

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

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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 2003-2004



PART II DUE APRIL 15, 2005

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by January 31, 2005. Part II is due to the Department by April 15, 2005.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **January 31, 2005**, 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 NCLB. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **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.

- **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 2005-2006, 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 2003-2004 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 15, 2005**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 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 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 2003-2004 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report. Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **January 31, 2005**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 15, 2005**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2003-2004 school year, unless otherwise noted. If needed, States should include for each section an explanation of the data provided (e.g., data irregularities).

States may use this format or a format of their choosing to submit the required information. If the information is available through another source, States may refer the Department to that source, e.g., State Report Cards. If a State refers the Department to another source, it must provide specific information on where the data may be accessed, e.g. the URL for the State Report Card.

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 182 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 3E231, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

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

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Carole S. 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 of Education

Signature

4/13/05

Date

**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 2003-2004 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. 295

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 2003-2004 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. 301

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

For the 2003-2004 school year, please provide the following:

1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State 1163
2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State 702
3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State 461

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 during the 2003-2004 school year. 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 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	50,642
Limited English Proficient	34,993
Homeless	2,618
Migrant	1,158

Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian or Alaskan Native	980
Asian	17,200
Black or African American	59,153
Hispanic or Latino	82,319
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N/A
White	109,780

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 during the 2003-2004 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level 2003-2004 School Year						
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0-2	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Age 3-5	338	6668	49	2	7057	2.6%
K	2016	19404	264	28	21712	7.9%
1	6040	20745	926	39	27750	10.1%
2	5385	19778	954	48	26165	9.5%
3	5280	20730	832	69	26911	9.8%
4	4663	20404	758	82	25907	9.4%
5	3685	19911	516	87	24199	8.8%
6	2994	18264	317	99	21674	7.9%
7	2062	17298	146	183	19689	7.2%
8	1973	17047	123	196	19339	7.1%
9	5272	13108	181	243	18804	6.9%
10	3750	9732	27	192	13701	5.0%
11	2236	9129	15	144	11524	4.2%
12	1616	8098	12	57	9783	3.6%
Ungraded	0	29	0	0	29	0.0%
TOTALS	47310	220345	5068	1469	274244	100.0%

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 2003-2004 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, A Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services 2003-2004 School Year	
Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	23926
Reading/Language Arts	34344
Science	369
Social Studies	305
Vocational/Career	2
Other (specify)	964
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	10
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	5463
Other (specify)	2182 Transportation, reading instruction, literacy support, summer school, IEP, tutoring

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 2003-2004 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 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	52
Teachers	1024
Teacher Aides	0 (included in "other" below)
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	44
Other (specify)	347 Teacher aides, other professionals, paraprofessionals, instructional assistants, literacy support, tutors.

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

A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the 2003-2004 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
____26 Projects____

**2. Even Start Families Participating
("Participating" means participating in all applicable core services.)**

a. Total number of families served
____622____

b. Total number of adults participating
("Adults" includes teen parents.)
____629____

c. Total number of adults who are English language learners
____418____

d. Total number of children participating
____685____

3. Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment

(A newly enrolled family means a family who is enrolled for the first time in Even Start at any time during the year.)

a. Number of newly enrolled families
____373____

b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants
____382____

c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the
Federal Poverty level
____61%____

d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a
high school diploma or GED
____69%____

e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade
____40%____

4. Percent of families that have remained in the program

(Include families that are newly enrolled and those that are continuing.)

a. From 0 to 3 months
____24%____

b. From 4 to 6 months
____26%____

c. From 7 to 12 months
____50%____

d. More than 12 months
____25%____

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 Name of required or optional indicator	Target or Standards Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator	Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator	Result Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available	Assessment of Progress Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met	Explanation of Progress Description of why results were obtained
EXAMPLE: Adult achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving and numeracy	EXAMPLE: 75% of adult learners will make a grade-level gain over a program year	EXAMPLE: Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)	EXAMPLE: 2001-2002: 45% of adult participants met target 2002-2003: 50% of adult participants met target	EXAMPLE: Target was not met in 2002-2003, but positive movement toward target was seen between 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.	EXAMPLE: Information on participation showed that only 50% of adult participants stayed in the program for 12 months. Participants who remained in the program for at least one full year were more likely to meet target. Of participants who remained in program for one full year, 70% met target as compared to only 40% of participants who remained in program for less than 12 months.
ADULT OUTCOMES Achievement in the areas of reading,	Even Start adult learners will make the following scale score gains on one of the following assessments:		All Tests: 49.4% of all adult participants who were assessed two or more times met or surpassed the	All Tests: Target was essentially met. The percentage of adults meeting the target was less	The percentage of adult participants who met or surpassed the target scale score gain for each test was substantially higher this year than in 2002 - 2003 (when the percentages were 26% for the

