

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

State Response

The state 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.

Oklahoma's state assessment system, including science standards, was approved through ED's peer review process in 2005-2006.

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 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.

Oklahoma's state assessment system, including science standards, was approved through ED's peer review process in 2005-2006.

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

Special Educations Services, of the Oklahoma State Department of Education, in collaboration with the Office of Accountability and Assessments, and the Office of Standards and Curriculum, and many dedicated special educators from across the state, has completed the Curriculum Access Resource Guide for the Alternate achievement of Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS) standards. In accordance with the United States Department of Education (USDOE) document on Alternate Achievement Standards for Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities, students with disabilities that meet the criteria for assessments based on alternate achievement of the standards must receive instruction on alternate grade level standards. The newly developed CARG Alternate will provide special education teachers in Oklahoma with a curriculum guide for the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The use of the guide with its activities and extended academic indicators will allow the results of alternate assessments for these students to be reported for AYP purposes, up to 1% of the total student population.

Availability of CARG Alternate

The Curriculum Access Resource Guide - Alternate (CARG-A) will be made available to all special education teachers in Oklahoma Public Schools in 2007 to enable them to provide access to these students to instruction that is aligned with the alternate achievement of grade level standards for a more appropriate assessment of their progress in the state's curriculum.

The process was repeated in the Spring of 2006 for the development of the Curriculum Access Resource Guide - Modified, for the modified achievement of the standards for up to 2% of students with disabilities who can make significant progress, but may not reach grade level achievement standards within the same time frame as other students, even after receiving the best designed instructional interventions from highly trained teachers. The CARG-M will provide special education teachers with a curriculum guide, for these students, that is based on modified academic indicators and allows for modified achievement of the grade level standards. The CARG-M is also intended to be provided to special educators statewide by winter of 2007.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

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

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	314770	67.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	58735	64.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	5354	82.10
Black, non-Hispanic	34000	49.80
Hispanic	27601	58.70
White, non-Hispanic	181830	72.90
Students with Disabilities	47011	34.20
Limited English Proficient	14137	52.20
Economically Disadvantaged	163582	59.90
Migrant	852	56.80
Male	160691	67.30
Female	153683	67.70

Comments: Migrant 2005-2006 increase is due to the fact this year was the first reporting year for Grades 6 and 7 testing.

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

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	313475	75.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	58462	73.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	5330	83.80
Black, non-Hispanic	34054	60.50
Hispanic	26673	63.70
White, non-Hispanic	181146	81.10
Students with Disabilities	47441	35.00
Limited English Proficient	13480	52.40
Economically Disadvantaged	161673	67.90
Migrant	817	59.20
Male	159990	71.90
Female	152950	79.90

Comments: Migrant 2005-2006 increase is due to the fact this year was the first reporting year for Grades 6 and 7 testing.

- 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	42461	99.30
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2646	99.30

Comments: Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards was not offered in 2005-2006.

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	44794	99.30
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2647	99.30

Comments: Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards was not offered in 2005-2006.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	45081	71.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	8541	69.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	790	85.10
Black, non-Hispanic	4847	54.30
Hispanic	4446	60.90
White, non-Hispanic	25706	76.80
Students with Disabilities	6724	43.10
Limited English Proficient	2964	54.70
Economically Disadvantaged	25800	63.90
Migrant	122	60.70
Male	22975	72.30
Female	22032	70.60

Comments: Migrant count has declined from previous year.

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	44946	81.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	8532	80.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	768	89.30
Black, non-Hispanic	4846	70.40
Hispanic	4347	71.40
White, non-Hispanic	25704	85.60
Students with Disabilities	6720	44.50
Limited English Proficient	2844	64.10
Economically Disadvantaged	25683	75.90
Migrant	119	61.30
Male	22909	78.40
Female	21963	85.00

Comments: Migrant count has declined from previous year.

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	44016	79.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	8357	77.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	763	90.00
Black, non-Hispanic	4806	62.50
Hispanic	4226	70.00
White, non-Hispanic	24986	84.50
Students with Disabilities	6863	48.90
Limited English Proficient	2466	63.70
Economically Disadvantaged	24582	72.20
Migrant	119	69.70
Male	22739	79.60
Female	21240	79.00

Comments: Migrant count has declined from previous year.

