

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

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

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



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

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

## PART I

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

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

## PART II

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

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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



**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I**

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



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

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

**State Response**

The Ohio Department of Education has completed the development of challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). Ohio's State Board of Education officially adopted the standards in December 2003. The academic content standards in science include 12th grade culminating expectations, benchmark expectations for the end of grades five and eight, and indicator expectations for the end of each grade level.



**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**

The Ohio Department of Education has developed assessments aligned to our academic content standards for grades 3-8 and for grade 10 in reading and mathematics. Science tests for grades 5 and 8 are fully operational in spring 2007. The science test for grade 10 was operational in spring 2005. The development and implementation of the alternate assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities in all subject areas is on the same schedule as the regular assessment and they are aligned with the grade level academic content standards.

The process of development includes widespread involvement of local district educators as content advisors, bias and sensitivity reviewers, and members of a statewide testing steering committee. The development of alternate assessments includes the involvement of local district special educators as advisors. All test items are field tested before inclusion in operational administrations.

The first operational administration of these new assessments occurred in spring 2004, when the third grade reading and tenth grade reading and mathematics tests were administered. In spring 2005, operational administrations of the third, fourth, fifth, and eighth grade reading tests; the third, seventh, eighth, and tenth grade mathematics tests; and the tenth grade science test occurred. In spring 2006, all reading and mathematics tests will be operational in grades 3-8 and 10, and science at grade 10. In spring 2007, the fifth and eighth grade science tests will be operational.

Additionally, each operational administration includes the operational administration of alternate assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities that are aligned to grade level academic content standards.

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

**State Response**

The Ohio Department of Education sets academic achievement standards based on data from the initial operational administration of each assessment. We apply a modified bookmark procedure, whereby content experts from Ohio local school districts apply their professional judgment to identify cut scores that represent student performance against Ohio's academic content standards.

To date, academic achievement standards have been set for the third through eighth and tenth grade reading tests; the third through eighth and tenth grade mathematics tests; and for the fifth, eighth and tenth grade science tests.

The standard setting for the alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities uses the collection of evidence method, whereby special education experts including teachers set the cut scores. Performance on the alternate assessment is measured against alternate achievement standards. The development of the alternate achievement standards has followed the same schedule as the regular assessment, except the academic achievement standards will be set for the fifth and eighth grade science tests for the alternate assessments in spring 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	964853	99.39
American Indian or Alaska Native	1315	98.72
Asian or Pacific Islander	12796	99.77
Black, non-Hispanic	160933	98.37
Hispanic	21871	98.87
White, non-Hispanic	742694	99.63
Students with Disabilities	143398	98.83
Limited English Proficient	14554	99.38
Economically Disadvantaged	354087	99.04
Migrant	736	99.46
Male	495182	99.29
Female	469671	99.50

**Comments:** Multiracial -> 25,244 / 25,438 = 99.24%

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	968656	99.43
American Indian or Alaska Native	1331	98.89
Asian or Pacific Islander	12646	99.74
Black, non-Hispanic	161826	98.46
Hispanic	21699	98.96
White, non-Hispanic	745725	99.66
Students with Disabilities	144096	98.91
Limited English Proficient	14485	99.45
Economically Disadvantaged	356300	99.10
Migrant	762	99.48
Male	497189	99.34
Female	471467	99.53

**Comments:** Multiracial -> 25,429 / 25,622 = 99.25%

- 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	73585	88.80
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	7934	9.60

**Comments:**

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	91282	89.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	10066	9.80

**Comments:**

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

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

**1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	131241	74.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	179	73.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1904	86.10
Black, non-Hispanic	21388	49.40
Hispanic	3348	61.00
White, non-Hispanic	99810	80.80
Students with Disabilities	18820	54.30
Limited English Proficient	2701	59.60
Economically Disadvantaged	53542	61.10
Migrant	118	58.50
Male	67696	75.50
Female	63545	74.10

**Comments:** Multiracial ->  $3,240/4,612 = 70.25\%$

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	135414	75.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	191	67.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1967	84.30
Black, non-Hispanic	22321	52.20
Hispanic	3520	59.00
White, non-Hispanic	102618	80.60
Students with Disabilities	19398	52.30
Limited English Proficient	2832	55.30
Economically Disadvantaged	56029	61.00
Migrant	153	47.70
Male	69855	72.50
Female	65559	77.80

**Comments:** Multiracial ->  $3,407/4,797 = 71.02\%$

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

**1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	131868	76.85
American Indian or Alaska Native	180	76.67
Asian or Pacific Islander	1933	91.10
Black, non-Hispanic	21695	50.72
Hispanic	3344	61.84
White, non-Hispanic	100424	82.89
Students with Disabilities	20186	51.89
Limited English Proficient	2591	59.86
Economically Disadvantaged	52931	62.34
Migrant	113	58.41
Male	67657	76.69
Female	64211	77.02

**Comments:** Multiracial -> Students Tested = 4,292; Percent Proficient = 72.83%

This test was not used for AYP purposes in 2005-06. No AYP goals were presented beforehand, and the alternate assessment cap was based on a wider population. Results submitted per instructions from U.S. Department of Education.

