

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Part 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 2002-2003



DUE JUNE 30, 2004

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	ii
General Instructions and Timelines	v
Cover Page for Submission	vi
Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)	1
William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)	5
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	14
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	24
Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)	24
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) Title II, Part A)	24
Enhancing Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)	24
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)	25
Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV, Part A)	27
21 st Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)	31
Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)	32
Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) (Title VI, Part B)	34
Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)	35

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 Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

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

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States submitted to the Department on December 22, 2003, requested 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 NCLB. Through the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submissions and through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States have already submitted the following 2002-2003 school year data related to the five ESEA goals.

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

In Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States reported the percentage of students proficient or advanced in reading/language arts and mathematics, based on assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. States reported achievement data for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students

with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

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.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the following: (1) the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students; (2) English language proficiency (ELP) data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration; (3) Information on the total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s); (4) Information on the total number of students identified as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s); and (5) performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and the percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency.

Performance Goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received "high-quality professional development;" and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided baseline graduation rate and dropout rate data from the 2001-2002 school year for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

This Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2002-2003 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-

2003 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 data collection.

Also, this report is limited to information that States should have available by Spring, 2004.

Consistent with these criteria, Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year does not request additional data for the programs listed below.

- Title I, Part D: Neglected or Delinquent - The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. This data will not be available in Spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report that will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.
- Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.
- Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants) – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented. In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application and in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year, States reported information related to teacher and paraprofessional quality, including the percentage of classes taught by high-qualified teachers, the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development, and the percentage of highly-qualified Title I paraprofessionals.
- Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology – The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.
- Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2003-2004 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2002-2003 school year must respond to this Part II of Consolidated State Performance Report. Reports are due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**, and should reflect data from the 2002-2003 school year. If needed, States should include for each section an explanation of the data provided (e.g., data irregularities). Throughout the report, States should use their definition of a school year, unless noted otherwise.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to conreport@ed.gov, or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

A State that submits only a paper report should mail the submission by express courier to:

Daisy Greenfield
U.S. Department of Education
Room 3E307
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20202-6400

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 2.32 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) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E307, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

OMB Number: _____
Expiration Date: _____

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

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

Massachusetts Department of Education

Address:

350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148 - 5089

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Carole Thomson, Associate Commissioner

Telephone: 781-338-6201

Fax: 781-338-3390

e-mail: cthomson@doe.mass.edu

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

David P. Driscoll, Commissioner

Signature

Date 6/25/04
revised 11/3/04

**I. Improving Basic Programs
Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)**

A. Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools

1. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. 135

2. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. 216

B. Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following:

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State | 1,128 |
| 2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State | 679 |
| 3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State | 449 |

C. Title I, Part A Student Participation

1. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	40,425
Limited English Proficient	25,211
Homeless	1,732
Migrant	1,056

Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian or Alaskan Native	857
Asian	15,569
Black or African American	53,653
Hispanic or Latino	65,809
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0 (included in Asian)
White	99,066

2. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide *programs* (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level						
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0-2	0	0	0	5	5	<.01
Age 3-5	689	5,214	28	7	5,938	2.45
K	1,756	17,699	173	6	19,634	8.10
1	7,409	19,407	1,058	18	27,892	11.51
2	5,916	19,402	877	23	26,218	10.82
3	5,385	19,178	847	74	25,484	10.52
4	4,777	19,389	688	79	24,933	10.29
5	3,830	18,756	558	131	23,275	9.60
6	2,732	17,515	352	188	20,787	8.58
7	1,842	14,390	252	284	16,768	6.92
8	1,431	14,147	208	299	16,085	6.64
9	4,435	7,726	124	435	12,720	5.25
10	3,090	6,029	14	367	9,500	3.92
11	1,918	4,975	11	199	7,103	2.93
12	1,480	4,437	8	79	6,004	2.48
Ungraded	0	0	2	0	2	<.01
TOTALS	46,690	188,264	5,200	2,194	242,348	100

3. Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, A Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services	
Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	17,181
Reading/Language Arts	32,688
Science	596
Social Studies	399
Vocational/Career	105
Other (specify) (see below)	662
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	53
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	2,201
Other (specify) (see below)	123