Indicator Name of required or optional indicator	Target or Standards Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator	Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator	Result Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available	Assessment of Progress Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met	Explanation of Progress Description of why results were obtained
writing, English language acquisition, problem solving and numeracy	<p>9 scale score gain for the BEST</p> <p>.4 scale score gain for the REEP</p> <p>27 scale score gain for the TABE</p>	<p>Basic Skills English Test (BEST)</p> <p>Arlington (Virginia) Education and Employment Program (REEP)</p> <p>Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)</p>	<p>target scale score gain for their test. The percentages broken down by type of test are:</p> <p>BEST: 52.4% of adults who took two or more BEST assessments met target.</p> <p>REEP: 56.3% of adults who took two or more REEP assessments met target.</p> <p>TABE: 36.5% of adults who took two or more TABE assessments met target.</p>	<p>than one percentage point below the target.</p> <p>BEST: Target was met.</p> <p>REEP: Target was met.</p> <p>TABE: Target was not met; however, the percentage of adults who did meet the target (36.5%) more than doubled from the previous year (16% in 2002-2003).</p>	<p>BEST, 39% for the REEP, and 16% for the TABE).</p> <p>Retention rates for adult learners in ABE vs. ESOL classes tend to be lower.</p> <p>Research studies currently being conducted in Massachusetts will provide more information on the relationship between adult outcomes and the length and intensity of participation in Even Start</p>

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>
Receipt of a high school diploma or a general equivalency diploma by adult	25% of the participating Even Start parents who have a goal of a high school diploma or equivalent will earn a high school diploma or equivalent during the program year.	Data on parental goals and achievement in the state's data collection system: SMARTT (System for Managing Accountability and Results through Technology)	Almost 23% of adult participants who had a goal of getting a high school diploma or equivalent met that goal during the program year.	Target was essentially met (under by 2% of the target)	

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>
Entry into a post secondary school, job-retraining program or employment or career advancement, including the military	10% of Even Start parents 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 on parental goals and achievement in SMARTT.	19.4% of adult participants who had goals pertaining to enrolling in a post secondary school, job retraining program or employment or career advancement, including the military achieved their goal by the end of the program year.	Target was met. There was a minimal increase from last year (18%).	Programs continue to collaborate with regional career centers in the state to provide information and support to parents on career exploration and job preparation. Efforts are made to incorporate activities into the project's curriculum.

Indicator Name of required or optional indicator	Target or Standards Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator	Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress	Result Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available	Assessment of Progress Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met	Explanation of Progress Description of why results were obtained
<p>CHILD OUTCOMES</p> <p>Improvement in ability to read on grade level or reading readiness</p>	<p>Using the Work Sampling Developmental Checklists, 80% of the Language and Literacy items will be rated at the level "2" or above for Even Start children in preschool, kindergarten, and early elementary grade levels.</p>	<p>Work Sampling Developmental Checklist</p>	<p>All grades (preschool – Grade 3): 82.4% of children assessed in the spring of 2004 had an average score of "2" or above on the Language and Literacy items.</p> <p>Preschool: 79.4% of children had an average score of "2" or above on the Language and Literacy items.</p>	<p>All grades: Target was met for all grade levels combined.</p> <p>Preschool: Target was <i>essentially</i> met. The percentage of children meeting the target was less than one percentage point below the target score. This was a similar percentage as in 2002-2003.</p> <p>Kindergarten: Target was met. The percentage of children who met the target score increased by almost 24 percentage points over 2002-2003.</p>	<p>An average score of "2" or above on the language and literacy items on the Work Sampling Developmental Checklist suggests that on average, children were reported by their teachers to be proficient or in the process of acquiring important developmentally appropriate language and literacy skills.</p> <p>Research studies currently being conducted in Massachusetts will provide more information on the relationship between child outcomes and the length and intensity of participation in Even Start.</p>
			<p>Kindergarten: 90.5% of children had an average score of "2" or above on the Language and Literacy items.</p> <p>Grades 1-3: Continued on next page.</p>		