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

**1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	131730	76.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	180	77.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1890	87.40
Black, non-Hispanic	21677	53.80
Hispanic	3271	61.90
White, non-Hispanic	100423	82.10
Students with Disabilities	20190	50.40
Limited English Proficient	2533	56.30
Economically Disadvantaged	52834	62.50
Migrant	111	53.20
Male	67586	74.60
Female	64144	79.00

**Comments:** Multiracial -> 3,138 / 4,289 = 73.16%

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



**1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	134979	62.66
American Indian or Alaska Native	190	54.21
Asian or Pacific Islander	1865	82.57
Black, non-Hispanic	22539	32.59
Hispanic	3190	46.74
White, non-Hispanic	103249	69.61
Students with Disabilities	20514	36.09
Limited English Proficient	2151	45.37
Economically Disadvantaged	52959	43.92
Migrant	113	46.02
Male	69138	63.94
Female	65841	61.31

**Comments:** Multiracial -> Students Tested = 3,946; Percent Proficient = 56.46%

This test was not used for AYP purposes in 2005-06. No AYP goals were presented beforehand, and the alternate assessment cap was based on a wider population. Results submitted per instructions from U.S. Department of Education.

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	134869	75.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	191	70.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1802	87.50
Black, non-Hispanic	22529	50.30
Hispanic	3125	59.80
White, non-Hispanic	103278	81.00
Students with Disabilities	20537	46.00
Limited English Proficient	2113	52.90
Economically Disadvantaged	52895	59.90
Migrant	110	54.60
Male	69080	73.00
Female	65789	77.60

**Comments:** Multiracial -> 2,897 / 3,944 = 73.45%

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

**1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	138317	68.36
American Indian or Alaska Native	206	64.08
Asian or Pacific Islander	1831	87.55
Black, non-Hispanic	24152	40.43
Hispanic	3202	52.69
White, non-Hispanic	105215	75.11
Students with Disabilities	21178	36.38
Limited English Proficient	2041	49.83
Economically Disadvantaged	54016	50.18
Migrant	106	48.11
Male	71350	67.82
Female	66967	68.92

**Comments:** Multiracial -> Students Tested = 3,711; Percent Proficient = 62.92%

This test was not used for AYP purposes in 2005-06. No AYP goals were presented beforehand, and the alternate assessment cap was based on a wider population. Results submitted per instructions from U.S. Department of Education.

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	138243	83.59
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	77.78
Asian or Pacific Islander	1802	92.18
Black, non-Hispanic	24146	64.80
Hispanic	3137	71.21
White, non-Hispanic	105239	88.16
Students with Disabilities	21183	55.82
Limited English Proficient	2010	61.99
Economically Disadvantaged	53960	71.31
Migrant	106	64.15
Male	71305	81.28
Female	66938	86.05

**Comments:** Multiracial -> Students Tested = 3,712; Percent Proficient = 82.81%

This test was not used for AYP purposes in 2005-06. No AYP goals were presented beforehand, and the alternate assessment cap was based on a wider population. Results submitted per instructions from U.S. Department of Education.

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

**1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	143708	63.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	176	54.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	1749	83.70
Black, non-Hispanic	25453	34.60
Hispanic	3072	47.00
White, non-Hispanic	109849	70.10
Students with Disabilities	21539	30.70
Limited English Proficient	1851	45.20
Economically Disadvantaged	52835	44.40
Migrant	111	36.00
Male	73920	62.40
Female	69788	64.00

**Comments:** Multiracial ->  $1,924 / 3,409 = 56.44\%$

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	143644	78.88
American Indian or Alaska Native	177	70.62
Asian or Pacific Islander	1713	88.85
Black, non-Hispanic	25445	56.16
Hispanic	2995	65.51
White, non-Hispanic	109898	84.38
Students with Disabilities	21564	43.52
Limited English Proficient	1824	53.56
Economically Disadvantaged	52787	63.56
Migrant	109	45.87
Male	73915	74.84
Female	69729	83.16

**Comments:** Multiracial -> Students Tested = 3,416; Percent Proficient = 78.16%

This test was not used for AYP purposes in 2005-06. No AYP goals were presented beforehand, and the alternate assessment cap was based on a wider population. Results submitted per instructions from U.S. Department of Education.

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

**1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	143404	68.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	61.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	1677	87.10
Black, non-Hispanic	24213	39.30
Hispanic	2999	49.00
White, non-Hispanic	111276	75.30
Students with Disabilities	21538	31.30
Limited English Proficient	1740	49.00
Economically Disadvantaged	49688	49.10
Migrant	108	42.60
Male	73626	67.60
Female	69778	69.50

**Comments:** Multiracial ->  $1,903 / 3,041 = 62.58\%$

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

**1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	143409	77.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	71.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1652	86.60
Black, non-Hispanic	24243	52.30
Hispanic	2954	62.60
White, non-Hispanic	111320	82.80
Students with Disabilities	21569	39.80
Limited English Proficient	1708	52.50
Economically Disadvantaged	49685	60.80
Migrant	107	41.10
Male	73649	73.50
Female	69760	80.90

**Comments:** Multiracial ->  $2,253 / 3,042 = 74.06\%$

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

**1.3.13 High School - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	141337	82.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	76.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	1837	92.70
Black, non-Hispanic	21493	59.60
Hispanic	2715	71.20
White, non-Hispanic	112873	87.20
Students with Disabilities	19615	44.70
Limited English Proficient	1479	61.30
Economically Disadvantaged	38109	67.40
Migrant	67	71.60
Male	71796	82.40
Female	69541	82.90

**Comments:** Multiracial ->  $1,807 / 2,233 = 80.92\%$

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

**1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	141350	89.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	187	86.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	1820	93.00
Black, non-Hispanic	21465	75.40
Hispanic	2696	79.50
White, non-Hispanic	112953	92.20
Students with Disabilities	19647	56.40
Limited English Proficient	1465	63.60
Economically Disadvantaged	38103	78.30
Migrant	66	65.20
Male	71800	87.00
Female	69550	91.70

**Comments:** Multiracial ->  $1,962 / 2,229 = 88.02\%$

- 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	3879	2349	60.60

**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	613	196	32.00

**Comments:** District accountability information was reviewed.

**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	2105	1071	50.90

**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	584	181	31.00

**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.

The primary focus of the system is to support district leadership to build the capacity to help their low performing schools improve.

