grade level, the ability to apply the knowledge is equally addressed through process standards such as observation and measurement, classification, experimentation, interpretation and communication, modeling, and inquiry. As students apply the content knowledge through these standards and through extended experimental projects, problem-solving skills and creative thinking processes are enhanced. The standards of *PASS* are rigorous as evidenced in the various levels of thinking skills targeted. In order to support teachers as they incorporate the Science standards in classroom curriculum, the Oklahoma State Department of Education has established PASSPORT II, an on-line database of interactive lessons and resources aligned to the *Priority Academic Student Skills* for each grade level. Assistance is also provided to state Science teachers through State Department of Education professional development workshops, videoconference presentations, and point-to-point videoconferences.



**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**

Oklahoma currently has a portfolio assessment in place for the alternate achievement assessment. The portfolio assessment will be aligned to grade level achievement standards based on the new alternate achievement standards developed for the assessment. The portfolio assessment had been developed by educators from Oklahoma and is advised by an advisory board consisting of personnel from LEAs. Upon the development of modified achievement standards, an assessment will be developed for grade level achievement assessment.

**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**

At this time we have completed the work for the development of new alternate achievement standards that are aligned to grade level PASS skills, our adopted state curriculum. All areas assessed have alternate achievement standards developed. We are in the process of developing modified achievement standards that will also be aligned to PASS skills in all areas assessed. We contracted with ThinkLink Learning for the development of the alternate achievement standards, and the workgroup developed consisted of Oklahoma educators in the areas of Special Education, Curriculum, and General Education. The alternate achievement standards (The Curriculum Access Resource Guide: An Alternate Approach To Teaching Priority Academic Student Skills [PASS]) were approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education in February 2006. The modified achievement standards are being developed based on the same guidelines, and will be sent for board approval on completion.

## **1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

### **Participation of All Students in 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1973.

**1.2.1 Student Participation in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration****1.2.1.1 2004-2005 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	222058	100.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	39533	99.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3643	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	24019	98.0
Hispanic	18105	98.0
White, non-Hispanic	126708	99.0
Students with Disabilities	31270	100.0
Limited English Proficient	30776	96.0
Economically Disadvantaged	112086	99.0
Migrant	671	98.0
Male	112436	99.0
Female	107635	99.0

- 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 2004-2005 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	221294	100.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	39483	99.0
Asian/ Pacific Islander	3741	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	23781	98.0
Hispanic	17667	98.0
White, non-Hispanic	130249	99.0
Students with Disabilities	33076	100.0
Limited English Proficient	9199	96.0
Economically Disadvantaged	110042	99.0
Migrant	657	98.0
Male	112353	99.0
Female	106903	99.0

- 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 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 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	31435	100.0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	5442	100.0

### 1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 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	32033	100.0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	5458	100.0

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1973.

**1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05</b>
All Students	43745	70.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	7975	68.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	732	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4764	51.0
Hispanic	4052	58.0
White, non-Hispanic	25108	77.0
Students with Disabilities	6311	39.0
Limited English Proficient	2291	53.0
Economically Disadvantaged	24308	63.0
Migrant	188	63.0
Male	22333	72.0
Female	20852	70.0

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

**1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05</b>
All Students	43640	78.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	7957	78.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	727	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4756	64.0
Hispanic	3996	66.0
White, non-Hispanic	25096	84.0
Students with Disabilities	6544	39.0
Limited English Proficient	2508	58.0
Economically Disadvantaged	24227	71.0
Migrant	184	68.0
Male	22272	76.0
Female	20809	82.0

- 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 04-05</b>
All Students	44008	75.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	8196	73.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	723	84.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4803	54.0
Hispanic	3905	66.0
White, non-Hispanic	25461	81.0
Students with Disabilities	6552	40.0
Limited English Proficient	2083	57.0
Economically Disadvantaged	24274	66.0
Migrant	140	67.0
Male	22332	74.0
Female	21279	75.0

- 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 04-05</b>
All Students	43945	83.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	8196	83.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	713	88.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4807	70.0
Hispanic	3844	72.0
White, non-Hispanic	25461	88.0
Students with Disabilities	6833	46.0
Limited English Proficient	2253	62.0
Economically Disadvantaged	24224	77.0
Migrant	137	72.0
Male	22294	81.0
Female	21257	86.0