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>
CHILD OUTCOMES Improvement in ability to read on grade level or reading readiness (Continued)	Using the Work Sampling Developmental Checklists, 80% of the Language and Literacy items will be rated at the level "2" or above for Even Start children in preschool, kindergarten, and early elementary grade levels.	Work Sampling Developmental Checklist	Grades 1-3: 81.8% of children had an average score of "2" or above on the Language and Literacy items.	Grades 1-3: Target was met. The percentage of children in grades 1-3 who met the target score increased by almost 9 percentage points over 2002-2003.	An average score of "2" or above on the language and literacy items on the Work Sampling Developmental Checklist suggests that on average, children were reported by their teachers to be proficient or in the process of acquiring important developmentally appropriate language and literacy skills. Research studies currently being conducted in Massachusetts will provide more information on the relationship between child outcomes and the length and intensity of participation in Even Start.
Grade retention and promotion	1) 80% to 90% of the children who are in kindergarten will advance to the next grade level or be placed in appropriate education services.	Teacher Questionnaire	1) 85.7% of kindergarten children were expected by their teacher to advance to the next grade level.	1) Target was met. This figure is similar to the 86% in 2002-2003.	Programs continue to establish and strengthen the partnership between the parents and their child's teachers(s) as well as to support parents in their children's learning.

Indicator Name of required or optional indicator	Target or Standards Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator	Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator	Result Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available	Assessment of Progress Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met	Explanation of Progress Description of why results were obtained
	2) 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.	Teacher Questionnaire	2) 93.1% of children in kindergarten through grade three were expected by their teacher to advance to the next grade level.	2) Target was met. This figure was increased by more than 3 percentage points from 2002-2003.	

Indicator Name of required or optional indicator	Target or Standards Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator	Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator	Result Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available	Assessment of Progress Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met	Explanation of Progress Description of why results were obtained
School Attendance	80% 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 30 hours or more per month in early childhood.	SMARTT Attendance Data	No conclusive data to make determination. Revisions implemented in the data collection system affected the manner in which programs provided attendance data. As a result the data was not provided in a consistent and uniform manner to yield conclusive information.		Clarification will be provided to the programs to ensure standardized data collection practices that will yield accurate data.

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>
FAMILY OUTCOMES Increases language-rich parent-child interactions	75% of the Even Start parents will support children's learning and increase language-rich parent-child interactions by: 1) Reading to their children daily 2) Contacting their children's teacher(s) at least 4 times per year 3) Demonstrating understanding of education program expectations	1) Parent Self Assessment Form 2) Teacher Questionnaire 3) Staff Assessment of Parent Progress (SAPP)	1) 51.3% of adults reported that they read to their children daily in their "post" self-assessment after having participated in Even Start. 2) Teachers reported that 80.3% of parents visited their children's classroom at least 4 times per year. 3) 63.4% of adult participants were rated by their Even Start staff as having increased their knowledge of educational program expectations and their role in their children's schooling.	1) Target was not met. However, 74% of parents read to their children several times a week or more. 2) Target was met. 3) Target was not met.	Although the target was met for only one of the four categories of family outcomes, it is important to note that majority of parents were engaging in language-rich interactions with their children at the end of the Even Start program year.

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>
FAMILY OUTCOMES (Continued) Increases language-rich parent-child interactions	4) Providing a home environment that supports children's learning and development in the home.	4) Staff Assessment of Parent Progress (SAPP)	4) 61.2% of adult participants were rated by their Even Start staff as having increased the amount and quality of developmentally appropriate interactions that they had with their children.	4) Target was not met in 2003-2004.	

C. Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

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. States should report data if local projects are using the indicated measures and the state collects the data.

Please note: The following information is not required for Massachusetts.

Indicator	Target <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator	Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal	Assessment of Progress Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained or not</i>
A. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading		TABE:	TABE:	TABE:	TABE:	
B. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics		CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:	
C. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition		TABE: CASAS:	TABE: CASAS:	TABE: CASAS:	TABE: CASAS:	*Please indicate measure used.

