

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

STATE RESPONSE

Rhode Island, in partnership with Vermont and New Hampshire, has developed science assessment benchmarks. These benchmarks identify the "big ideas" in science, from which we will build assessments at grades 4, 8 and 11. Staff from the Center for Assessment, located in Dover, NH, facilitated the development of these and involved state department content and assessment staff as well as science teachers at the elementary, middle and high school levels. Their work was guided by existing standards and benchmarks available at the national level. The benchmarks were finalized in June, 2005. Rhode Island expanded these assessment benchmarks to develop gradespan expectations. These expectations were written for grades k2, 3-5, 6-8 and high school. Rhode Island involved science teachers from kindergarten through grade 12 in the development and review of the grade span expectations. The final Rhode Island grade span expectations were ready in January, 2006. Rhode Island has expanded its science expectations to be include technology and engineering for a comprehensive set of science, technology, and engineering standards.

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

Mathematics and Language Arts: Rhode Island's assessment program in reading, writing, and mathematics in grades 3-8 were administered for the first time in October, 2005. These assessments were developed in partnership with the New Hampshire and Vermont Departments of Education; their title is the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP). Measured Progress of Dover, NH, is the contractor for these assessments and the Center for Assessment is providing technical assistance. LEAs have had extensive involvement in the development of the NECAP assessments, beginning with the development of the grade level expectations (GLE). Teachers and administrators from many of our school districts participated in the development of the GLE; and each district was asked to assemble "review teams" that would provide written feedback on the draft GLE and plan for professional development within the district. These review teams were comprised of teachers representing each content area and all grade levels. The lead person on each review team was invited to an intensive professional development series to learn more about the GLE and the test blueprints in reading, writing and mathematics. Annually, teachers and administrators from RI serve on assessment review committees for each content area. In this role, they join practitioners from VT and NH to review test items across very specific criteria. Other RI practitioners participate in the bias and sensitivity review committee with colleagues from VT and NH. Finally, a one-time standard setting process involved over 80 educators from RI joined colleagues from the partner states to make recommendations as part of a standard setting panel in January. The new high school assessments in reading, writing, and mathematics for RI, NH, and VT have been pilot tested in all three states. Teacher participation panels, similar in format to the NECAP 3-8 panels, have been involved in the development of the high school tests. Measured Progress is the contractor. The New Standards Reference Exam in English Language Arts and Mathematics will be administered to 11th graders in March of 2007 for the last time. The new NECAP assessments will be phased-in in October 2007. Science Assessments: Rhode Island is developing its science assessments for grades 4, 8, and 11 in partnership with NH and VT. The jointly developed science assessment benchmarks were used to develop test specifications as part of an RFP. The contract was awarded to Measured Progress and West Ed. A pilot test is scheduled for implementation in May of 2007. Teachers have been involved in all phases of review and development in the process outlined for other all NECAP testing. Alternate Assessment: Rhode Island has a contract with Measured Progress for the Alternate Assessment development for grade 2 through 8 and 10 for reading and mathematics and grades 4, 7, 10 for writing. The Alternate Assessment in Science will be administered in grades 4, 8, and 11. The revised test design supports a portfolio aligned to the GLE. Teams of regular education and special education teachers wrote Alternate Grade Span Expectations (AGSE) in mathematics, reading, writing, and science by creating a downward extension of the GLE. The AGSE have been reviewed in school districts using a process similar to that described above for GLE review. A pilot of the revised Alternate Assessment was conducted during the 2005-2006 school year. Standards were set for the revised Alternate Assessment in October of 2006 involving a panel of regular education and special education teachers representing all grade spans. The science alternate assessment is under development and will be pilot tested in the spring of 2007.

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

Rhode Island, with our NECAP partners, Vermont and New Hampshire, set academic achievement standards for our new assessments at grades 3-8 in reading, writing and mathematics in January, 2006. Each state had 84 teacher participants (6 per grade level and content area) who met for two days to use a "bookmark" standard setting protocol to recommend cut scores -- how good is good enough? -- for each of the four achievement levels. The teacher participants were nominated by their schools and districts. The process was facilitated by Measured Progress, with assistance from the Center for Assessment. The tri-state Technical Advisory Committee had assisted in identifying the best processes to use. These are the names of the four academic achievement levels: Proficient With Distinction, Proficient, Partially Proficient, and Substantially Below Proficient.