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



**1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05</b>
All Students	44820	77.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	8425	73.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	699	88.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5020	58.0
Hispanic	3770	69.0
White, non-Hispanic	25688	81.0
Students with Disabilities	6765	38.0
Limited English Proficient	1825	60.0
Economically Disadvantaged	24394	68.0
Migrant	163	65.0
Male	23012	76.0
Female	21417	76.0

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

**1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05</b>
All Students	44719	69.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	8426	66.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	690	79.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5025	53.0
Hispanic	3695	55.0
White, non-Hispanic	25672	76.0
Students with Disabilities	7008	26.0
Limited English Proficient	1992	39.0
Economically Disadvantaged	24313	60.0
Migrant	158	57.0
Male	22951	66.0
Female	21376	74.0

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

**1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05</b>
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Grade 6 not tested.

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

**1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05</b>
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Grade 6 not tested.

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

**1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05</b>
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Grade 7 not tested.

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

**1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05</b>
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Grade 7 not tested.

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

**1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05</b>
All Students	46107	69.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	8220	65.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	792	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4892	47.0
Hispanic	3439	58.0
White, non-Hispanic	27821	76.0
Students with Disabilities	6638	28.0
Limited English Proficient	1316	48.0
Economically Disadvantaged	21798	59.0
Migrant	116	51.0
Male	23358	69.0
Female	22303	69.0

- 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 04-05</b>
All Students	46063	73.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	8231	69.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	785	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4891	52.0
Hispanic	3389	57.0
White, non-Hispanic	27829	79.0
Students with Disabilities	6894	26.0
Limited English Proficient	1449	40.0
Economically Disadvantaged	21776	61.0
Migrant	112	39.0
Male	23337	68.0
Female	22277	77.0

- 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 04-05</b>
All Students	43378	29.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	6717	22.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	697	56.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4540	10.0
Hispanic	2939	17.0
White, non-Hispanic	25630	34.0
Students with Disabilities	5004	7.0
Limited English Proficient	1070	13.0
Economically Disadvantaged	17312	17.0
Migrant	64	10.0
Male	21401	30.0
Female	21784	27.0

- 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 04-05</b>
All Students	42927	62.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	6673	57.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	826	68.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4302	40.0
Hispanic	2743	44.0
White, non-Hispanic	26191	68.0
Students with Disabilities	5797	16.0
Limited English Proficient	997	24.0
Economically Disadvantaged	15502	47.0
Migrant	66	32.0
Male	21499	57.0
Female	21184	67.0

- 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 2004-2005 school year.

<b>School Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	1782	1727	97.0

<b>District Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	540	489	91.0

**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 2004-2005 school year.

<b>Title I School Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of Title I schools in State</b>	<b>Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	1286	1251	97.0

<b>Title I District Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of Title I districts in State</b>	<b>Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	538	489	91.0

**1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

- 1.4.3.1** In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2005-2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2005 - 2006 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP 2004-2005."

**Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)**

See attached file

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

SEA provides a website (<http://sde.state.ok.us>) to support school improvement initiatives.

- SEA provides a website link (<http://www.sde.state.ok.us/nclb>) to provide the most current information on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and resources to help school sites implement the required activities around the law.
- SEA technical assistance for school improvement plan implementation to meet *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* Requirements (Public Law 107-110, Section 1116) is provided through: videoconferences; point-to-point assistance via H.323; on-site assistance; and a SDE contact person for writing plan.
- SEA's Oklahoma Essential Elements document assists schools in conducting a comprehensive needs assessment in the following areas:
  - Academic Performance – Curriculum
  - Academic Performance – Classroom Evaluation/Assessment
  - Academic Performance – Instruction
  - Learning Environment – School Culture
  - Learning Environment – Student, Family and Community Support
  - Learning Environment – Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation
  - Efficiency – Leadership
  - Efficiency – Organizational Structure and Resources
  - Efficiency-Comprehensive and Effective Planning
- SEA provides assistance to schools for developing the School Improvement Plan through the School Improvement Toolkit. (<http://sde.state.ok.us/NCLB/schoolimprove>).
- SEA provides schools in improvement the School Improvement Checklist to ensure they are meeting plan requirements by law.
- SEA annually reviews progress of each school site in School Improvement status to determine if the schools are making adequate progress in meeting the *Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS)*.
- SEA provides support to the schools in School Improvement status through School Support Team visits to sites. SST's provide assistance in analyzing and planning for school improvement.
- SEA provides support to the schools through high quality professional development, school improvement conferences (See Educational Calendar-<http://sde.state.ok.us/cal>), and through the videoconference network (See Videoconference Calendar-<http://sde.state.ok.us/cal/videocal>).
- Professional learning opportunities are offered through the SDE in mathematics, reading, special education, English language learners, data analysis, and teaming.
- SEA provides Curriculum Walk-Through training for all school administrators and teacher leaders.
- SEA designates schools (Academic Achievement Awards and Distinguished Title I schools) that serve as models to schools in School Improvement status.
- SEA offers the Master Teacher Model in which master teachers are trained throughout the state and offer training to various School Improvement sites.
- SEA offers the Professional Development Toolkit (<http://sde.state.ok.us/NCLB>).