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	43886	85.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	8355	85.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	746	94.10
Black, non-Hispanic	4810	76.00
Hispanic	4127	76.30
White, non-Hispanic	24973	89.40
Students with Disabilities	6854	51.10
Limited English Proficient	2351	68.70
Economically Disadvantaged	24474	80.40
Migrant	117	70.10
Male	22661	83.30
Female	21188	88.70

Comments: Migrant count has declined from previous year.

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	44524	76.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	8611	72.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	736	86.40
Black, non-Hispanic	4827	60.60
Hispanic	4105	69.10
White, non-Hispanic	25244	81.50
Students with Disabilities	7095	41.80
Limited English Proficient	2457	61.70
Economically Disadvantaged	24477	68.10
Migrant	125	62.40
Male	22794	75.90
Female	21695	76.60

Comments: Migrant count has declined from previous year.

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	44401	74.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	8612	72.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	720	82.00
Black, non-Hispanic	4829	60.30
Hispanic	4004	61.90
White, non-Hispanic	25241	80.50
Students with Disabilities	7081	34.60
Limited English Proficient	2338	49.70
Economically Disadvantaged	24384	65.90
Migrant	122	57.40
Male	22721	71.40
Female	21648	78.60

Comments: Migrant count has declined from previous year.

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	45163	73.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	8611	70.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	743	90.20
Black, non-Hispanic	4998	54.00
Hispanic	3926	66.00
White, non-Hispanic	25787	79.00
Students with Disabilities	6922	33.20
Limited English Proficient	1794	52.90
Economically Disadvantaged	24100	64.60
Migrant	148	60.10
Male	23250	71.50
Female	21863	75.30

Comments:

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

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	45068	76.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	8602	74.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	726	87.20
Black, non-Hispanic	4992	59.90
Hispanic	3855	63.60
White, non-Hispanic	25794	82.40
Students with Disabilities	6916	34.30
Limited English Proficient	1715	46.30
Economically Disadvantaged	24013	68.10
Migrant	142	65.50
Male	23220	72.50
Female	21797	81.10

Comments:

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	45450	67.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	8362	63.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	748	83.30
Black, non-Hispanic	5159	46.60
Hispanic	3807	54.70
White, non-Hispanic	26462	73.50
Students with Disabilities	6989	25.00
Limited English Proficient	1588	40.20
Economically Disadvantaged	23739	56.70
Migrant	142	56.40
Male	23203	66.10
Female	22206	67.90

Comments:

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	45263	72.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	8346	70.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	740	82.40
Black, non-Hispanic	5140	56.40
Hispanic	3698	60.50
White, non-Hispanic	26434	78.40
Students with Disabilities	6964	28.80
Limited English Proficient	1464	43.90
Economically Disadvantaged	23581	63.20
Migrant	138	54.30
Male	23099	68.00
Female	22125	77.70

Comments:

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	46666	71.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	8665	67.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	770	87.20
Black, non-Hispanic	4927	53.00
Hispanic	3719	62.80
White, non-Hispanic	27467	77.40
Students with Disabilities	7020	32.10
Limited English Proficient	1686	52.60
Economically Disadvantaged	22709	62.00
Migrant	109	62.40
Male	23818	70.90
Female	22769	72.80

Comments: Migrant count has declined from previous year.

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	46608	75.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	8671	72.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	753	84.00
Black, non-Hispanic	4927	56.60
Hispanic	3655	60.10
White, non-Hispanic	27492	81.00
Students with Disabilities	7017	30.30
Limited English Proficient	1603	41.70
Economically Disadvantaged	22653	65.10
Migrant	105	56.20
Male	23792	71.40
Female	22737	78.70

Comments: Migrant count has declined from previous year.

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	43868	32.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	7588	26.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	804	54.00
Black, non-Hispanic	4435	14.70
Hispanic	3372	20.20
White, non-Hispanic	26177	38.10
Students with Disabilities	5398	10.60
Limited English Proficient	1182	17.50
Economically Disadvantaged	18173	21.80
Migrant	87	13.70
Male	21911	33.40
Female	21877	31.70

Comments: The increase for Migrant numbers is due to the increased efforts to prevent dropouts and could also be due to the fact more Migrant students entered into high school in 2005-2006 than the previous year.