Table C-3
Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance by Type of Services

Instructional Services Other	Public TAS
Early Childhood	184
English for LEP	19
French	11
Extended Day Programs	65
Readiness	67
Other (Did not specify)	267
Organization skills	49
Total	662

Support Services Other	Public TAS
Homework Club	101
Speech	9
Other (Did not specify)	13
Total	123

C. Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

Staff Information for Title I, A Targeted Assistance Programs	
	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	51.85
Teachers	1,044.93
Teacher Aides	440.45
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	19.54
Other (specify)	59.13

Table C
Other Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs

Other Staff	Public TAS
Tutors	39.18
Speech Therapist	.28
Parent Coordinator	3.00
Total	42.46

II. William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)

A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following information:

1. Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State	
a. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State	25
2. Even Start Families Served	
a. Total number of families served	526
b. Total number of adults participating	544
c. Total number of adults who are English language learners	351
d. Total number of children participating	623
3. Characteristics of newly enrolled families <u>at the time of enrollment</u>	
a. Number of newly enrolled families	412
b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	426
c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal Poverty level	34%
d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED	67%
e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade	27%
4. Percent of families that have remained in the program	
a. Less than 3 months	22%
b. From 4 to 6 months	39%
c. From 7 to 12 months	39%
d. More than 12 months	17%

B. State Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its performance indicators developed under section 1240 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Include all State indicators, as developed under section 1240, including both required and optional indicators. Provide any targets set, measures used and results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets or standards, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. For indicators with more than one year of available data, please note the data in the results column and include trend information in the assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
ADULTS Adult Achievement in the areas of reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving and numeracy.	At least 50% of the total adult learners will make the following scale score gains on one of the following assessments: - 9 scale score gain BEST - .4 scale score gain REEP 27 scale score gain TABE	<u>ASSESSMENTS</u> BEST REEP TABE	27% of adult learners met the targeted gains: The percentage of gains made by each category - 26% (BEST) - 39% (REEP) - 16% (TABE)	The target for adult learner achievement was not met. Unable to make a comparison from the previous year due to the implementation of a new assessment policy.	We have revised our targets to be more realistic and to reflect completion of NRS levels vs. scale score gains. This revision would also be consistent with our state ABE targets.
ADULTS Receipt of a high school diploma or a general equivalency diploma (GED).	25% of adult learners who have a goal for the current year of a high school diploma or a GED will achieve one.	GED exam results/ High School Diploma	32% of the adult learners received a GED.	The target of 25% was exceeded.	

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
ADULTS Entry into a post-secondary school, job retraining program or employment or career advancement, including the military.	10% of adult learners who have a goal of enrolling in a post secondary school, job retraining program or employment or career advancement, including the military, will achieve this goal by the end of the program year.	Data Collection system Parent Self Assessment (Pre and Post)	18% of adult learners met the target.	The target of 10% was met and was exceeded by 8%.	Planned refinements to the data collection system should yield a greater increase next year.
CHILDREN Improvement in ability to read on grade level or reading readiness.	Using the <i>Work Sampling Developmental Checklists</i> , 80% of the <i>Language and Literacy</i> items will be rated at the level of "2" or above for Even Start children at preschool, kindergarten and early elementary levels.	Work Sampling Developmental Checklist and Teacher questionnaire	Target partially met Preschool: 80%- Kindergarten: 67% Grades 1-3: 73%	The target was met for preschool but falls short by for kindergarten and primary grades.	Not able to make comparisons from the previous year because the instrument used (<i>Work Sampling Developmental Checklists</i>) was piloted last year.
CHILDREN Grade retention and promotion	- 80% to 90% of the children in kindergarten will	Teacher questionnaire	Targets met: - 86% Early	This target was also met last year.	Programs continue to establish and strengthen the partnership between the parents and their