**1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.**

**1.4.4.1** In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2005 - 2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action). Additionally for any Title I district identified for improvement or corrective action for the 2005 - 2006 school year that made AYP based on data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP for 2004-2005."

**Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)**

**See attached file**

**1.4.4.2** Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

- SEA provides a website (<http://sde.state.ok.us>) to support district and school improvement initiatives.
- SEA provides a website link (<http://www.sde.state.ok.us/nclb>) to provide the most current information on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and resources to help district implement the required activities around the law.
- SEA technical assistance for district plan implementation to meet *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* Requirements (Public Law 107-110, Section 1116) is provided through: videoconferences; point-to-point assistance via H.323; on-site assistance; and a SDE contact person for writing plan.
- SEA's Oklahoma Essential Elements document assists districts/schools in conducting a comprehensive needs assessment in the following areas:
  - o Academic Performance – Curriculum
  - o Academic Performance – Classroom Evaluation/Assessment
  - o Academic Performance – Instruction
  - o Learning Environment – School Culture
  - o Learning Environment – Student, Family and Community Support
  - o Learning Environment – Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation
  - o Efficiency – Leadership
  - o Efficiency – Organizational Structure and Resources
  - o Efficiency-Comprehensive and Effective Planning
- SEA provides assistance to LEA's for developing the District Improvement Plan through the District Improvement Toolkit. (<http://sde.state.ok.us/NCLB/schoolimprove>).
- SEA provides districts in improvement the District Improvement Checklist to ensure they are meeting plan requirements by law.
- SEA annually reviews progress of each LEA to determine if the schools served by the LEA are making adequate progress in meeting the *Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS)*.
- SEA reviews LEA plan to determine if LEA is carrying out its responsibilities to the schools in improvement by providing high quality professional development, support to improve parental involvement initiatives, and other technical assistance.
- SEA provides support to the district schools in School Improvement status through School Support Teams visits to sites. SST's provide assistance in analyzing and planning for school improvement.
- SEA provides support to the districts and schools through high quality professional development and school improvement conferences (See Educational Calendar-<http://sde.state.ok.us/cal>) and through the videoconference network (See Videoconference Calendar-<http://sde.state.ok.us/cal/videocal>).
- SEA offers professional learning opportunities in mathematics, reading, special education, English language learners, data analysis, and teaming.
- SEA provides Curriculum Walk-Through training for all district administrators and teacher leaders.

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

**1.4.5.1 Public School Choice**

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 2004-2005 school year. 43
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 2004-2005 school year. 42 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 2004-2005 school year. 884
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 2004-2005 school year. 23010

**Optional Information :**

5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 926

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 2004-2005 school year. 884

**1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

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 2004-2005 school year. 37

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 1917

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 8929

**Optional Information :**

If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 2734

**1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY**

**1.5.1** In the following table, please provide data from the 2004-2005 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>	112246	111152	99.0
<b>Elementary Level</b>			
High-Poverty Schools	11391	11275	99.0
Low-Poverty Schools	10277	10240	99.0
All Elementary Schools	40943	40659	99.0
<b>Secondary Level</b>			
High-Poverty Schools	7835	7728	99.0
Low-Poverty Schools	32059	31672	99.0
All Secondary Schools	71303	70493	99.0

The state would have liked to shown actual percentages instead of rounded percentages.