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

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	43301	63.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	7344	57.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	877	69.70
Black, non-Hispanic	4509	42.90
Hispanic	2987	45.90
White, non-Hispanic	26207	71.00
Students with Disabilities	5889	20.20
Limited English Proficient	1165	30.90
Economically Disadvantaged	16883	49.80
Migrant	74	43.30
Male	21587	57.90
Female	21491	69.60

Comments: The increase for Migrant numbers is due to the increased efforts to prevent dropouts and could also be due to the fact more Migrant students entered into high school in 2005-2006 than the previous year.

- 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	1789	1591	88.90

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	429	348	81.10

Comments: We have 540 districts but our dependent districts are K-8 or K-6, one building sites/districts. For AYP purposes the state counts these districts as a site only.

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	1304	1144	87.73

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	428	348	81.30

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.

-SEA provides a Web site (<http://sde.state.ok.us>) to support school improvement initiatives, including a link (<http://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 a plan.

-SEAs 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 a School Improvement plan template on the Web site (<http://sde.state.ok.us/NCLB/schoolimprove>)

-SEA provides a School Improvement plan checklist to ensure they are meeting the requirements of the law

-SEA annually reviews progress of each school site in School Improvement status to determine if the schools are making adequate yearly progress

-SEA provides support to the schools in School Improvement status through School Support Team visits to sites. SSTs provide assistance in analyzing and planning for school improvement

-SEA provides support to the schools through high-quality professional development, the videoconference network, and school improvement conferences, such as Dr. Robert Marzano's What Works in Schools 6 series conference and Melvina Phillips' Creating a Culture of Literacy for Middle and High Schools.

-SEA designates schools (Academic Achievement Awards and Distinguished Title I schools) that serve as models to schools in School Improvement

-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 professional learning opportunities in mathematics, reading, special education, English language learners and data analysis

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.

-SEA provides a Web site (<http://sde.state.ok.us>) to support district and school improvement initiatives, including a link (<http://sde.state.ok.us/NCLB>) to provide the most current information on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and resources to help districts and school sites implement the required activities around the law.

-SEA technical assistance for district 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 a plan.

-SEAs Oklahoma Essential Elements document assists districts and 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 a District Improvement plan template on the Web site (<http://sde.state.ok.us/NCLB/schoolimprove>)

-SEA provides a District Improvement plan checklist to ensure they are meeting the requirements of the law

-SEA annually reviews progress of each district in improvement status to determine if the schools are making adequate yearly progress

-SEA provides support to the districts and schools in School Improvement status through School Support Team visits to sites. SSTs provide assistance in analyzing and planning for school improvement

-SEA provides support to the districts and schools through high-quality professional development, the videoconference network, and school improvement conferences, such as Dr. Robert Marzano's What Works in Schools 6 series conference and Melvina Phillips' Creating a Culture of Literacy for Middle and High Schools.

-SEA designates schools (Academic Achievement Awards and Distinguished Title I schools) that serve as models to districts and schools in Improvement

-SEA offers the Master Teacher Model in which master teachers are trained throughout the state and offer training to various district and school improvement sites

-SEA offers professional learning opportunities in mathematics, reading, special education, English language learners and data analysis

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	34
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	44
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.	447
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.	18896
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
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.	
Comments:	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	27
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2248
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.	14212
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2980
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	132298	122844	92.90
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	12817	12085	94.30
Low-Poverty Schools	11434	10677	93.40
All Elementary Schools	47881	44928	93.80
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	11926	10507	88.10
Low-Poverty Schools	37837	35009	92.50
All Secondary Schools	84417	77916	92.30
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

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

How is a teacher defined?

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

How is a class defined?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	4.00
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	93.70
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.20
d) Other (please explain)	
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	5.50
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	92.90
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.60
d) Other (please explain)	
Comments:	

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	79.90	50.00
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced-Price Lunch	
Secondary Schools	69.20	41.30
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced-Price Lunch	

Comments: The original quartiles were calculated according to what we understood the 'definitions and instructions' below to say; elementary and secondary schools were lumped together into one list. If the second sentence had read 'Divide each list into 4 equal groups' instead of 'Divide the list into 4 equal groups', this would have clarified what needed to be done.