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
	advance to the next grade level or be placed in appropriate education services - Of the 5 to 8 year olds whose parents have participated in Even Start for a minimum of 80 hours, there will be an overall promotion rate of 90% or greater.		Childhood/ Kindergarten children advanced to the next level. - 90% Elementary aged children advanced to the next grade level.		child's teacher(s) as well as to support parents in their children's learning.
CHILDREN School Attendance	80% to 90% of the children who are in kindergarten or the elementary grades will attend 90% of the total school days offered. 60% of the children who are in preschool or an infant and toddler program will attend an average of 36 hours or more per month in early childhood and interactive literacy		Due to the implementation of revisions made in the data collection system, not all programs entered the data in a consistent manner that would yield accurate and reliable data for this indicator. Refinements and clarification have been made which will result in solid		

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
	activities.		data for next year.		
FAMILIES Increase in language rich parent-child interactions.	75% of the Even Start parents will support their children's learning and increase language rich parent child interactions by: reading to their children daily; communicating with their children's teachers(s) at least four times per year; demonstrating understanding of education program expectations; and providing a home environment that supports children's learning and development in the home.	Staff Assessment of Parent Progress (pre and post) Teacher Questionnaire Parent Self-Assessment (pre and post)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More than 75% of Even Start parents communicate with their child's teacher at least on a quarterly basis: <u>Preschool/Kinderg.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 67%: quarterly parent visits to child's class - 40% weekly visits - 14% monthly visits <u>Elementary</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 58% quarterly visits - 12% monthly visits - 6% weekly visits More than 70% of families demonstrated significant changes	Target is met.	Not all the same instruments and measures were used last year as for this year so it is difficult to make an assessment of progress. However, the quality of the engagement between parents and their children's teachers; and between the parents and their children appear to have improved due to increased level of knowledge, confidence and skills obtained through the program.

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
			<p>in all variables associated with the child's learning and development.</p> <p>The majority of parents read to their children daily and engage in interactive literacy activities in the home and in the community on a regular basis.</p>		

C. Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

NOTE: PER THE REQUIREMENT OF THE USDOE EVEN START STAFF, THIS SECTION IS ONLY TO BE COMPLETED IF OUR STATE USES THE GPRA MEASURES. MASSACHUSETTS DOES NOT USE THE GPRA MEASURES.

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State.

Indicator	Target <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Cohort Number of participants who have this goal	Result <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
A. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading						
B. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics						
C. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition						

Indicator	Target <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Cohort <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	Result <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
D. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED						
E. Percentage of non- school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED						
F. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development						
G. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of reading readiness						
H. Percentage						

Indicator	Target <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Cohort <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	Result <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
of school-aged children who are reading on grade level						
I. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities						

**III. Education of Migratory Children
(Title I, Part C)**

Please complete the following charts for the Title I, Part C program.

General Data Reporting Information

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2002-2003. The Reporting Period for these data is September 1, 2002, to August 31, 2003.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE I. POPULATION DATA

In Table I States are to report the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 – 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	0	212	105	147	152	132	149	106	119	104	96	66	48	41	26	23	371	1897
B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"	0	66	16	25	28	25	22	19	13	15	13	13	5	5	3	6	150	424
C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																		
1. Migrant Children who are LEP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION																		
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	0	1	3	1	1	0	1	2	3	1	0	1	0	2	2	3	0	21
E. MOBILITY																		
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	65	13	24	27	25	21	18	10	15	13	12	5	3	1	4	126	382
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	60	31	35	34	22	44	29	29	25	19	18	12	11	5	4	137	515

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
3.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	34	29	35	32	24	27	20	29	18	21	3	13	5	3	6	88	387
4.	Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months)	0	123	40	58	64	53	56	48	39	36	38	24	25	12	5	8	315	945

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS

Table II asks for the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total	
F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school graduation <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> for migrant students has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																				
1. Dropped out of school												0	0	0	0	0	0	26		26
2. Obtained GED																				
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- (Note: The results of migrant students on State assessments in mathematics and reading/ language arts have been collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																				

INSTRUCTION: TABLE III. G. MEP PARTICIPATION – REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR

Table III G. asks for the statewide, *unduplicated* number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Participation information is required for children who *received instructional or support services* funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. *DO NOT count migrant children served through any schoolwide programs (SWP) in any row of this table.*

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count children not served. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Regular School Year Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted.