Indicator	Target Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data	Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator	Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal	Assessment of Progress Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"	Explanation of Progress Description of why results were obtained or not
D. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED		*Please indicate diploma or GED.	*Please indicate diploma or GED.	*Please indicate diploma or GED.	*Please indicate diploma or GED.	*Please indicate diploma or GED.
E. Percentage of non- school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED		*Please indicate diploma or GED.	*Please indicate diploma or GED.	*Please indicate diploma or GED.	*Please indicate diploma or GED.	*Please indicate diploma or GED.
F. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development		Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:
G. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of reading		Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive: Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI):	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive: Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI):	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive: Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI):	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive: Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI):	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive: Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI):
		Head Start FACES Letter	Head Start FACES Letter	Head Start FACES Letter	Head Start FACES Letter	Head Start FACES Letter Naming Task:

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 to whom the indicator applies</i>	Result <i>Number of participants who met the achievement goal</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained or not</i>
readiness		Naming Task:	Naming Task:	Naming Task:	Naming Task:	
H. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level		Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.
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		Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)

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

Please complete the following tables for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education 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 2003-2004.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE I. POPULATION DATA
 Table I requires you 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 2003-2004 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	178	84	92	96	103	76	90	84	72	75	59	34	29	18	25	731	1846	
B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																				
1.	All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"																			
				41	46	48	44	44	47	41	38	41	37	23	18	2	11			481
C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																				
1.	Migrant Children that are LEP		6	26	40	56	75	69	59	51	47	60	52	35	32	13	1	0		622

D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION																						
1.	Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	22		
E. MOBILITY																						
1.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	28	10	7	7	8	9	5	6	6	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	22
2.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	82	37	35	31	37	30	27	28	22	23	24	13	9	5	12	222	637			
3.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	45	25	26	34	33	20	37	29	23	29	18	14	10	9	1	147	500			
4.	Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months; counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	155	72	68	72	78	59	69	63	53	56	43	31	20	14	25	659	1537			

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 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

		Ages		K		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10		11		12		Un-grad- ed		Out- of- school		Total							
TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS																																									
F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school completion <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> have been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																																									
1. Dropped out of school																																									
2. Obtained GED																																									
G. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- (Note: The results of state assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts are collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, information on the number of eligible migrant students who participated in the state assessment will be collected below.)																																									
Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment – Reading/Language Arts)																																									
1. Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts (State Assessment)																																									
2. Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment – Mathematics)																																									
3. Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State Assessment)																																									
4. Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State Assessment)																																									

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

Table III H. 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. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

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 a schoolwide program (SWP) where MEP funds were combined, in any row of this table.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. 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 (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area 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.

	Ages		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
	0-2	3-5																
H. PARTICIPATION—REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR																		
1. Served in MEP (with an MEP-funded Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in a SWP where MEP funds are combined)	43	170	82	90	94	97	73	87	79	68	73	57	34	29	18	21	491	1598
2. Priority for Service	1	5	40	45	47	40	42	45	39	35	40	35	23	18	2	7	2	466
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	0	13	20	32	36	30	27	22	25	14	22	16	5	6	3	4	113	388
5. Reading Instruction	0	13	20	32	36	30	27	22	25	14	22	16	5	6	3	4	113	388
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	2	16	26	31	23	19	19	14	13	13	7	3	2	3	4	3	198
7. High School Credit Accrual																		
8. Any Support Service	43	139	75	85	83	91	67	82	73	63	70	55	33	29	18	14	427	1447
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	0	13	20	32	36	30	27	22	25	14	22	16	5	6	3	4	113	388

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

Table III I. 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. 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. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

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

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. 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 (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area 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		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
		0-2	3-5																
I. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																			
1.	Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	23	111	52	51	51	52	36	38	32	26	23	19	11	10	0	13	290	838
2.	Priority for Service	0	3	30	33	37	31	29	28	20	18	18	18	10	9	0	9	2	295
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	0	86	50	44	47	49	34	35	24	24	20	15	6	5	0	11	122	572
5.	Reading Instruction	0	86	50	44	47	49	34	35	24	24	20	15	6	5	0	11	122	572
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	23	19	11	17	19	10	17	11	10	7	1	0	0	0	6	1	152
7.	High School Credit Accrual																		
8.	Any Support Service	22	45	24	35	39	37	31	25	31	18	23	18	5	6	3	11	354	729
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	0	86	50	44	47	49	34	35	24	24	20	15	6	5	0	11	122	572

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 those schools.