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	89.00

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

The first English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards were developed in 2003. A copy of the ELP standards was included in the report which was submitted to the United States Department of Education on September 1, 2003. Then in February 2006, Oklahoma joined the World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) consortium, and purchased the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs) for assessing ELL students in Oklahoma. The Title III Director will present the WIDA standards to State Superintendent Sandy Garrett and the State Board of Education for adoption in January 2007. The WIDA Standards were developed based on guidelines under No Child Left Behind, and written by Dr. Margo Gottlieb, a leading person in the field of English as a Second Language and assessment research, and the Title III Directors from participating states. The WIDA standards have been adopted by the Teachers of English to Speakers of other Languages (TESOL) organization.

There are five standards which reflect the social and academic dimensions of language acquisition of a second language that are expected of English language learners in grade levels K-12. Each English language proficiency standard addresses a specific context for language acquisition (social and instructional settings as well as language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) and is divided into four grade level clusters: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12.

Overall, the language proficiency standards center on the language needed and used by English language learners to communicate: (1) in English for social and instructional purposes within the school setting; (2) information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of language arts; (3) ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of mathematics; (4) information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of science; (5) information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of social studies.

Each of the five English language proficiency standards encompasses four language domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The language domains reflect the modality of the communication that is further delineated by language proficiency levels and their model performance indicators. The definitions of the four language domains are as follows: listening-to process, understand, interpret, and evaluate spoken language in a variety of situations; speaking-to engage in oral communication in a variety of situations for an array of purposes and audiences; reading-to process, interpret, and evaluate written language, symbols, and text with understanding and fluency; and writing-to engage in written communication in a variety of forms for an array of purposes and audiences.

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

An Aligning workshop to align ACCESS for ELLs and the Oklahoma Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS) in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science was held on Wednesday, November 8, and Thursday, November 9, 2006, at Fulton Learning Academy Center, in Tulsa. There were over 80 mathematics, science, and reading/language arts teachers, counselors, and English as a Second Language teachers participating in the alignment workshop. The alignment is an independent study and conducted by the WIDA staff, who applied the Web Alignment Tools (WAT). Norman Webb's alignment system is one of several alignment systems developed during the last decade. (Webb, 1977) There are five criteria for alignment between standards and assessments. These criteria, and their associated cutoff values, are: Categorical Concurrence, Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency, Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence, Balance of Representation, and Source of Challenge. Teachers were assigned into groups based on their expertise. Each group had at least five reviewers, and one of whom was the Group Leader. Four consultants from the WIDA came to add perspective and validity to the study. Teachers were asked to judge the depth-of-knowledge level of the content objectives under each standard and to identify the primary and up to two secondary objectives to which each item corresponded and to judge whether there was a source of challenge issue with any items. After that, the teachers ranked the Depth-of-Knowledge of both the PASS standards and the WIDA standards. After ranking them, the teachers aligned the standards of both. Unfortunately, because computers were down for a period, the teachers were not able to complete the alignment process. They were asked to complete the project back at their schools, using their school computers and the process has been completed.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

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

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

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

An independent study to align the WIDA standards to the PASS standards was conducted by the WIDA staff, who applied the Web Alignment Tool. By January 2007, when the alignment is completed, a copy of the WIDA standards will be sent to all school districts that have ELL students enrolled. A workshop will be held to provide teachers with strategies of how to apply the standards in their daily instruction.

The new ELP assessment, Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs), was implemented in the spring of 2006. All the K-12 ELL students in Oklahoma were assessed, using the same test and within the same testing window. All ELL students in Oklahoma are required to be assessed annually. The ACCESS for ELLs test includes five levels: K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12, and the test assesses five language areas--listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension.