Standard Setting for the RI Alternate Assessment: Following the first year of full implementation of the revised RI Alternate Assessment, in summer of 2007, the achievement standards will be set. The method to be used will be determined after consultation with Measured Progress, the Center for Assessment and the tri-state

Technical Advisory Committee. The Alternate Assessment achievement standards in science have been developed and are being used to design the pilot Alternate Assessment in Science, which will be administered in the spring of 2007.

Standard Setting for the NECAP Science Assessments: The academic achievement standards for the NECAP Science Assessments will be set in summer of 2008, following the first administration of these assessments in spring, 2008. The method to be used will be determined after consultation with the soon-to-be-named contractor, the Center for Assessment and the tri-state Technical Advisory Committee.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments

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

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

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

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	81954	98.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	473	96.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	2580	97.80
Black, non-Hispanic	6836	96.70
Hispanic	13769	96.70
White, non-Hispanic	57218	98.00
Students with Disabilities	14953	95.00
Limited English Proficient	5589	98.00
Economically Disadvantaged	29758	97.80
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	41333	97.30
Female	39175	98.40

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

Awaiting data on high school assessments. Revised report will be submitted by Dec. 21st.

- 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	81980	98.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	478	97.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2527	96.30
Black, non-Hispanic	6804	96.40
Hispanic	13557	95.40
White, non-Hispanic	57290	98.20
Students with Disabilities	14998	95.40
Limited English Proficient	5177	95.80
Economically Disadvantaged	29516	97.10
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	41272	97.20
Female	39055	98.10

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	14597	95.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	356	98.60

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island's Alternate Assessment is aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards.

Awaiting data on high school assessments. Revised report will be submitted by Dec. 21st.

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	14642	95.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	356	98.60

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island's Alternate Assessment is aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards.

Awaiting data on high school assessments. Revised report will be submitted by Dec. 21st.

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	11155	50.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	75	29.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	382	51.10
Black, non-Hispanic	967	27.20
Hispanic	2039	23.10
White, non-Hispanic	7680	60.90
Students with Disabilities	1960	28.50
Limited English Proficient	1050	17.10
Economically Disadvantaged	4530	30.60
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	5726	52.30
Female	5343	49.10

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	11084	60.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	75	44.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	371	61.70
Black, non-Hispanic	963	40.40
Hispanic	1989	31.90
White, non-Hispanic	7674	70.00
Students with Disabilities	1962	31.10
Limited English Proficient	972	20.90
Economically Disadvantaged	4476	40.00
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	5697	56.40
Female	5308	64.30

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	11369	52.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	48	33.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	359	53.20
Black, non-Hispanic	956	25.00
Hispanic	2035	26.00
White, non-Hispanic	7964	62.10
Students with Disabilities	2127	24.90
Limited English Proficient	1007	15.90
Economically Disadvantaged	4543	32.30
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	5855	53.00
Female	5439	51.60

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	11300	60.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	48	56.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	354	59.90
Black, non-Hispanic	951	35.90
Hispanic	1977	31.90
White, non-Hispanic	7963	70.30
Students with Disabilities	2128	25.90
Limited English Proficient	929	18.50
Economically Disadvantaged	4493	39.80
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	5819	55.70
Female	5411	65.80

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	11469	52.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	69	26.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	361	62.60
Black, non-Hispanic	952	28.90
Hispanic	1984	30.90
White, non-Hispanic	8091	60.90
Students with Disabilities	2245	24.60
Limited English Proficient	951	19.90
Economically Disadvantaged	4438	34.50
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	5835	53.50
Female	5534	52.70