In the first column of Table IV, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children during the regular school year. Schools include public schools, alternative schools, and private schools (that serve school-age children, i.e., grades K-12). 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			
J. STUDENT ENROLLMENT		NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a.	188	b. 939
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a.	0	b. 0

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. K. MEP PROJECT DATA – TYPE OF MEP PROJECT

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds (by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant) and provides services directly to the migrant child. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs in which MEP were combined in any row of this table.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA			
K. 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	0
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a.	33	1598
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a.	9	838
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a.	0	0
	b.		

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

For each school term, enter both the actual number and *full-time-equivalent* number of staff whose salaries are paid by the MEP. Report both the actual number and FTE units by job classification. For actual numbers, enter the total number of individuals who were employed in the appropriate job classification, regardless of the percentage of time the person was employed. For the FTE number, 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 where MEP funds are combined with those of other programs.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA

L. KEY MEP PERSONNEL		NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR	FTE IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR 1 FTE = 185 Days	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION	FTE IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION 1 FTE = 26 Days
1. State Director	a.	1	b. 0.2	c. 1	d. 0.2
2. Teachers	a.	12	b. 4.89	c. 37	d. 6.44
3. Counselors	a.	0	b. 0	c. 0	d. 0
4. All Paraprofessionals	a.	8	b. 3.39	c. 54	d. 5.76
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	a.	8	b. 3.39	c. 8	d. 0.85
6. Recruiters	a.	11	b. 11	c. 4	d. 0.6
7. Records Transfer Staff	a.	3	b. 3	c. 2	d. 0.42

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

A. Student Participation in Title I, Part D by Racial/Ethnic Groups and Gender

In the following table, please provide the unduplicated number of children participating in Title I, Part D by racial/ethnic groups and gender during the 2003-2004 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, D by Racial or Ethnic Group 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7
Asian	54
Black or African American	603
Hispanic or Latino	698
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	N/A
White	1394

Student Participation in Title I, D by Gender 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students
Male	2162
Female	621

B. Program Results

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2004-2005 school year. These data will be available for the first time for the 2004-2005 school year and will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report that will cover the results of school year 2004-2005 activities.

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

- A. Please provide the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in reading/language arts based on data from the 2003-2004 school year. 55.9%
- B. Please provide the percentage of CSR schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in mathematics based on data from the 2003-2004 school year. 54.4%
- C. How many schools in the State have or have been awarded a CSR grant since 1998?
174

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

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)**

Funding Year: FY 2002
School Years: 2002 – 2003 AND 2003 – 2004

FY 2002 Program Information
State (Approved) Technology Plan (YES/NO) <u> yes </u>
Year last updated: <u> 2003 </u>
Date of State Approval: <u> 2003 </u>
Web Site Location/URL: <u> http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/tplan03_06.html </u>

State Program Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its EETT performance indicators based on data sources that the State established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement, as submitted in the Consolidated State Application. Indicate which of the three or combination of the three Title II, Part D goals relates to your State goals.

Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology Goals:

1. Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools.
2. To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.
3. To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.

Provide results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

For the purpose of completing the table below, please explain how you define the following:

1. Curriculum Integration

In Massachusetts the definition of curriculum integration is based on the document Local Technology Plan Guidelines (School Year 2004-2005 through 2006-2007) (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/tplanguide04_07.html). This document provides a set of guidelines for schools in technology planning for teaching and learning. Under Benchmark 2 in the document, technology integration describes how teachers and students should use technology outside the classroom and within the classroom:

- Outside the classroom includes “ lesson planning, administrative tasks, communications, and collaboration.”
- Within the classroom includes “multimedia, simulations, data interpretation, communications, and collaboration.”

2. Technology literacy

- Student Technology Literacy – In 2001 the Massachusetts Board of Education approved the Massachusetts Recommended PreK – 12 Instructional Technology Standards. (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/standards/itstand.pdf>). The primary purpose of this document is to define what PreK – 12 students should know and be able to do in order to use technologies for learning.
- Teacher Technology Literacy – In 2003 the Massachusetts Department of Education developed the Massachusetts Technology Self- Assessment Tool (TSAT) http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/standards/sa_tool.html. This tool is aligned with the Massachusetts Recommended PreK-12 Instructional Technology Standards, the ISTE Technology Standards and the state’s Educational Technology Advisory Council’s STaR Chart (School Technology and Readiness Chart). TSAT identifies four mastery levels for teachers: early technology, developing technology, proficient, and advanced levels.