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received any type of referred service (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child). This is NOT a count of the referrals, but represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service that they would not have otherwise have obtained.

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION		Ages	Ages	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-	Out-	Total
		0-2	3-5														grad-	of-	
G. PARTICIPATION—REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR																			
1.	Served in MEP (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in any SWPs even if MEP funds are combined)	43	186	97	138	137	123	139	97	112	99	91	63	48	40	26	21	315	1175
2.	Priority for Service	0	47	14	22	20	17	18	16	12	12	10	11	5	4	3	4	98	313
3.	Continuation of Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.	Any Instructional Service	2	17	17	35	37	27	24	17	10	13	3	3	2	2	2	1	67	279
5.	Reading Instruction	0	17	17	35	37	27	24	17	10	13	3	3	2	2	2	1	67	277
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	0	17	35	37	27	24	17	10	13	3	3	2	2	2	1	2	195
7.	High School Credit Accrual													0	0	0	0	0	0
8.	Any Support Service	2	17	17	35	37	27	24	17	10	13	3	3	2	2	2	1	67	279
9.	Counseling Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Any Referred Service	43	177	95	133	132	119	136	96	112	98	90	60	47	39	26	17	290	1710

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE III. H. MEP PARTICIPATION –SUMMER/INTERSESSION TERM

Table III H. asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Participation information is required for children who *received instructional or support services* funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count children not served. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received any type of referred service (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child). This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP personnel.

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
H. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																			
1.	Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	29	110	54	62	59	53	68	43	44	43	27	15	12	11	3	6	114	753
2.	Priority for Service	0	48	11	17	20	19	17	13	7	11	8	8	3	4	0	3	78	267
3.	Continuation of Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.	Any Instructional Service	11	89	51	60	53	50	64	39	41	41	21	12	12	9	2	6	73	634
5.	Reading Instruction	0	89	51	60	53	50	64	39	41	41	21	12	12	9	2	6	73	623
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	3	8	10	8	14	14	13	15	13	12	5	6	7	1	2	6	137
7.	High School Credit Accrual													0	0	0	0	0	0
8.	Any Support Service	11	89	51	60	53	50	64	39	41	41	21	12	12	9	2	6	73	634
9.	Counseling Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Any Referred Service	22	49	14	11	20	13	14	10	7	6	7	5	1	1	0	2	64	246

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA

Table IV asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools and who received the special services noted below according to the descriptive categories. In the first column of Table IV, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children. In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide.

TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA		
I. STUDENT ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 270	b. 1291
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 0	b. 0

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. J. MEP PROJECT DATA – TYPE OF MEP PROJECT Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs that were supported with MEP funds.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
J. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 0	b. 0
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 13	b. 1175
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 11	b. 753
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 0	b. 0

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. K. MEP PROJECT DATA – KEY MEP PERSONNEL

For each school term, enter the number of *full-time-equivalent* staff whose salaries are paid by the MEP. Report FTE units by job classification. Define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. For example, one regular term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days, one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs that combined MEP funds/services with those of other programs.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
K. KEY MEP PERSONNEL	REGULAR-TERM FTE 1 FTE = 248 Days	SUMMER-TERM /INTERSESSION FTE 1 FTE = 30 Days
1. State Director	a. 00.50	b. 00.50
2. Teachers	a. 17.00	b. 10.29
3. Counselors	a. 00.00	b. 00.00
4. All Paraprofessionals	a. 00.30	b. 03.74
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	a. 00.00	b. 00.00
6. Recruiters	a. 09.51	b. 10.70
7. Records Transfer Staff	a. 03.00	b. 03.34

**IV. Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth
Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)**

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. These data will not be available in Spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report that will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.

**V. Comprehensive School Reform
(Title I, Part F)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

**VI. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
(Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund)
(Title II, Part A)**

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following teacher quality information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received "high-quality professional development;" and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

**VII. Enhancing Education through Technology
(Title II, Part D)**

The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.