One-third of the ACCESS for ELLs test items are changed each year. Teachers from all participating states are encouraged to participate in the item writing course led by the Center for Applied Linguistics. There were four teachers from Oklahoma who participated in the writing course last year. Items on every test are grouped thematically, and each theme addresses one of the five WIDA English language proficiency standards, except in speaking and writing where there are integrated tasks and one theme/set of tasks that addresses two standards. An example of addressing Standard 4 for grade level cluster 9-12, listening, might center on the theme of scientific methods in a science lab. Items targeting lower level performance indicators might call on students to identify common scientific tools or objects graphically depicted. As the items progress in addressing higher levels of English language proficiency, they might ask students to follow multi-step instructions in conducting a science experiment by choosing from a set of pictures or text. In this way, students are given a context for using academic language in a real school situation.

The ACCESS for ELLs is a secure test which is based on the NCLB, which has a specific testing window. Test security must be followed, and all materials must be accounted for. All administrators must sign confidentiality statements, and no testing materials may be produced for any purposes. District and test administrators are accountable for maintaining test security and password access to training since it contains operational test items. The test must be given by certified teachers, and those teachers must also take an online test and score 80% or higher to be able to administer the ACCESS for ELLs. Teachers score the speaking test, but the reading, writing, and listening tests are scored and reported by MetriTech, Inc. The ACCESS for ELLs was adopted by the Oklahoma State Board of Education; therefore, the test security guide is applied as it is to the state test.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	28857	81.90
2. Cherokee	1846	52.40
3. Vietnamese	930	26.40
4. German	301	0.00
5. Hmong	272	0.00
6. Chinese	245	0.00
7. Korean	236	0.00
8. Arabic	232	0.00
9. Creek	193	0.00
10. Choctaw	165	0.00

Comments: Percentages for German, Hmong, Chinese, Korean, Arabic and Creek are less than .01. However the EDEN system automatically changed these numbers to .01

For Choctaw, the percentage is .04 thus the system changed that percentage to 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 1.6.3.2.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

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

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

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
6961	2867	5

Comments:

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

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

The WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards describe the continuum of language development with five proficiency levels that are fully delineated in the standards document. These five levels outline the progression of language development implied in the acquisition of English as an additional language. These five levels are in order from lowest to highest and include: Level 1: Entering; Level 2: Beginning; Level 3: Developing; Level 4: Expanding; Level 5: Bridging. For each of the five levels, the WIDA standards describe performance definitions. Three criteria or descriptors have been used to form the definitions which are based on the students increasing in: (1) comprehension and use of technical language of content areas, (2) linguistic complexity of oral interaction or writing, and (3) developing of phonological, syntactic, and semantic understanding or usage as they move through the second language acquisition continuum. Performance definitions apply broadly to all four language domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

WIDA Language Proficiency Levels and Performance Definitions

At the given level of English language proficiency, English language learners will process, understand, produce, or use:

5-Bridging

-the technical language of the content areas;

-a variety of sentence lengths of varying linguistic complexity in extended oral or written discourse, including stories, essays, or reports;

-oral or written language approaching comparability to that of English proficient peers when presented with grade level material

4-Expanding

-specific and some technical language of the content areas;

-a variety of sentence lengths of varying linguistic complexity in oral discourse or multiple, related paragraphs;

-oral or written language with minimal phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that do not impede the overall meaning of the communication when presented with oral or written connected discourse with occasional visual and graphic support

3-Developing

-general and some specific language of the content areas;

-expanded sentences in oral interaction or written paragraphs;

-oral or written language with phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that may impede the communication but retain much of its meaning when presented with oral or written, narrative or expository descriptions with occasional

visual and graphic support

2-Beginning

-general language related to the content areas;

-phrases or short sentences;

-oral or written language with phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that often impede the meaning of the communication when presented with one to multiple-step commands, directions, questions, or a series of statements with visual and graphic support

1-Entering

-pictorial or graphic representation of the language of the content areas;

-words, phrases, or chunks of language when presented with one-step commands, directions, WH-questions, or statements with visual and graphic support

If a student scores 4.8 or above in all five components: listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension, this student has achieved the proficient level, Level 5--Bridging, and the student is no longer considered ELL. However, in a description of the ACCESS for ELLs, Level 6--Reaching and Level 7--Never ELL are also discussed. The student in Level 6-Reaching is a student in the first year of monitoring who has exited from the program and has acquired the English skills necessary to be successful in an English-only mainstream classroom without extra support. A student in Level 7--Never ELL is a student in the second year of monitoring, and is making satisfactory level or above on the Reading Core Curriculum Tests (OCCT). This student is doing as well as other students in a mainstream classroom.