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p>Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p>	<p>Massachusetts' Title IID Program Goal can be found on page 55 of the Massachusetts Consolidated State Application approved 7/1/02 http://www.doe.mass.edu/nclb/stateapp/0703app.pdf under Title II, Part D – Enhancing Education Through Technology, Program Goals, Performance Indicators, and Performance Objectives. “The goal is to improve access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement.”</p>
<p>Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p>	<p>The following table shows how Massachusetts Title IID goals are related to the statutory goals of the Enhancing Education Through Technology Act:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">NCLB Title IID Goals MA Title IID Goals</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To improve student academic achievement through the use of technology On page 55 of the Consolidated Plan, under Program Goals, it states that the Massachusetts' goal is “.... to improve access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement.” 2. To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade On page 56, under Statewide Initiatives and Activities, 3rd paragraph, it states, “In October 2001 the Board of Education approved the Massachusetts Recommended PreK-12 Instructional Technology Standards. These standards provide guidelines on what students should know and be able to do to use technology for learning in the PreK-4, 5-8, and 9-12 grade span levels” 3. To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development On page 55, under Program Goals, it states that there should be “quality professional development for all staff”
<p>Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p>	<p>In addition to the objectives listed on page 55 of the Consolidated Application, Massachusetts Title IID Program has updated its objectives based on the recommendations of the State's Educational Technology Advisory Council (ETAC) http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/sac/edtech/:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “To prepare students for 'their future not our past' and to teach them the skills and competencies they will need to succeed in a 21st century economy” • “To expand faculty teaching repertoires so that teachers will use the web, interact on line, provide instruction from a distance. Teachers will construct their lessons to provide differentiated instruction and varied learning activities to match student learning styles and student needs to instructional techniques.” • “To improve management using a vast array of technology tools for

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>productivity in schools and systems.... Using these tools, educational information will be easily accessed and easily interrelated for purposes of analysis and decision-making.”</p>
<p>Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p>	<p>In addition to the indicators listed on page 55 of the Consolidated Plan, Massachusetts has included <u>additional</u> indicators in the Title IID Program. By 2007 a school district will have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A technology budget that includes staffing, hardware, software, professional development, and support. • An evaluation plan that measures the effectiveness of the progress in the use of technology for teaching and learning. • At least 85% of teachers use technology outside the classroom every day and use technology appropriately within the classroom every week. • At least 85% of students from grades 5 to 8 show proficiency in all the Massachusetts Recommended PreK-12 Instructional Standards for Grades 5 to 8. • At least 90% of teachers are working to meet the proficient level stated in the Massachusetts Technology Self-Assessment Tool. • 85% of district staff will have participated in at least 45 hours of high quality professional development covering technology skills and integration of technology into instruction by 2006-2007. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom applications of e-learning include courses, cultural projects, virtual field trips, etc.
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA</p>	<p>The following data is from the publication, <u>Technology in Massachusetts Schools 2002-2003</u> http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/etreport/2003.pdf published by the Massachusetts Department of Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 96% of school districts submitted data to the Department and 100% had data about their technology expenditures. The statewide average for technology expenditures per student was \$298. • 43% of teachers used technology “nearly every day”, 31% of teachers used technology “about once a week”, and 26% of teachers used technology “about once a month, rarely, or never”. • 61% of the teachers received some type of professional development. • 37% of school districts have one or more staff taking online professional development. • Ratio of students per modern computer was 4:7 to 1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 95% of Massachusetts’s classrooms are connected to the Internet and 72% of districts with 100% of their classrooms connected.
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p>For the 2003-2004 school year, approximately 96% of school districts submitted data on the implementation of their technology plans at the end of December 2004. Based on the submitted data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The statewide average for technology expenditures per student was \$286, a 4% decrease from 2002-2003. • 37% of teachers used technology “nearly every day”, 32% of teachers used technology “about once a week”, and 21% of teachers used technology “about once a month, rarely, or never”.