The system is deployed through 12 Regional School Improvement Teams. These teams coach district and instructional leaders to build their capacity in the following school improvement process areas:

Data analysis

Focused planning

Research-based practices

High Quality Professional Development

Implementation and Monitoring

Resource Management

Technical assistance, based on student performance data, is deployed across a Tri-Tiered Model to districts most in need prioritized as follows:

Districts in District Improvement Status and districts with buildings in School Improvement Status - Tier 1

Districts with buildings in At Risk status or SI Delay status - Tier 2

All other districts - Tier 3

Additionally, other state products, programs and services are strategically targeted to districts to support their low performing schools. For example, state professional development training in reading instruction, is targeted to the following:

Helping district and school leadership in understanding the role leadership plays in supporting teachers in implementing new instructional practices; and

Ensuring that critical masses of educators in low performing schools participate in state initiatives so there is an ongoing professional dialogue that extends beyond the training, with a resulting impact on educator practice and ultimately student achievement.

Additionally, Title I served schools identified for improvement are eligible for targeted Title I school improvement funds. Those schools are to employ external academic coaches to work with other building staff to increase ongoing capacity to implement standards-based classrooms.



**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.

The Office of Field Relations collaborates with offices throughout the Ohio Department of Education and regional providers to coordinate a Statewide System of School Improvement Support founded on the principle of building a district's capacity to plan and implement school improvement processes. By working with district and instructional leaders, the system assists districts in learning how to work better with school leadership to increase student achievement for all students while closing achievement gaps. Using a Tri-Tiered service delivery model, ODE provides aligned resources, information, tools, professional development and technical assistance to all districts, with greater intensity focused on the lowest-performing districts. Rather than providing services as part of the district's team, members of the state's 12 Regional School Improvement Teams (RSITs) act as partners to improve and leverage existing services in support of the district's improvement plan. RSIT members are selected based on experience, demonstrated success with school improvement support, and knowledge about the six key elements of academic improvement: data analysis; research-based best practices; focused planning; implementation and monitoring; resource management; and high-quality professional development.

Through the Tri-Tiered model, the RSITs help districts close achievement gaps in reading, math and sub-group performance by providing High Quality Technical Assistance to district and instructional leaders based on district data. Tier 1 -- Intensive Services -- coaches districts with schools and districts in improvement to develop the capacity for planning and implementing school improvement consequences. Tier 2 -- Targeted Services -- develops district capacity to plan and implement school improvement consequences for districts and schools in At Risk status. Tier 3 -- Universal Access -- provides access to select products and programs to build regional capacity.

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

<b>1.4.5.1 Public School Choice</b>	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	143
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.	204
How many of these schools were charter schools?	2
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.	1994
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.	115450
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

<b>1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services</b>	
	<b>Number</b>
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	168
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	7468
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.	86974
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY**

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

<b>School Type</b>	<b>Total Number of Core Academic Classes</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>
<b>All Schools in State</b>	556540	525437	94.40
<b>Elementary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	64400	57757	89.70
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	72151	71547	99.20
<b>All Elementary Schools</b>	280835	269187	95.90
<b>Secondary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	57388	51728	90.10
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	79335	76965	97.00
<b>All Secondary Schools</b>	275705	256250	92.90
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Definitions and Instructions**

*What are the core academic subjects?*

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

***How is a teacher defined?***

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

***How is a class defined?***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	47.80
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	10.80
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	32.20
d) Other (please explain)	9.20
<b>SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	16.80
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	31.80
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	45.20
d) Other (please explain)	6.20
<b>Comments:</b>	



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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
<b>Elementary Schools</b>	61.20	20.90
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Economic Disadvantage	
<b>Secondary Schools</b>	40.30	12.40
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Economic Disadvantage	

**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	77.90

**Comments:**

**1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**

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

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

Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

The Ohio Department of Education, with the assistance of a writing team representing Ohio educators in the fields of English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual education, has completed the development of Ohio English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards. Throughout the development process, periodic reports and updates were provided to the State Board of Education, and opportunities were given to the members of the State Board for questions and feedback. The final draft was completed in September 2004, and a written report on the final draft was provided to the State Board of Education in its October 2004 meeting.

The final version of Ohio's English Language Proficiency Standards is currently posted on the Ohio Department of Education website. Additionally, printed copies of the final document have been sent to all school district superintendents, and additional copies have been provided to school staff at a statewide conference and to requesting persons via U.S. mail.

Ohio's English Language Proficiency Standards focus on the English language competencies that LEP students need to develop in order to (a) participate effectively in classrooms in which English is the language of instruction, (b) achieve Ohio's academic content standards, and (c) fully participate in U.S. society. The Standards are grouped into the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing, as indicated below:

Listening Standards in English for LEP Students

1. LEP students will develop the English listening skills required both for academic achievement and for communication in socially and culturally appropriate ways.

1.1 Comprehend spoken instructions

1.2 Identify main ideas and supporting details of spoken English

1.3 Determine speaker attitude and point of view

1.4 Comprehend the meaning of academic and/or specialized vocabulary when spoken

1.5 Make inferences and predictions when listening to speakers

Speaking Standards in English for LEP Students

2. LEP students will develop the English speaking skills required both for academic achievement and for communication in socially and culturally appropriate ways.