## **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 8<sup>th</sup> 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, 2005, 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 being 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 the classes taught by not highly qualified teachers).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
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	16.0
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.0
d) 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)	65.0
e) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0
f) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	9.0
g) Other (please explain)	

Total core content classes taught by regular education teachers was 112,246. Total classes taught by special education teachers was 20,041 (includes special education classes that may not be considered core classes, i.e., speech pathology). Total number of classes taught by highly qualified teachers was 120,408 (includes 9,256 special education classes). Preliminary data indicates 91% of classes were taught by highly qualified teachers. Data did not include the special education HOUSSE option.

**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	Low-Poverty Schools
Elementary Schools	More than <u>75.4%</u>	Less than <u>44.8%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced-Price Lunch	
Secondary Schools	More than <u>75.4%</u>	Less than <u>44.8%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced-Price Lunch	

**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 2004-2005 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
2004-2005 School Year	68.0



**1.6 English Language Proficiency****1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

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

Developed  Yes  No

Approved, adopted, sanctioned  Yes  No

Operationalized  Yes  No (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)

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

#### STATE RESPONSE

The English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards were developed in 2003. A copy of the ELP standards was included in the report sent to the United States Department of Education on September 1, 2003. The Oklahoma ELP Standards define progress levels of competency in the use of English in four domains of language—listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The standards' alignment with the Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS) in language arts mathematics and the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)'s English as a second language (ESL) for Pre-K-12 sets the foundation for the development of three goals, each with three standards that address each of four domains of language. There are three levels of English language proficiency for each standard and domain (beginning, intermediate, and advanced), which reflect the different knowledge levels of students at each stage of English proficiency. The ELP Standards are grouped into four grade levels that align with the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA): K - 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> - 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade.

The ELP Standards were revised in 2003-2004 to individual grade levels to align with the PASS and to link with science.

However, Oklahoma has just signed a contract with the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) to use the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs). An independent study on the alignment of Oklahoma's state academic standards, ELP standards, and the WIDA Consortium ELP standards will be conducted by the WIDA. The WIDA will recommend augmentations if the standards do not meet the requirements of NCLB. The alignment study will be finalized on or before August 1, 2006.

**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**

A committee was established and composed of English as a second language (ESL) teachers, elementary teachers, and content area teachers to revise goal two, to use English to achieve academically in all content areas, and group the skills into individual grade levels. The members of the group reviewed the PASS and the ELP standards individually and as a group. The committee aligned ELP standards in reading and language arts with PASS and with the mathematics and science standards in PASS. The ELP Standards address all four domains of language--listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The ELP Standards were designed to aid all teachers working with limited English proficient students.

A series of workshops were held at four regional areas that targeted special grade levels to provide training on the new ELP Standards. The Title III Director applied the strategies and techniques from the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) to train teachers in Grades K-12. In addition to the training which was designed for bilingual/English as a Second Language Teachers, the Director also provided the SIOP training to "Oklahoma Master Teachers." Since the English language learners spend most of their time with classroom teachers, it is important to provide the training to all teachers that work with ELL students, so they can be more effective in teaching their students. The Master Teachers will provide professional development to all teachers in their schools.

## 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 2006 . Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:**
  - **An independent alignment study** Yes
  - **Other evidence of alignment** No
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:**
  - **The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;**
  - **The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;**
  - **ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;**
  - **Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)**

### STATE RESPONSE

1. Although the Oklahoma English Language Proficiency standards were developed before Oklahoma joined the WIDA consortium, the Title III Director has used the national English as a second language (ESL) standards developed by the Teachers of English to Speaker of Other Languages (TESOL) as a model in the development of the Oklahoma ELP. The WIDA consortium has also used the TESOL ESL standards as a guide in developing of the WIDA's ELP standards.

An independent study on the alignment of the Oklahoma academic standards, ELP standards, and the WIDA Consortium ELP standards will be conducted by the WIDA. The WIDA will recommend augmentations if the standards do not meet the requirements of NCLB. The alignment study will be finalized on or before August 1, 2006.