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For those teachers that used the state’s TSAT tool, 37% of teachers considered themselves to be in the “Early Technology” level, 30% considered themselves in the ”Developing Technology” level, 22% considered themselves to be in the ”Proficient” level, and 10% considered themselves to be in the “Advanced” level. • 71% of the teachers received professional development covering technology skills and the integration of technology into instruction. • 69% of school districts have one or more staff taking online professional development. • Ratio of students per modern computer was 6.9 to 1. • 94% of Massachusetts’s classrooms are connected to the Internet and 79% of districts with 100% of their classrooms connected.
<p>Target <i>Set target for 2004-05 school year.</i></p>	<p>There was a 25% funding cut for this year because of the decrease in Massachusetts’s Title I Students. We hope to see improvement in the targets for this year.</p>
<p>Target <i>Set target for 2005-06 school year</i></p>	<p>If funding is stable, we expect to see improvement in the targets. (However, 28% of Title IID funds have been cut for this year.)</p>
<p>Target <i>Set target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p>	<p>If funding is stable, we expect to see improvement in the targets. (However, Title IID funds have been eliminated under the President ‘s budget.</p>
<p>Target <i>Set target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p>We expect school districts to meet the targets as indicated above.</p>
<p>Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> <i>(1) Target met</i> <i>(2) Target not met</i></p>	<p>(1) Massachusetts is meeting most of the targets set by the Local Technology Plan Guidelines (SY 2004-2005 through 2006-2007), particularly in professional development. (2) Massachusetts has not made progress in some targets, specifically in teacher use of technology and the students-to-computer ratio (see below).</p>
<p>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</p>	<p>We use the data from the annual state’s Tech Plan Implementation Report submitted via electronic forms through the state’s Security Portal.</p>
<p>Explanation for not making progress - <i>Description of why target(s) was not met for SY 03-04, and steps that will taken to ensure progress.</i></p>	<p>We do not see progress in some indicators because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Massachusetts Title IID funds were cut from \$14 million in 2003 to \$11 million in 2004, a 21% cut. • We updated the definition of high-capacity computer. While the former definition specified a minimum of 32 MB of RAM and a 225 MHz processor (133 for Macintosh computers), the new definition specifies a minimum of 128 RAM and a Pentium 3 or Macintosh G3 processor (or equivalent). <p>In 2004 the DOE provided a survey for districts to gather data on teacher technology use http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/techplan/teachersurvey.pdf. As a result, we get more accurate reporting, whereas, in previous years, the data were reported by estimation.</p>

If you have modified or added Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets since submitting the State Consolidated Application, please indicate in the chart below.

Original Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets)	Modification or Additions
<p>See above.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

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

A. Performance Measures

Instructions: In the following chart, please identify:

- Each of your State indicators as submitted in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application;
- The instrument or data source used to measure the indicator;
- The frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection;
- The baseline data and year the baseline was established; and
- Targets for the years in which your 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	Targets	Actual Performance
Early initiation of alcohol use will be reduced by 5% by June 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: Every other year	2002-2003 27.9	2002-2003 27.9
			2003-2004 26.7	2003-2004 25.2
			2004-2005 25.4	Baseline: 27.9 Year established: 2001
		Year of most recent collection: 2003	2005-2006 24.2	
			2006-2007 22.9	
		2007-2008 21.7		
Lifetime alcohol use will be reduced by 5% by June 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: Every other year	2002-2003 81.2	2002-2003 81.2
			2003-2004 80.0	2003-2004 75.2
			2004-2005 78.7	Baseline: 81.2 Year established: 2001
		Year of most recent collection: 2003	2005-2006 77.4	
			2006-2007 76.2	
		2007-2008 75.0		
Binge drinking will be reduced by 3% by June 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: Every other year	2002-2003 32.7	2002-2003 32.7
			2003-2004 32.0	2003-2004 26.9
			2004-2005 31.2	Baseline: 32.7 Year established: 2001
		Year of most recent collection: 2003	2005-2006 30.4	
			2006-2007 29.7	
		2007-2008 29.0		