VIII. English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)

States are not required to report any additional data for the 2002-2003 school year in this Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report. States reported data for the 2002-2003 school year for the Title III program in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application. Specifically, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application, States reported the information listed below.

1. A description of the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describing how the State's ELP standards:

- Address grades K through 12
- Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing
- Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006).

2. English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. ELP baseline data included all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

A. The ELP baseline data included the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

B. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State was reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
 - Describe how the composite score was derived;
 - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
 - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

3. Information on the total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

4. Information on the total number of students identified as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

5. Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. In September 2003, States provided performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Through the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year and future years and through the Biennial Performance Report for Title III, States will be required to report information similar to that reported for the September 2003 Consolidated State Application.

**IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act
(Title IV, Part A)**

General Instructions

Words that appear underlined throughout (for example, “physical fighting”) should be defined in accordance with State policy or based on the instrument the State uses to collect the information. States are asked to submit their definition of these terms.

If the State does not collect data in the same format requested on this form, the State may provide data from a similar question. If that occurs, please include a footnote for those data that explains the differences between the data requested on the form and the data the State is able to supply.

A. In the following chart, please identify each of the State indicators as submitted in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application and provide the following:

- a. the instrument or data source used to measure the indicator
- b. the frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection
- c. 2002-2003 baseline data
- d. targets for the years in which the State has established targets

A. 1 State Performance Indicators for Title IV, A - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection/year of most recent collection	2002-2003 Baseline	Targets
Early initiation of alcohol use will be reduced by 5% by June 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Every other year; 2003	27.9 (2001 data)	2003-2004 26.7
				2004-2005 25.4
				2005-2006 24.2
				2006-2007 22.9
Lifetime alcohol use will be reduced by 5% by June 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Every other year; 2003	81.2 (2001 data)	2003-2004 80.0
				2004-2005 78.7
				2005-2006 77.4
				2006-2007 76.2
Binge drinking will be reduced by 3% by June 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Every other year; 2003	32.7 (2001 data)	2003-2004 32.0
				2004-2005 31.2
				2005-2006 30.4
				2006-2007 29.7
Physical fighting among high school students will be reduced by 3% by 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Every other year; 2003	33.2 (2001 data)	2003-2004 32.4
				2004-2005 31.7
				2005-2006 31.0
				2006-2007 30.2
Rate of weapon carrying will be reduced by 4% by 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Every other year; 2003	13.2 (2001 data)	2003-2004 12.2
				2004-2005 11.2
				2005-2006 10.2
				2006-2007 9.2
Lifetime marijuana use will decrease by 4% by 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Every other year; 2003	50.4 (2001 data)	2003-2004 49.4
				2004-2005 48.4
				2005-2006 47.4
				2006-2007 46.4
Number of students expelled for substance use and/or violence related behavior will decrease by 6% annually until 2007.	Massachusetts Student Exclusion Record 2002-03: Suspension for more than 10 consecutive school days (including expulsion) forms.		1537 (2002-3 data)	2003-2004 1,445
				2004-2005 1,358
				2005-2006 1,277
				2006-2007 1,201
Number of students suspended for substance use and/or violence related behavior will decrease by 4% by 2007.	Missing data Current Suspension Data form does not collect data by offense			2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007

A.2 Provide an explanation of the data provided in the table (A.1).

Prevalence measures of substance use and physical fighting are provided by the Massachusetts Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS). The YRBS is a paper-and-pencil questionnaire administered to a random sample of public high school students in the spring of every odd-numbered year. The Massachusetts Department of Education consistently receives high response rates on the YRBS, ensuring the results are representative of all students in grades 9 -12 in the Commonwealth. Baseline measures included in Chart A1 (above) are from the results of the 2001 survey. State performance indicators were set to achieve realistic decreases in substance use and physical fighting by 2007, as measured by the YRBS, with an average decrease of .75 - 1.25 percentage points per year."

As noted, the reported expulsion and suspension data is based on Massachusetts Student Exclusion Record 2002-03, which did not capture all the necessary data elements. In addition, there may be some duplication of counts. In the future, the data will be collected using the new Student Discipline Reporting System that is designed to provide accurate and unduplicated counts.