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	11393	59.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	69	39.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	344	63.70
Black, non-Hispanic	937	36.70
Hispanic	1933	36.00
White, non-Hispanic	8098	68.10
Students with Disabilities	2250	25.90
Limited English Proficient	861	22.20
Economically Disadvantaged	4371	41.00
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	5808	54.60
Female	5493	65.70

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	12095	49.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	73	46.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	383	51.40
Black, non-Hispanic	1031	26.40
Hispanic	2138	24.20
White, non-Hispanic	8429	58.60
Students with Disabilities	2297	17.50
Limited English Proficient	917	13.70
Economically Disadvantaged	4676	30.00
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	6249	49.20
Female	5752	50.40

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	12020	57.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	73	50.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	371	50.90
Black, non-Hispanic	1022	39.50
Hispanic	2089	34.00
White, non-Hispanic	8423	66.30
Students with Disabilities	2295	21.20
Limited English Proficient	841	16.20
Economically Disadvantaged	4618	38.20
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	6205	52.90
Female	5726	63.60

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	12198	47.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	89	29.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	384	47.10
Black, non-Hispanic	1082	20.20
Hispanic	2106	19.90
White, non-Hispanic	8524	57.40
Students with Disabilities	2235	13.20
Limited English Proficient	711	8.40
Economically Disadvantaged	4568	25.60
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	6199	47.10
Female	5901	47.50

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	12131	56.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	88	42.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	374	51.90
Black, non-Hispanic	1066	30.20
Hispanic	2066	28.40
White, non-Hispanic	8523	66.70
Students with Disabilities	2242	18.10
Limited English Proficient	619	11.00
Economically Disadvantaged	4510	34.10
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	6169	52.50
Female	5867	60.90

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	12351	47.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	68	32.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	396	48.50
Black, non-Hispanic	1001	20.20
Hispanic	2016	19.10
White, non-Hispanic	8861	56.60
Students with Disabilities	2289	13.70
Limited English Proficient	597	6.70
Economically Disadvantaged	4320	25.80
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	6307	47.80
Female	5943	46.90

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	12305	55.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	69	46.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	393	49.10
Black, non-Hispanic	993	29.80
Hispanic	1969	24.60
White, non-Hispanic	8871	65.70
Students with Disabilities	2296	21.00
Limited English Proficient	521	10.80
Economically Disadvantaged	4272	32.70
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	6289	51.20
Female	5917	60.70

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

- 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	10196	45.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	47	36.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	310	46.10
Black, non-Hispanic	810	20.10
Hispanic	1404	20.90
White, non-Hispanic	7494	53.30
Students with Disabilities	1514	16.10
Limited English Proficient	353	12.50
Economically Disadvantaged	2565	26.30
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	4982	45.50
Female	5158	45.70

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

Awaiting data on high school assessments. Revised report will be submitted by Dec. 21st.

- 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	10292	56.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	52	42.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	310	53.90
Black, non-Hispanic	830	37.10
Hispanic	1429	33.40
White, non-Hispanic	7562	63.80
Students with Disabilities	1540	25.00
Limited English Proficient	353	15.60
Economically Disadvantaged	2608	38.30
Migrant	0	0.00
Male	5069	50.60
Female	5200	62.70

Comments: NOTE: Rhode Island no longer accepts Title I-Part C Migrant Education funds.

Awaiting data on high school assessments. Revised report will be submitted by Dec. 21st.

- 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	319	216	67.70

Comments: Number may have been much higher in 2004-05 because assessments administered in h.s. only; elem. and middle schools evaluated on attendance target only and almost all therefore made ayp.

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	36	22	61.10

Comments:

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	143	81	56.60

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	33	19	57.60

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.

Schools Identified for Improvement

Schools identified for improvement are required to revise their school improvement plans so they include all plan components required by No Child Left Behind. Schools are also required to implement a Peer Review process of their school improvement plans. In addition, RIDE provides regular school improvement/Title I clinics for schools and districts to understand school and district responsibilities pertaining to choice and supplemental education services

Schools Identified for Corrective Action

Schools identified for corrective action are required to revise their school improvement plans to include all plan components required by No Child Left Behind. Schools are also required to implement a Peer Review process of their school improvement plans. In addition, RIDE provides regular school improvement/Title I clinics for schools and districts to understand school and district responsibilities pertaining to corrective actions specifically in the development of a Corrective Action Plan.