The ACCESS for ELLs is broken down into five grade-level clusters: Kindergarten, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. The Listening, Reading, and Writing tests are group-administered and centrally scored. The Speaking test is an individual-administered, adaptive test that is scored by the test administrator.

ACCESS for ELLs assesses all four domains of language--listening, speaking, reading, and writing. When a student reaches 4.80 as the composite score, and also reaches Satisfactory on the reading/language arts section of the state test, he/she is determined to be proficient.

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

For 2005 - 2006, the state proposed that 55 percent of ELL students would show progress and 25 percent of students would attain English proficiency.

A majority of school districts in Oklahoma would have met this target if the students had been assessed with either the LAS or IPT, but Oklahoma adopted a new test, Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs). This test not only assesses the social language of students but also assesses their academic language while the LAS and IPT tests measure only social language.

The ACCESS for ELLs is a standards-based, criterion-referenced English language proficiency test. The ACCESS for ELLs was designed based on the guidelines of the OELA office to measure both social and academic language.

The Oklahoma State Department of Education understands the different nature and purpose of the ACCESS for ELLs and the LAS and IPT tests. Therefore, the Department submitted a letter to the United States Department of Education Office of Language Language Acquisition to request using test scores of ELL students as the new baseline. The request was denied. To be fair to all school districts and ELL students, the Oklahoma State Department of Education established a committee to help develop a method to convert test scores from the LAS and IPT to the ACCESS for ELLs. The committee members included Title III Directors, English as a Second Language teachers, classroom teachers, counselors, and administrators from Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Union, Lawton, Midwest City-Del City, Duncan, El Reno, Mustang, Edmond, Western Heights, and Woodward. The committee reviewed bridge studies which were conducted by the WIDA, as well as a study conducted by one school district that tested 46 ELL students who previously scored proficient or 11 on the LAS/IPT in previous years. The test scores ranked from 3.5 to a high of 4.9. Based on the results of this study and the bridge studies which were conducted by WIDA, the committee concluded that 11, the proficient level which Oklahoma had previously selected, based on the LAS and IPT tests, is equivalent to only 4.0 on the ACCESS for ELLs. The committee also proposed that for 2006-2007 and for upcoming years, the score 4.8 in level C is the proficient level. If a student scores 4.8 in all components: listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension, he/she will be considered proficient.

For the transitional year, the committee has recommended score conversions all school districts must use to calculate the English language growth of ELLs.

A composite score of oral, reading and writing on the LAS/IPT is equivalent to a composite score on the ACCESS for ELLs as follows:

A score of 2, 3, or 4 on the LAS/IPT is equivalent to 1.0 (Entering) on the ACCESS for ELLs

A score of 5 or 6 on the LAS/IPT is equivalent to 2.0 (Beginning) on the ACCESS for ELLs

A score of 7, 8, or 9 on the LAS/IPT is equivalent to 3.0 (Developing) on the ACCESS for ELLs

A score of 10 on the LAS/IPT is equivalent to 4.0 (Expanding) on the ACCESS for ELLs

A score of 11 on the LAS/IPT is equivalent to 4.0 (Bridging) on the ACCESS for ELLs

If a student has an equivalent ACCESS for ELLs test score of 2, 3, or 4 in the LAS/IPT, and his/her current score is

2.1, or 2.3 on the ACCESS for ELLs, this student is Making Progress and showing growth. The new AMAOs which Oklahoma has proposed for making progress and attaining English proficiency, rank the scores as follows:

1.0 for all students scoring 1.0 - 2.0;

.7 for all students scoring 2.1 - 2.8;

.6 for all students scoring 2.9 - 3.5;

.5 for all students scoring 3.6 - 4.1;

.5 for all students scoring 4.2 - 4.7.