2.1 Speak fluently, using clear pronunciation and with appropriate intonation and stress

2.2 Speak using appropriate grammar and vocabulary

## 2.3 Speak for varied purposes, both formal and informal, with focus, relevance and cohesion

### Reading Standards in English for LEP Students

3. LEP students will develop the English reading skills required both for academic achievement and for communication in socially and culturally appropriate ways.

3.1 Demonstrate reading strategies

3.2 Identify the meaning of written vocabulary

3.3 Read with comprehension

3.4 Read for varied purposes

### Writing Standards in English for LEP Students

4. LEP students will develop the English writing skills required both for academic achievement and for communication in socially and culturally appropriate ways.

4.1 Write using appropriate conventions and grammar

4.2 Write for varied purposes and audiences, with appropriate tone and voice

4.3 Write using the writing process

4.4 Write using a range of vocabulary, sentence structures and verb tenses

Under each standard, benchmarks have been developed for four of the English proficiency levels that have been established for LEP students in Ohio: Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced, and Proficient/Trial Mainstream. As reported in its previous Consolidated State Performance Report, Ohio has divided the Beginning level into Low Beginning (now called "Pre-functional" Level) and Mid-High Beginning (now called "Beginning" Level).

The benchmarks describe the specific language skills that LEP students can demonstrate as they progress to the designated proficiency level for each standard. Also, the benchmarks indicate the grade-level spans for which they are applicable. For the purposes of the benchmarks, the grade-level spans have been designated as follows: K-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12. The benchmarks describe specific language skills that LEP students are expected to demonstrate by the end of a given proficiency level and a given grade cluster. As such, the benchmarks can be used to monitor students' progress toward meeting the ELP standards.

Most of the benchmarks are applicable to all four grade-level spans. This means that LEP students at all grade levels are expected to go through the same stages in developing grammatical competency in each domain. However, even though LEP students at different grade spans go through similar stages in their English language writing development, they are expected to focus on different content and subject matter in their writing. For this reason, it is made clear in the standards document that all Ohio English language proficiency standards relate to language used in grade-appropriate academic settings and age-appropriate social settings.

Ohio's ELP Standards now serve as the framework for school districts' instructional programs designed to meet the needs of LEP students. Beginning in 2004, the Ohio Department of Education has provided information and training sessions regarding the use of the ELP Standards to guide instruction in classrooms that have LEP students. These training sessions have been provided at statewide conferences and at regional and district-level workshops. For example, Ohio's ELP Standards have been used in numerous training sessions in the state that focus on the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model, a research-based approach to making content comprehensible for English language learners. One of the guiding principles of the SIOP model is that teachers clearly state before each lesson both content and language objectives to be achieved during the learning activity. Participants of the SIOP training sessions are shown how Ohio's ELP Standards serve as the main resource when developing language objectives for learning activities that involve LEP students.

---

**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**

Ohio's English Language Proficiency Standards are closely linked to Ohio's English Language Arts Standards and other content standards. English language proficiency standards define proficiency levels that will help LEP students to acquire the English language skills necessary to meet academic content and achievement standards in language arts as well as in other content areas. As such, English language proficiency standards have been designed to assist teachers in moving LEP students both towards proficiency in the English language and towards proficiency on Ohio's English Language Arts content standards.

The goal of Ohio's ELP Standards is to build a foundation in the English language that will enable LEP students to succeed in all their academic content subjects, including the core content areas of mathematics and science. For this reason, in developing the ELP Standards, the writing team referred on an ongoing basis to Ohio's academic content standards and noted the kinds of language competencies needed to make academic progress. Taking academic language into account, the writing team made sure that Ohio's ELP Standards included linkages to content area standards. For example, the following examples of benchmarks included in the ELP Standards focus on the kind of English language communication skills that are needed in order to access the mathematics and science curriculum in mainstream classroom settings:

- Listening benchmark: Recognize and comprehend grade-level academic spoken vocabulary.
- Speaking benchmark: Make formal and informal multimedia presentations.
- Reading benchmark: Monitor reading comprehension by summarizing, note taking, or making lists or graphic organizers to construct meaning.
- Writing benchmark: Publish for display and/or sharing, use available technology.

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

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

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

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

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

As of this date, Ohio has not conducted an independent alignment study between the Ohio Test of English Language Acquisition (OTELA) and the State's ELP Standards. However, Ohio is planning to conduct such a study within the next year.

The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades K-12

The administration of Ohio's annual assessment of LEP students in grades k-2 for school year 2005-2006 took place during the month of April through the coordination of the Ohio Department of Education's Office of Assessment. The following information was communicated to all district test coordinators:

Ohio Test of English Language Acquisition

In Ohio, State law as well as Federal law require an annual assessment of K-12 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students to measure their English language proficiency. The Ohio Test of English Language Acquisition (OTELA) is the assessment used for testing English language proficiency for Ohio LEP students in grades 3-12. The English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) is used for the same purpose for Ohio LEP students in grades K-2.

The OTELA is based on the test item banks and scales from the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) for grades 3-12. The ELDA was developed by a multi-state consortium under the direction of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). As a member of the consortium, Ohio assisted with the development and field testing of the ELDA. In spring 2004, Ohio participated in a pilot test of ELDA items, and in spring 2005 Ohio conducted a statewide census field test of the ELDA. Refer to Ohio's 2004-2005 CSPR for additional background information regarding the ELDA test for grades 3-12.

The OTELA differs from the ELDA 3-12 in that it is comprised of shorter forms (fewer test items) for each tested domain. These shorter OTELA forms still address the same English Language Proficiency Standards and are of comparable reliability.