2. The Oklahoma State Department of Education was a member of the LEP Students Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards which included the American Institute for Research, the Center for the Study of Assessment Validity and Evaluation at the University of Maryland, and Measurement Incorporated in order to develop the English Language Development Assessments (ELDA). Many school districts in Oklahoma piloted the ELDA in spring 2005; however, concerns expressed by school district personnel who participated in the field test regarding the length of the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) prompted the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) to continue its search for a test with high validity and shorter test administration. This has led to the selection of a new assessment instrument. This test, Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs), conforms to the requirements of the No Child Left behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

After the Title III Director made a presentation to the Oklahoma State Superintendent Sandy Garrett and to Oklahoma State Board members on Thursday, January 26, 2006, regarding the new test, ACCESS for ELLs will be used in Oklahoma to assess all ELLs in spring 2006. A letter was sent to all school district superintendents and principals of each school site to inform them of the ACCESS for ELLs. Information included the reason why Oklahoma will be use the ACCESS for ELLs instead of using the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA), the cost for each student, the test window in the spring, and the date of two one- day workshops on test administration. These two workshops are scheduled for Monday, February 27 and Tuesday, February 28, 2006, in Oklahoma City. The letter also informed school districts that beginning spring 2006, the ACCESS for ELLs test will be the required assessment for all students designated as ELLs, replacing the Language Assessment Scales (LAS) and IDEA proficiency Test (ITP).

To ensure the annual assessment of all LEP students, the Title III Director reviews the Student Performance Report, which includes the English proficiency level of the ELL students in their districts, and compares it with the data from the Limited English language (LEP) Survey. The staff of the Title III Section contacts the school districts that do not report their ELLs to remind them that they are required to test their ELL students in order to meet the requirements of the NCLB.

Since the WIDA consortium has a contract with MetriTech Inc. to provide printing, distributing, scoring and reporting of the test, all Oklahoma school districts are required to order the ACCESS for ELLs test from this company. A list of Bilingual/Title III school contact people has been compiled and sent to MetriTech. The Title III staff is working closely with MetriTech to assure all school districts that have ELL students enrolled order the test.

The ACCESS for ELLs addressed all five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension (a composite score of listening and reading). The composite score of all five domain areas will determine of the level of proficiency of the ELL student. There are six levels of proficiency--Entering, Beginning, Developing, Expanding, Bridging, and Monitoring. The student who scores at monitoring level will be mainstreamed into the regular classroom and will be monitored for two years after becoming proficient.

3. Since Oklahoma has just joined the WIDA consortium in January 26, 2006, Oklahoma's ELP is not aligned with the ACCESS for ELLs test.

4. The WIDA has conducted the validity and reliability of the ACCESS for ELLs.

**1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data**

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2004-2005** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

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

**1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data**

2004-2005 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State											
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency									
		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP (3)	Number and Percentage at Basic or <b>Level 1</b> (4)	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or <b>Level 2</b> (5)	Number and Percentage at Advanced or <b>Level 3</b> (6)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or <b>Level 4</b> (7)					
IPT & LAS	33508	33508 100.0	6539 20.0	13730 41.0	5990 18.0	7249 21.0					

- (1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
- (3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
- (4-7) In columns four-seven, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

**1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State**

<b>2004-2005 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs</b>		
<b>Language</b>	<b>Number and Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>	
1. Spanish	24482	77.0
2. Cherokee	1996	6.0
3. Vietnamese	1057	3.0
4. German	315	9.0
5. Korean	288	9.0
6. Arabic	224	7.0
7. Chinese	218	6.0
8. Choctaw	218	6.0
9. Creek	206	6.0
10. Hmonh	193	6.0

- 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 1.6.4.1.

**1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data**

2004-2005 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III												
Name of ELP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency								Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (7)	
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)			
IPT & LAS	29971	100.0	5890	20.0	12650	42.0	5403	18.0	6028	20.0	0	

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year.
- (3-6) In columns three-six, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2004-2005 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-6 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (7) In column seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

**1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data**

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111©:

1.6.4.1	Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2004-2005	<u>6926</u>
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	<u>6244</u>
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	<u>28</u>



### 1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

**If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), 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. Oklahoma has not made any changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report. We defined "proficient" as all students who have attained a composite score of "11" on either of the two state-adopted English language proficiency assessments-the Language Assessment Scales (LAS) or the Individualized Development English Activities (IDEA) Proficiency Test.