Only 5% of students after five years in the program attained English. Oklahoma would like to request to revise the AMAO after the ELL students have participated for the second 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

It is important to think of how the AMAOs realistically portray who our students are and how indeed they acquire English for academic success in a timely fashion. Based on current literature and studies conducted by WIDA, Oklahoma is requesting to change the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) so that:

- They reflect the amount of time LEP/ELLs are enrolled in a language instruction educational program.
- They are based on the proficiency level of the LEP/ELLs (Cohorts Levels).
- They set targets for annual increases in English proficiency and attainment of English using a baseline.
- They use consistent methods and measurements to indicate progress in English proficiency and attainment of English proficiency.

Therefore, five cohorts have been identified based on the amount of time, and proficiency level, and the progress of each cohort. These cohorts are:

- I. All ELL students who have a composite score on the ACCESS from 1.0 - 2.0
- II. All ELL students who have a composite score on the ACCESS from 2.1 - 2.8
- III. All ELL students who have a composite score on the ACCESS from 2.9 - 3.5
- IV. All ELL students who have a composite score on the ACCESS from 3.6 - 4.1
- V. All ELL students who have a composite score on the ACCESS from 4.2 - 4.7
- VI. All ELL students who reached proficient have a composite score on the ACCESS of 4.8 or above and score satisfactory or above on the state reading test become first year Monitoring.
- VII. All ELL students in the second year of Monitoring and have reached proficient level of 4.8 or above and score satisfactory or above on the state reading test.

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

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

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

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 55.00	# 18880	% 63.00	# 19720	% 25.00	# 7735	% 26.00	# 8138

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	55.00	18880	63.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		244	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	25.00	7735	26.00
TOTAL		26859	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? No

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	72
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	48
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	40
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	68
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	31
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	36
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	61
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	10
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	10
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	Yes

Comments:

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

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

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments		
Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	499	89.00
4	631	92.00
5	657	83.00
6	698	78.00
7	512	71.00
8	476	73.00
H.S.	214	58.00

Comments:

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	460	82.00
4	593	86.00
5	683	86.00
6	713	80.00
7	488	77.00
8	501	77.00
H.S.	133	28.00

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

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

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

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

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	82.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	86.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.60
Black, non-Hispanic	76.20
Hispanic	70.20
White, non-Hispanic	86.40
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

Comments: Specific group information left blank 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 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	3.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.80
Black, non-Hispanic	4.70
Hispanic	7.50
White, non-Hispanic	3.00
Students with Disabilities	3.60
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	3.80
Female	3.30

Comments: LEP, Economically Disadvantaged, and Migrant group information is not collected for Dropout Rate. Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

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

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

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

STATE RESPONSE

175 instructional days plus 5 professional days = 180 total days

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	529	513
LEAs with Subgrants	11	11

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	134	220
1	141	201
2	118	205
3	129	191
4	109	167
5	104	149
6	101	124
7	113	107
8	120	141
9	135	147
10	123	110
11	111	86
12	112	54

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	334	623
Doubled-up	873	885
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	98	57
Hotels/Motels	83	2
Unknown	162	335

Comments:

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

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

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

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

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	220
1	201
2	205
3	191
4	167
5	149
6	124
7	107
8	141
9	147
10	110
11	86
12	54

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

77

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

208

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)

0

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)	195
English Language Learners (ELL)	138
Gifted and Talented	43
Vocational Education	76

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

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

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	10
Expedited evaluations	4
Staff professional development and awareness	6
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	5
Transportation	8
Early childhood programs	5
Assistance with participation in school programs	7
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	7
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	4
Coordination between schools and agencies	8
Counseling	5
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	5
Clothing to meet a school requirement	5
School supplies	6
Referral to other programs and services	5
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	4
Other (optional)	

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

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

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

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

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
High mobility	1

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

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

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	145	91
Grade 4	Yes	103	77
Grade 5	Yes	113	70
Grade 6	N/A	47	33
Grade 7	N/A	37	24
Grade 8	Yes	78	43
Grade 9	N/A	20	7
Grade 10	Yes	38	18
Grade 11	N/A	4	2
Grade 12	N/A	2	0

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	145	77
Grade 4	Yes	104	73
Grade 5	Yes	116	70
Grade 6	N/A	47	31
Grade 7	N/A	37	20
Grade 8	Yes	79	45
Grade 9	Yes	32	5
Grade 10	Yes	34	17
Grade 11	N/A	7	1
Grade 12	N/A	3	1

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.