RIDE provides technical assistance in the form of Turnaround Facilitators or leadership team mentors. RIDE also develops Corrective Action Partnership Agreements with the school(s), teachers union, district, and state and implements Commissioner's Visits to assess implementation and progress toward meeting the goals outlined in the School Improvement Plans

Schools Identified for Restructuring

See schools identified for corrective action.

RIDE works collaboratively with the district in the development of a Restructuring Plan.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

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

Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action

Districts identified for improvement and corrective action are required to work with RIDE to develop and implement a District Negotiated Agreement that outlines district and state roles and responsibilities and school-focused Action Plans. The allocation of state and federal resources is tied to the District Negotiated Agreement. Quarterly district face to face meetings with the RI Department of Education are held to assess progress and troubleshoot barriers to implementation. Currently, RIDE provides district leadership mentors or a "Special Master" if warranted. RIDE also maintains oversight of all district federal and state funding expenditure decisions.

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.	16
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.	18
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.	34
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.	16334
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.	175
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.	34
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.	21
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2402
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.	12472
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.	3665
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	11168	9075	81.30
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	1272	979	76.97
Low-Poverty Schools	1225	1032	84.24
All Elementary Schools	5305	4335	81.70
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	720	518	71.94
Low-Poverty Schools	1612	1400	86.26
All Secondary Schools	5863	4740	80.88
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	50.00
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	50.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	35.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	60.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	5.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
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	35.00	35.00
Poverty Metric Used	Free/Reduced Lunch. High poverty: More than 58% of students receiving free/reduced-price lunch. Low poverty: Less than 11.4% of students receiving free/reduced-price lunch.	
Secondary Schools	35.00	35.00
Poverty Metric Used	Free/Reduced Lunch. High poverty: More than 60% of students receiving free/reduced-price lunch. Low poverty: Less than 10% of students receiving free/reduced-price lunch.	
Comments:		

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

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

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

Rhode Island is a partner with World Class Instruction Design and Assessment(WIDA) Consortium along with 15 other States.In 2004 RI rolled out the WIDA Consortium Standards for grades K-12 with the following clusters K-2 3-5 6-8 and 9-12. Shortly after the consortium realized that we needed to have a pre-k 1-2 3-5 6-8 and 9-12. That reconfiguration will be implemented in 2008 testing cycle. The Pre-K Standards are ready and will be distributed and implemented by January, 2007. Recognizing that this change was forthcoming we put a hold on going to the Board for Approval and decided to wait until the revised version is complete.

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

In 2003-2004 the WIDA Consortium developed the English Language Proficiency standards for English Language Learners in Kindergarten through Grade K- 12 based on each participant State content standards or in the case of RI Grade Level Expectations for grades 3-8. Since then RI has developed the 9-12 Grade Span Expectations (GSES) and K-12 Grade Span Expectations in Science.

Wida has scheduled for December 4-5, 2006 the alignment of assessments to standards that is the degree to which a test's items cover the content the test is intended to measure and at the appropriate depth. Alignment is necessary for making valid inferences about student performance on large -scale assessments. Furthermore, evidence of alignment between a State's English Language Proficiency test is a Title III reporting requirements.