For students K-2, Ohio conducted a census field test of the ELDA K-2 assessments in spring 2006. The K-2 ELDA also was developed by the ELDA multi-state consortium, as indicated in Ohio's 2004-2005 CSPR. To measure the English language proficiency of students in these grade levels, the ELDA K-2 used a set of informal inventories for each of the four language domains: listening, speaking, reading and writing. The inventories focused on how students use English to communicate in various school related settings, including the classroom, cafeteria and playground. They included observation of students' performance for social as well as for academic purposes.

In spring 2006, the OTELA 3-12 and the ELDA K-2 were administrated statewide as a progress assessment to LEP students through the coordination of the Ohio Department of Education's Office of Assessment. Measurement Incorporated (MI) served as the operational test vendor for both the OTELA 3-12 and ELDA K-2.

Ohio's ELP assessments address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension

Ohio's ELP assessments are based on Ohio's ELP core standards

The OTELA directly measures standards in the language domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. A comprehension score is derived from a combination of the listening and reading scores. The standards for each domain are as follows:

Listening:

Comprehend spoken instructions

Determine main idea/purpose

Identify important supporting ideas

Determine speaker's attitude/perspective

Comprehend key vocabulary/phrases

Draw inferences, predictions, conclusions

Speaking:

Connect - establish and confirm conversational connections

Tell - provide essential information cued for, and describe with detail

Explain - elaborate on ideas and information

Reason - express and support a clear position

Reading:

Demonstrate pre/early reading skills

Comprehend key vocabulary/phrases

Comprehend written instructions

Determine main idea/purpose

Identify important supporting ideas

Draw inferences, predictions, conclusions

Determine writer's attitude/perspective

Analyze style/form

Writing:

Plan and organize for writing

Write draft texts: narrative; descriptive; expository; persuasive

Revise written texts

Edit written texts

Write with standard conventions

The ELDA K-2 also directly measures standards in the language domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing, with a comprehension score derived from a combination of the listening and reading scores. The K-2 inventories focus on what students do in the classroom, cafeteria, playground and other settings. There is one set of inventories for kindergartners and one set for students in grades 1-2. They include observation in social as well as in academic settings.

The Reading inventory for both for kindergarten and for grades 1-2 has 14 entries. They range from prereading activities (e.g., letter recognition) to fairly complex reading activities calling for conclusions and generalizations. The Listening inventory has 7 entries, ranging from simple, one-step instructions to complex stories and conversations requiring the student to draw conclusions or make generalizations. The Writing inventory has 9 entries, ranging from pre-writing skills and drawing activities to writing sentences with correct spelling. The Speaking inventory has 8 entries, ranging from simple questions in familiar settings to offering complex defenses or explanations of thoughts with complex sentences in English.

Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.) of OTELA 3-12 and ELDA K-2

The item banks for the ELDA (upon which the OTELA are based) were developed following the same procedures used for Ohio's other large scale assessments. These procedures are designed to provide evidence that the test instruments have content validity. Test vendors brought together a highly competent pool of item writers, using a mix of external item writers, NAEP foreign language item writers and other internal content experts. Following the first field-test administration, various analyses were performed (classical item analysis and differential item functioning (DIF) analysis) to evaluate the performance of field-test items. Item response theory (IRT) procedures were used to calibrate the field-test items and place them on a common scale.

The OTELA 3-12 is designed provide student assessment results that are fully comparable with assessment results from the ELDA. To achieve this goal, the OTELA is equated to and utilizes the test scales used by the LEP-SCASS for the ELDA.

Based on data from the 2005-06 administration of the ELDA K-2 and the OTELA 3-12, the following estimates of test reliability (internal consistency) are shown below: These estimates compare very favorably with reliability estimates for Ohio's other large scale assessments.

Grade Band

K-2 (ELDA)3-5 6-8 9-12

Writing Form Reliability 0.94 0.86 0.86 0.86

Reading Form Reliability 0.95 0.86 0.86 0.86

Listening Form Reliability 0.94 0.84 0.88 0.91

Speaking Form Reliability 0.95 0.99 0.99 0.99

Test vendors provided ODE a set of technical reports for the ELDA K-2 and OTELA 3-12 which completely described the test development, construction, scaling and equating procedures used for these assessments (as well as the reliability data shown above). These reports also contain detailed information about the decision consistency for these assessments. ODE has reviewed these data, and will review them after each test administration in an effort to monitor the technical characteristics of the OTELA test forms in order to assure the continued technical adequacy of these assessments.



**1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data**

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2005-2006** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

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

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data													
2005-2006 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State													
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP (3)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency									
				Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (4)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (5)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (7)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5 (8)	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ELDA (grades K-2)	6436	6436	26.40	586	2.40	2660	10.90	1172	4.80	1511	6.20	507	2.10
OTELA (grades 3-12)	16653	16653	68.40	2889	11.90	4781	19.60	3915	16.10	4104	16.80	964	4.00
Ohio Reading and Writing Achievement tests	1272	1272	5.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1272	5.20
Totals	24361	24361	100.00	3475	14.30	7441	30.50	5087	20.90	5615	23.00	2743	11.30

**Comments:** Ohio's Reading and Writing Assessments are used as a criterion for determining if LEP students who have achieved a composite score of 5 on the ELDA or OTELA in a prior year have attained full English proficiency. Refer to Ohio's definition of proficient in Section 1.6.5.

- (1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
- (3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
- (4-8) In columns four-eight, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-8 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in

column 3.

<b>1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State</b>		
<b>2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs</b>		
<b>Language</b>	<b>Number of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>	<b>Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>
1. Spanish	13231	39.20
2. Somali	3493	10.30
3. Arabic	1834	5.40
4. German	1462	4.30
5. Japanese	1035	3.10
6. Vietnamese	654	1.90
7. Russian	644	1.90
8. Korean	588	1.70
9. Ukrainian	578	1.70
10. Cantonese	381	1.10
<b>Comments:</b>		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.