B. In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students. States should use their definition of elementary, middle, and high school and provide those definitions in the report.

1. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	88	All
Middle	156	All
High School	298	All
Other	23	All

2. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	42	All
Middle	145	All
High School	258	All
Other	16	All

3. The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	NA	NA
Middle	NA	NA
High School	NA	NA
Other	NA	NA

4. The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	9	All
Middle	98	All
High School	394	All
Other	10	All

C. Describe the outcomes of the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts.

In addition to the Governor's Alliance Against Drugs, SEA staff coordinate with other state agencies including the Department of Public Health's Bureau of Substance Abuse Services and the Executive Office of Public Safety. This coordination has resulted in membership on the Governor's Heroin Task Force, state District Attorneys, New England Regional as well as Massachusetts Inhalant Abuse Task Force, and the Massachusetts Interscholastic Athletic Association Wellness Committee. These partnerships have resulted in providing the public at large, including parents, with prevention education and information. The SEA continues to work with various partners in providing information to the public regarding drug and violence prevention efforts.

**X. 21st Century Community Learning Centers
(Title IV, Part B)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

XI. Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)

A. Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

The major results available to date regarding Massachusetts Title V, Part A activities funded during the 2002-2003 school year are as follows.

- Massachusetts school districts focussed their spending predominantly on instructional and educational materials, including library services and media materials, as well as software, hardware, and other technology related areas. Over 60% of the total amount of funds awarded to districts supported these types of materials.
- A smaller but still sizable portion of the funding supported high school reform initiatives. Particular areas of focus for these initiatives were for at risk students and gifted and talented students. Approximately 14% of the total amount allocated to districts supported these initiatives.
- The third largest area districts chose to address with Title V funds was professional development and the hiring of highly qualified staff; with over 11% of the total funds awarded supporting these efforts.
- The remaining funds were devoted to programs that support school safety, health areas, and parental involvement.

In addition to the above information that outlines the types of programs and services Title V grants supported across the state, the following information addresses how many districts focused 20% or more of their funding in a specific area.

- More than 60% of districts receiving Title V grants focused a majority of their money on materials and programs to help students with academic achievement.
- More than 20% of the districts chose to focus primarily on training teachers in the school.
- Approximately 14% of districts chose to divide their funds between student achievement and professional development.
- 4% focused their funding on programs for at risk students.
- Approximately 3% of the districts made safety their primary focus in spending.

B. The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including: (1)** student achievement in reading and mathematics; **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2002-2003 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area ¹	Number of LEAs that used 20% or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of LEAs that met
Area 1: Student Achievement in Reading and Math	193	
Area 2: Teacher Quality	87	
Area 3: Safe and Drug Free Schools	7	
Area 4: Increase Access for all Students	10	
Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).		

B.1 Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2002-2003, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. **Two (2) LEAs fall into this category.**

B.2 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2002-2003. **Both districts listed in B.1. made AYP in 2002-2003.**

¹ In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)
 Part II – Spring Submission, 2004
 Massachusetts Department of Education
 6/25/04

**XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)
(Title VI, Part B)**

A. Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2002-2003 school year.
0 (zero)

B. Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)

1. LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2002-2003 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	0
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	2
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	2
Parental involvement activities	2
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	1
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1

2. Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Programs as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

All five districts participating in the Rural and Low-Income Schools Program met their district performance or improvement targets in the aggregate for the 2002-2003 school year. (Participating districts were: Athol-Royalston, Greater Lawrence Vocational Technical School, Greater Lowell Vocational Technical School., Greenfield, and North Adams.)

XIII. Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)

A. State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2002-2003 school year? No

B. Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds

1. Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2002-2003 school year. 30

2. In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	2	\$6,770.50
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	6	\$236,685.
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	2	\$16,464.
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	9	\$566,469.
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	15	\$287,059.61

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>FROM</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>FROM</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	17	\$915,632.61
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	8	\$40,701.50
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	2	\$144,177.
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	3	\$12,937.