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:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent alignment study <u>Yes</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of alignment <u>Yes</u>
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:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p>ACCESS for ELLs will be administered for the 2nd time on March 2007. Every student in grades K-12 will take the test. Also Rhode Island tests the monitored students in grades K-12. Because RI has a student ID we are able to match these results and the NECAP results to ensure that the monitored students are doing ok on both tests. The ACCESS for ELLs measure five domains: Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing and Comprehension. This test was developed based on the ESL Standards.</p> <p>The ACCESS for ELLs has series 100, (2005) series 101 (2006) and series 102 (2008). For Technical quality WIDA has produced two reports: 1st. Annual Technical Report for series 100, 2005 Administration. Results indicate that the reliability of the overall composite score is very high across all grade level clusters. The report presents a wealth of data documenting all technical qualities of ACCESS for ELLs series 100. In addition to information on validity, reliability and the accuracy and consistency of classifications, the report provide details on equating and scaling, differential item functioning (DIF analysis) for each item or assessment task, information on conditional standard errors of measurement for all scores, including a separate table highlighting conditional standard errors around the cut score</p> <p>The analyses will be used in the continual refinement and improvement of the ACCESS for ELLs assessment program. This is the only test that RI has to determine English Language Proficiency.</p> <p>2nd. Development and Field Test of ACCESS for ELLs Technical Report #1. The reliability of the field test scores is important. Issues related to the interaction of the test items and the variation due to individual raters can be raised. WIDA plans an annual refreshment of a portion of the items in each operational year of ACCESS for ELLs, an increase in the reliability of the items may indicate a decrease in measurement error due to a better specifications of the items for the intended populations, improvement in the training of the raters and administrators, and better targetting of the items to the intended examinee population for each form.</p> <p>The WIDA consortium has an active technical advisory council with national experts to assist with ensuring the highest standards of validity and reliability.</p> <p>2nd. Development and Field Test of ACCESS for Ells Technical #1 The reliability analyses focuses on understanding the relationship between variation among the unobserved "true" scores in a group of students and the variation among the observed scores in a group of students. The variation in observed scores is viewed as due to a combination of both the true score variation and variation due to error. While there are different approaches to the analyses of reliability and the computation of reliability indices, conceptually such indices intend to show the ratio of true score variation plus variation due to measurement error.</p> <p>2nd.</p>

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	7904	68.90
2. Portuguese	7904	4.70
3. Creole Patois	7904	3.20
4. African Languages	7904	2.40
5. Cape Verdean	7904	1.80
6. Cambodian	7904	1.40
7. Asian Languages	7904	1.00
8. French	7904	0.90
9. Hmong	7904	0.90
10. Laotian	7904	0.80

Comments: We have many more small numbers of Japanese Turkish Polish Korean Italian German Greek Hindi etc.

- 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
2600	2600	0

Comments: During the 2005-2006 school year RI actually experienced a decrease in the immigrant students.

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.)

Rhode Island attributes the decrease to be due to the lack of jobs, the issues with immigration and the Rhode Island economy.

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

Currently we still use the same definition of Proficiency that was submitted in the previous report.

RI is trying to make final decisions, however we only have one year data from The ACCESS for ELLs. The ACCESS tests have four separate domains (Listening, Speaking, Reading and writing) and provide score reports in those four plus comprehension (based on the listening and reading domains).

The WIDA consortium just convened teachers from each member State to to do the cut scores (reports not available yet)

The domains are weighted as follows:

50% listning + 50% speaking

50% Reading + 50% Writing

In addition to the test scores, teachers give feedback and input on how students demonstrate proficiency in their classrooms.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

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

Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

The same reason applies for achieving progress. We only have one year of data so we still struggling with decisions that are made based on data. We have met a few times and are leaning toward .5 (we'll validate this with our second year of testing data).

The English Language Proficiency Levels are:

Entering, Beginning, Development, Expanding, Bridging and Attained.

Our criteria is a multiple approach-English Proficiency Scores, content scores, teacher input, ESL Standards and GLEs and GSEs. As indicated our criteria is .5 but (it will be validated with our second year of testing data).

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

RI USES A MATCH NAME COHORT. 3 YEARS OR MORE IN LEP PROGRAM INCREASE 40% IN PROFICIENCY LEVEL.

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	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#

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.

RI uses ACCESS for ELLs to determine the progress of ELL students in learning English and NECAP for Content Achievement. We also have a student Id that will facilitate how the same student will do on both Assessments. At this point it is not complete.