**1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data**

**Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth**

**Definitions:**

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

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

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
11606	7153	38

**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.)**

The number of immigrant/refugee students enrolled in Ohio's elementary and secondary schools has continued to increase during the past several years due to both primary migration and to an even larger number of secondary-migration refugees from other states. A survey conducted by the Ohio Department of Education in 2005 shows that the school districts in Cuyahoga and Franklin Counties reported serving over 4,300 refugee students during the current school year. The Ohio Refugee Services Program reports that the countries of origin of refugees settling in the two counties indicated above during the past three years include the following: Afghanistan, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia, China, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Iran, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Liberia, Mauritania, Russia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, USSR (former), Uzbekistan, Vietnam, and Yugoslavia.

The increase in the number of refugee students in certain Ohio school districts in Cuyahoga and Franklin Counties during the past six years is illustrated below.

Selected Ohio School Districts

Comparison of Refugee Student Enrollment

From School Year 1999-2000 to School Year 2004-2005

School District Number of refugees reported

1999 - 2000 Number of refugees reported

2004-2005 Percent of Increase

Columbus City Schools

850

2,800

229%

Parma City Schools

109

179

64%

South - Western City Schools

35

487

1,291%

Westerville City Schools

28

280

900%

On May 19, 2005, a report entitled "Summary Assessment and Recommendations regarding the Secondary Migration of Somali Bantu Refugees to Columbus, Ohio" was presented to the Ohio Refugee Services of the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services. Included in the report, which was prepared by staff of the National Somali Bantu Project at Portland State University, was the following information:

"In the last six months, the city of Columbus, Ohio has become an unanticipated secondary migration destination for approximately 211 recently resettled Somali Bantu refugees. The secondary migrants originate from 13 cities in ten geographically dispersed regions from Arizona to New York and Georgia to Chicago. The refugees primarily arrive by bus in Columbus as families with about an equal number of men and women. The adults number about 50 while the children number about 160."

---

**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**

Ohio's definition of proficient

(revised definition submitted on April 3, 2006 to U.S. Department of Education as an amendment to Ohio's Title III accountability plan):

The ability to understand, speak, read, and write the English language at a level in which an individual is able to a) achieve successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English, b) meaningfully participate in academic assessments in English, and c) participate fully in society in the United States.

Demonstration of proficiency in English by students in Ohio's elementary and secondary schools will be based on the following criteria:

1. Achievement at the proficient level (composite score) in Ohio's approved English language proficiency test of the language domains of listening, speaking, reading or writing (with comprehension as a derived score); achievement at the proficient level or higher on a grade level Ohio Achievement Test in reading and/writing would count as having achieved the proficient level in reading and/writing on the English language proficiency assessment; and
2. Two years of successful participation in classrooms where the language of instruction is English (this is referred to as the "Trial Mainstream" period, which begins after the student has met the first exit criterion above); and
3. Attainment of proficient or above in the State's Language Arts

Assessments (reading and writing), which may be administered during the student's "Trial-Mainstream" period.

Scale Score Ranges, OTELA (grades 3-12)

Subject Grade Level Pre-Functional Beginners Intermediate Advanced Full English Proficiency

Reading 3-5 Below 450 450 - 579 580 - 647 648 - 769 770 and Above

6-8 Below 460 460 - 611 612 - 689 690 - 828 829 and Above

9-12 Below 545 545 - 629 630 - 717 718 - 849 850 and Above

Listening 3-5 Below 450 450 - 543 544 - 644 645 - 724 725 and Above

6-8 Below 554 554 - 625 626 - 717 718 - 805 806 and Above

9-12 Below 556 556 - 631 632 - 728 729 - 849 850 and Above

Speaking 3-5 Below 450 450 - 546 547 - 667 668 - 808 809 and Above

6-8 Below 458 458 - 610 611 - 718 719 - 824 825 and Above

9-12 Below 570 570 - 649 650 - 764 765 - 849 850 and Above

Writing 3-5 Below 450 450 - 576 577 - 668 669 - 866 867 and Above

6-8 Below 553 553 - 652 653 - 721 722 - 893 894 and Above

9-12 Below 509 509 - 630 631 - 718 719 - 849 850 and Above

Explanation of Rules for Establishing Proficiency Levels for Comprehension and Composite

While levels for the four tests (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) are based on scale scores, levels for the two derived scores (Comprehension and Composite) are based on rules. The rules utilize the levels students achieved on the four tests. Comprehension scores are based on the Listening and Reading scores, and comprehension levels are based on the following rule table:

Rules for Combining Listening and Reading Levels to Yield a Comprehension Level

If Reading Level is: And Listening Level is: Then Comprehension Level is:

1 1 1

1 2 1

1 3 1

1 4 2

1 5 2

2 1 2

2 2 2

2 3 2

2 4 2

2 5 3

3 1 2

3 2 3

3 3 3

3 4 3

3 5 3

4 1 3

4 2 3

4 3 4

4 4 4

4 5 4



5 1 3

5 2 3

5 3 4

5 4 5

5 5 5

For example, if a student received a level 3 on Reading and a level 2 on Listening, the student received a level 3 for Comprehension. However, if the levels were reversed (3 on Listening and 2 on Reading), the Comprehension level would have been 2.

A similar set of rules is used to create an intermediate score called Production (from Speaking and Writing).