2. To attain a composite score of "11", a student must be proficient by scoring a "5" in oral (speaking and listening), a "3" in writing and a "3" in reading. To make a total of "11" a student must be proficient in oral (speaking, and listening) to reach to highest score of "5", in writing "3", and in reading "3". These are scale points that Oklahoma State has given to each skills area. For example, if a student comes to the United States in December, and makes "1" in oral (listening and speaking), a "1" in reading, and a "0" in writing, this student is a non-speaker.

There are six proficiency levels based on the composite scores. Each proficiency level is a combination of oral, reading, comprehension, and writing from both LAS and IPT.

(1) Non-Speaker (Composite Score 2-3)-the student has no formal education, has not been exposed to the English language and has no abilities of speaking, listening, reading and writing:

(2) Lower Beginning (Composite Score 4-5)-the student has some formal education and has little exposure to the English language and has limited abilities in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

(3) Upper Beginning (Composite Score 6-7)-the student has some knowledge of basic English conversational skills but is still limited in reading and writing.

(4) Lower Intermediate (Composite Score 8-9)-the student has a growing knowledge of English conversation skills and is beginning to have some knowledge of academic content; the student uses both languages but is stronger in the native language.

(5) Upper Intermediate (Composite Score 10)-the student has good knowledge of English conversational skill and growing knowledge of academic content; the student uses both languages but is stronger in English.

(6) Proficient (Composite Score 11)-the student meets the proficiency requirements for English language proficiency and score at the satisfactory level on Oklahoma's assessment in reading/language arts. The student can be mainstreamed into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students

3. Proficiency at this level will also have to be reflected on the state mandated assessments in reading/language arts as "satisfactory." The composite score of "11" is the highest total points possible when combining the oral (listening and speaking), reading, and writing scores.

However, Oklahoma will be using the ACCESS for ELLs this spring, and we would like to request permission to revise the state's definition of proficient when we submit the Biennial Report next year.

**1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress**

**If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), 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**

Oklahoma has not made any changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submitted in 2003-2004. Oklahoma proposed that for 2003-2004, 40% of the ELL students would show progress and 10% would attain English language proficiency; for the 2004-2005 school years, 45% of the students would show progress, and 15% would attain English language proficiency.

1. There are six levels of English proficiency- (1) Non-Speaker (Composite Score 2-3); (2) Lower Beginning (Composite Score 4-5); (3) Upper Beginning (Composite Score 6-7); (4) Lower Intermediate (Composite Score 8-9), (5) Upper Intermediate (Composite Score 10), (6) Proficient (Composite Score 11).

2. In order for a student to progress from one proficiency level to the next, the student must attain a higher composite score. For 2004-2005, 45% of ELL students in Oklahoma must show progress and 15% of ELL students must attain English proficiency.

**1.6.7 Definition of Cohort**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), 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**

Oklahoma has not made any change in the definition of cohort. Oklahoma defines "cohort" as Grades K-12 in all levels of proficiency over a 7-year time span. The performance target will show the percentage of the cohort of K-12 students showing progress in increasing English language proficiency and attaining proficiency each year as defined by the assessment using the LAS and IPT and the Oklahoma ELP Standards. The cohort includes students in all grade levels, at all levels of proficiency when entering schools, and in all types of language instruction educational programs.

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

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

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

Yes       No

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	45.0	15078	57.9	19416	15.0	5026	22.0	7472

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.

**1.6.9** Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	45.0	13486	50.0	15177	15.0	4495	22.0	6516

**1.6.10** Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2004-2005 School Year

	<b>Number:</b>
Number of Title III subgrantees	47
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	31
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	16

**1.6.11** On the following tables for 2004-2005, 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 2004-2005 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	359	87.0
4	473	91.0
5	445	79.0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	223	71.0
H.S.	157	57.0

**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	330	79.0
4	441	84.5
5	493	85.5
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	228	72.3
H.S.	83	30.0

**1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools**

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 2005 - 2006 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	<b>Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>
2005-2006 School Year	0



## 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 2003-2004 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>High School Graduates</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	85.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	86.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	78.0
Hispanic	64.0
White, non-Hispanic	81.0
Students with Disabilities	82.0
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	76.0
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

In the areas left blank, the information is not available.

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 2003-2004 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>Dropouts</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	3.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	3.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5.7
Hispanic	9.5
White, non-Hispanic	3.3
Students with Disabilities	3.9
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	4.2
Female	3.6

In the areas left blank, the information is not available.

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.