AMAOs--Proficiency Attainment: ELL students must achieve English Language proficiency at a satisfactory pace. The operational definition of this indicator is based on performance on the ACCESS for ELLs Assessment first administered in March 2006. Student proficiency on ACCESS is treated in the AMAO system as a score of 4.5 on the 6 point ACCESS scale. (A special review of data has indicated that students who achieve proficiency at the 4.5 level or higher have a probability of achieving proficient proficiency on the NECAP exams that is comparable to students in the general population. The AMAO target stipulates that of all students in LEP services for at least three years, at least 40 percent of those students district-wide must be proficient.

Proficient Improvement: ELL students must make sufficient progress in English language proficiency. If the district-wide average growth score was at least 0.5 performance levels on the 6 point scale, the district met the AMAOP for proficiency improvement.

Academic Achievement: ELL students must meet the ELA and mathematics achievement level requirements used under the NCLB/Title I portion of the law. RI uses ELL performance as two of the 37 performance targets in determining whether districts make adequately yearly progression in the NCLB accountability system.

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	4.50		
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS			
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	0.50		
TOTAL			

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

* 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	16
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	11
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	11
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	12
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	12
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	14
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	5
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	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments: RI applies Title III moneys for all LEP students. We still working on a system that will provide us with all the required information.

* 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	239	97.00
4	251	94.00
5	329	85.00
6	468	40.00
7	298	34.00
8	166	22.00
H.S.	388	15.00

Comments: This data includes Monitored students Year 1 and Year 2.

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	238	81.00
4	251	63.00
5	329	73.00
6	469	37.00
7	311	25.00
8	168	22.00
H.S.	388	33.00

Comments: This data includes Monitored students year 1 and year 2.

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	85.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	72.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	81.00
Black, non-Hispanic	78.70
Hispanic	73.70
White, non-Hispanic	87.80
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	82.60
Female	87.30

Comments: Rates for students with disabilities, LEP and economically disadvantaged students will not be available until 2007-08; RI does not collect information on migrant students.

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	15.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	27.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	19.00
Black, non-Hispanic	21.30
Hispanic	26.30
White, non-Hispanic	12.20
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	17.40
Female	12.70
Comments: see comments on graduation rates.	
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.	

1.9.1.1 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

A total of 180 instructional 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	35	35
LEAs with Subgrants	6	6

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	20	39
1	11	39
2	19	25
3	14	29
4	14	23
5	<n	31
6	10	24
7	14	23
8	10	18
9	13	19
10	<n	<n
11	<n	15
12	<n	11

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	37	192
Doubled-up	62	64
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	<n	<n
Hotels/Motels	25	47
Unknown	31	<n

Comments:

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

1.9.2.1 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	49
1	39
2	33
3	30
4	28
5	35
6	29
7	22
8	15
9	17
10	<n
11	<n
12	<n

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

14

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

49

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)	121
English Language Learners (ELL)	23
Gifted and Talented	<n
Vocational Education	<n

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

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

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	6
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	4
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	4
Transportation	6
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	5
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	4
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	5
Coordination between schools and agencies	4
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
Clothing to meet a school requirement	3
School supplies	5
Referral to other programs and services	3
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	4
Other (optional)	1

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	3
School selection	1
Transportation	3
School records	2
Immunizations or other medical records	2
Other enrollment issues	2

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
Frequent mobilization of families	1
Doubled-up families not self-identifying homeless status	1
	0

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	DNA		
Grade 4	DNA		
Grade 5	DNA		
Grade 6	DNA		
Grade 7	DNA		
Grade 8	DNA		
Grade 9	DNA		
Grade 10	DNA		
Grade 11	DNA		
Grade 12	DNA		

Comments: For 05-06 homeless student achievement data is not available as a state student identification system has not been established. When costs allow, this data will be made available.

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	DNA		
Grade 4	DNA		
Grade 5	DNA		
Grade 6	DNA		
Grade 7	DNA		
Grade 8	DNA		
Grade 9	DNA		
Grade 10	DNA		
Grade 11	DNA		
Grade 12	DNA		

Comments: For 05-06 homeless student achievement data is not available.

* 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.