Rules for Combining Speaking and Writing Levels to Yield a Production Level

(All Grade Levels)

If Writing Level is: And Speaking Level is: Then Production Level is:

1 1 1

1 2 1

1 3 1

1 4 2

1 5 2

2 1 2

2 2 2

2 3 2

2 4 2

2 5 3

3 1 2

3 2 3

3 3 3

3 4 3

3 5 3

4 1 3

4 2 3

4 3 4

4 4 4

4 5 4

5 1 3

5 2 3

5 3 4

5 4 5

5 5 5

When the Comprehension and Production levels are combined to create the Composite level, the following set of rules applies

Rules for Combining Comprehension and Production Levels to Yield a Composite Level (All Grade Levels)

If Production Level is: And Comprehension Level is: Then Composite Level is:

1 1 1

1 2 1

1 3 2

1 4 2

1 5 3

2 1 1

2 2 2

2 3 2

2 4 3

2 5 3

3 1 2

3 2 2

3 3 3

3 4 3

3 5 4

4 1 2

4 2 3

4 3 3

4 4 4

4 5 4

5 1 3

5 2 3

5 3 4

5 4 4

5 5 5

When the Comprehension and Production levels are not the same, the rule is to average the two levels and round down. For example, if the Production level were 3 and the Comprehension were 4, the average would be 3.5, and the final Composite would be 3.

#### Brief Explanation of Composite Proficiency Levels for OTELA

Level 1 - "Pre-functional" indicates that the student who is limited English proficient is:

- Beginning to understand short utterances
- Beginning to use gestures and simple words to communicate
- Beginning to understand simple printed material
- Beginning to develop communicative writing skills

Level 2 - "Beginning" indicates that the student who is limited English proficient can:

- Understand simple statements, directions and questions
- Use appropriate strategies to initiate and respond to simple conversation
- Understand the general message of basic reading passages
- Compose short informative passages on familiar topics

Level 3 - "Intermediate" indicates that the student who is limited English proficient can:

- Understand standard speech delivered in school and social settings
- Communicate orally with some hesitation
- Understand descriptive material within familiar contexts and some complex narratives
- Write simple texts and short reports

Level 4 - "Advanced" indicates that the student who is limited English proficient can:

- Identify the main ideas and relevant details of discussions or presentations on a wide range of topics
- Actively engage in most communicative situations familiar or unfamiliar
- Understand the context of most text in academic areas with support
- Write multi-paragraph essays, journal entries, personal/business letters, and creative texts in an organized fashion with some errors

Level 5 - "Full English Proficiency" indicates that the student who is limited English proficient can:

- Understand and identify the main ideas and relevant details of extended discussion or presentations on familiar and

unfamiliar topics

- Produce fluent and accurate language
- Use reading strategies the same as their native English-speaking peers to derive meaning from a wide range of both social and academic texts
- Write fluently using language structures, technical vocabulary and appropriate writing conventions with some circumlocutions

#### Cut Scores for ELDA K-2

ELDA K-2 Cut Scores Listening (Out of 21 Points) Reading (Out of 42 Points) Speaking (Out of 24 Points) Writing (Out of 27 Points)

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

2 4 6 8 10 6 8 7 8

3 9 11 20 22 12 13 16 17

4 15 16 36 31 18 18 21 21

5 19 19 40 39 22 22 26 25

---

**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**

Ohio's definition of English language proficiency levels

(as submitted on April 3, 2006 to U.S. Department of Education as an amendment to Ohio's Title III accountability plan):

As indicated the previous section, Ohio has five levels of English proficiency for LEP students. These are pre-functional, beginning, intermediate, advanced and proficient/trial mainstream. The fifth level represents those students who have demonstrated sufficient competencies in all language domains to transition on a trial basis to classrooms not designed to meet the special needs of LEP students. During this transition stage, students' progress is carefully monitored and additional support is provided on an "as-needed" basis. It should be recognized that within each of these levels, students represent a certain range of proficiencies (low, mid, high).

Ohio's definition of making progress

(as submitted on April 3, 2006 to U.S. Department of Education as an amendment to Ohio's Title III accountability plan):

In order to demonstrate progress in their acquisition of English proficiency, LEP students need to move from one composite proficiency level to another. The composite score is calculated based on the rule decision described in the previous section.

**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**

Ohio's definition of cohort

(as submitted on April 3, 2006 to U.S. Department of Education as an amendment to Ohio's Title III accountability plan):

For the purpose of setting performance targets or annual measurable objectives for the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English, and who will attain English proficiency, Ohio will define a cohort as follows:

The total number of LEP students in a current school year who have been enrolled in a district for at least 120 days, and who participated in Ohio's annual spring English language proficiency assessment the previous school year.

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

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

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

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 51.40	# 5892	% 31.30	# 3585	% 80.00	# 518	% 46.60	# 302

**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.

Data notes: These numbers are based on comparing composite scores from 2005 and 2006. It should be noted that less than half of Ohio's students who were LEP students for either of those years could be included, as they did not have complete test results for both years. The total number with complete records was 11,464.

In addition, the test vendor provided erroneous results to several large districts. This resulted in an unknown number of students who actually did make progress being omitted from the calculation - perhaps as many as 3,200 students.

The denominator for this percentage is calculated based on the 648 students who were classified as "trial mainstream" at the end of 2004 and reported in the data this year.

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

#### Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

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

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

#### TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

#### Definitions:

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



1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
<b>MAKING PROGRESS</b>	51.40	3450	31.10
<b>DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS</b>		7634	
<b>ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>	80.00	271	42.90
<b>TOTAL</b>		11355	

**Explanation of data for Table**

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

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

\* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

**Title III Subgrantee Information**

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	96
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>making progress</b>	24
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>attaining</b> English proficiency	75
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>AYP</b>	69
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	18
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	39
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	36
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet <b>any</b> AMAO	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the <b>State</b> meet <b>all</b> three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

**Comments:** Notes for Section 1.6.9 (Comments section for Section 1.6.9 was not provided in online submission tool)

-Roughly a third of students who had two year's of any data had second-year data for which validity was suspect. We have reporting errors acknowledged by the vendor.

-Progress is calculated only for the 11, 084 students who had complete test records for both 2005 and 2006.

-This percentage is based on the 631 "proficient trial mainstream" students served in 2004 for whom data was reported in 2006 by Title 3 districts or consortia.

Notes for Section 1.6.10

-Ohio calculated AMAOs for districts and not consortia in 2004-2005. Additionally, of the 75 districts participating in Title 3 in 2006, only 69 also participated in 2005.

-Due to circumstances described in Ohio's 2004-2005 CSPR and response to Attachment T submitted on September 30, 2006, Ohio as of this date has not required districts to submit improvement plans for not meeting Title III AMAOs.

\* 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	18	85.70
4	30	96.80
5	19	100.00
6	20	95.20
7	18	90.00
8	12	85.70
H.S.	15	88.20

**Comments:** "Formerly served" students are those with a reclassification date.

**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	18	81.80
4	28	90.30
5	17	89.50
6	17	81.00
7	12	60.00
8	10	71.40
H.S.	15	88.20

**Comments:** "Formerly served" students are those with a reclassification date.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

**Comments:**

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

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

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

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

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

<b>1.8.1 Graduation Rates</b>	
<b>High School Graduates</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>2004-2005 School Year</b>
All Students	86.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	74.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.50
Black, non-Hispanic	68.40
Hispanic	74.10
White, non-Hispanic	89.80
Students with Disabilities	83.90
Limited English Proficient	77.30
Economically Disadvantaged	79.70
Migrant	68.60
Male	84.30
Female	88.00
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 80.13	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

**1.8.2 Dropout Rate**

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

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

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

<b>1.8.2 Dropout Rate</b>	
<b>Dropouts</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	3.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.00
Black, non-Hispanic	8.60
Hispanic	7.30
White, non-Hispanic	2.60
Students with Disabilities	3.70
Limited English Proficient	4.40
Economically Disadvantaged	6.40
Migrant	2.30
Male	4.00
Female	3.30
<b>Comments:</b> Multiracial -> 5.57	
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**

For the purposes of this report, the school year consists of the 2005-2006 school year beginning in August-September 2005 through the end of summer programming in 2006.

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

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	1059	1059
LEAs with Subgrants	19	19

**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	291	762
1	267	708
2	242	711
3	226	703
4	215	721
5	218	731
6	178	752
7	192	940
8	171	903
9	177	1173
10	123	609
11	99	422
12	115	328

**Comments:**

<b>1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth</b>		
Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.		
Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>without</b> subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>with</b> subgrants
Shelters	312	5896
Doubled-up	1736	2866
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	38	146
Hotels/Motels	148	174
Unknown	280	381
<b>Comments:</b>		
* 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

<b>Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006</b>	<b>Number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level</b>
K	725
1	662
2	680
3	667
4	690
5	700
6	719
7	883
8	856
9	1050
10	554
11	395
12	306

**Comments:** Pre-K = 734; Other (i.e., Adult Education) = 59.

**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**

529

**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**

308

**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)**

24

**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

<b>Educational and school related activities and services</b>	<b>Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services</b>
Special Education (IDEA)	991
English Language Learners (ELL)	162
Gifted and Talented	72
Vocational Education	184

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services**

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

<b>Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program</b>	<b>Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	18
Expedited evaluations	12
Staff professional development and awareness	18
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	15
Transportation	16
Early childhood programs	12
Assistance with participation in school programs	17
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	17
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	18
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	17
Coordination between schools and agencies	17
Counseling	15
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	15
Clothing to meet a school requirement	14
School supplies	18
Referral to other programs and services	16
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	18
Other (optional)	0

**Comments:**

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

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

<b>Barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	10
School selection	9
Transportation	13
School records	10
Immunizations or other medical records	10
Other enrollment issues	6

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)**

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

<b>List other barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Lack of family support	1
Family dysfunction	1
Low ed/voc skills of parents	1

**Comments: Stigmatization 1**

**Isolation 1**

**Lack of access and knowledge to resources 1**

**Lack of employment and low wages 1**

**Lack of affordable housing 1**

**Food 1**

**Clothing 1**

**School supplies 1**

**Hygiene materials 1**

**Identifying students 2**

**Reporting 1**

**Custody issues 1**

**Transient parents 1**

**Transportation for preschool students 1**

**Servicing charter schools 1**

**Limitations of state reporting system EMIS 1**

**Living with nonguardian 1**

**Summer school fee 1**

**Phones out of service 1**

**Lack of awareness in LEA 1**

**Disabled parents 1**

---

**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	588	241
Grade 4	Yes	686	309
Grade 5	Yes	701	306
Grade 6	No	703	362
Grade 7	No	645	266
Grade 8	Yes	604	233
Grade 9	No	36	29
Grade 10	Yes	463	287
Grade 11	No	79	51
Grade 12	No	38	23

**Comments:** For this evaluation period, some state assessments are not required in determining Adequate Yearly Progress.

**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	588	222
Grade 4	No	685	208
Grade 5	No	589	132
Grade 6	No	705	219
Grade 7	Yes	648	156
Grade 8	Yes	603	164
Grade 9	No	<n	<n
Grade 10	Yes	467	164
Grade 11	No	93	40
Grade 12	No	48	22

**Comments:** For this evaluation period, some state assessments are not required in determining Adequate Yearly Progress.

\* 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.