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance		
Physical fighting among high school students will be reduced by 3% by 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: Every other year	2002-2003	33.2	2002-2003	33.2
			2003-2004	32.4	2003-2004	30.7
			2004-2005	31.7	Baseline: 33.2 Year established: 2001	
		Year of most recent collection: 2003	2005-2006	31.0		
			2006-2007	30.2		
			2007-2008	29.5		
Rate of weapon carrying will be reduced by 4% by 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: Every other year	2002-2003	13.2	2002-2003	13.2
			2003-2004	12.2	2003-2004	13.5
			2004-2005	11.2	Baseline: 13.2 Year established: 2001	
		Year of most recent collection: 2003	2005-2006	10.2		
			2006-2007	9.2		
			2007-2008	8.2		
Lifetime marijuana use will decrease by 4% by 2007.	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: Every other year	2002-2003	50.4	2002-2003	50.4
			2003-2004	49.4	2003-2004	46.7
			2004-2005	48.4	Baseline: 2001 Year established: 2001	
		Year of most recent collection: 2003	2005-2006	47.4		
			2006-2007	46.4		
			2007-2008	45.4		
Number of students expelled for substance use and/or violence related behavior will decrease by 6% by 2008.	Massachusetts School Safety and Discipline Report	Frequency:	2002-2003	MD	2002-2003	
			2003-2004	280	2003-2004	
			2004-2005	263	Baseline Year established: 2002-2003	
		Year of most recent collection: 2003/2004	2005-2006	247		
			2006-2007	232		
			2007-2008	218		
Number of students suspended for substance use and/or violence related behavior will decrease by 4% by 2008.	Massachusetts School Safety and Discipline Report	Frequency: annually	2002-2003	MD	2002-2003	
			2003-2004	11,801	2003-2004	11,801
			2004-2005	11,328	Baseline: Year established: 2003-2004	
		Year of most recent collection: 2003/2004	2005-2006	10,875		
			2006-2007	10,440		
			2007-2008	10,023		

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

YRBS

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 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.

SSDR

During the 2003 – 2004 school year, the School Safety and Discipline Reporting System was implemented. This electronic reporting system gathers the following information on a school-by-school basis:

1. incidents involving drugs or violence on school property and any resulting suspension or expulsion imposed on the student offenders involved, and
2. suspensions of *more than 10* consecutive school days (including expulsion) for activities that are *not* drug or violence related.
3. suspensions of 10 or fewer days of Special Education students for activities that are not drug or violence related.

The report has two parts: the Violence or Drug-Related Incidents on School Property form, and the Student Discipline Record form.

Since this data is more accurate than previously reported, the baseline for suspensions and expulsions have been re-established beginning with the 2003 – 2004 school year. Further it should be noted that the high total number of suspensions for substance and/or violence related behavior could be attributed to the following:

- 3837 suspensions for substance use includes students suspended for tobacco use on school property, which is illegal in Massachusetts.

B. Suspension and Expulsion Data

Instructions: In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students for each of the underlined incidents.

Please also provide the State's definition of an elementary, middle, and high school, as well as the State's definition of each of the incidents underlined below.

(If your State does not collect data in the same format as requested by this form, the State may provide data from a similar question, provided the State includes a footnote explaining the differences between the data requested and the data the State is able to supply.)

School Type	State Definition
Elementary School	K – 5
Middle School	6 – 8
High School	9 – 12

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

State definition of physical fighting: Mutual participation in an incident involving physical violence

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	1146	380
Middle	2096	380
High School	3578	380

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	0	380
Middle	1	380
High School	12	380

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

State definition of weapons: Knife, Gun, Firearm, Explosive or Incendiary device

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	383	380
Middle	435	380
High School	689	380

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	10	380
Middle	40	380
High School	104	380

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

State definition of alcohol-related: Possession or use of an Alcoholic Substance

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	45	380
Middle	111	380
High School	676	380

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	0	380
Middle	0	380
High School	4	380

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

State definition of illicit-drug related: Tobacco, marijuana or other illicit substances

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	155	380
Middle	470	380
High School	3212	380

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	0	380
Middle	20	380
High School	89	380

C. Parent Involvement

Instructions: Section 4116 of the No Child Left Behind Act requires that each State provide information pertaining to the State’s efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts. Please describe your State’s efforts to include parents in these activities.

YRBS data is available on the Massachusetts DOE website. DOE staff serve on the Governor’s Advisory Council on Substance Use which provides information on substance use prevention, intervention and treatment to parents and families statewide. DOE staff collaborate with local District Attorney’s Offices on program planning and implementation for parent programs in their counties. DOE staff provided technical assistance to the Department of Public Health and DA’s offices on parent brochures for substance use prevention as well as assisting in the dissemination of information directly to parents. DOE staff has participated in community based meetings/forums designed for parents. Safe and Drug-Free staff members have participated on the statewide advisory committee for community based substance prevention and intervention SAMSHA grant.

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 Massachusetts Department of Education has received detailed information regarding Title V spending from more than 85% of the districts awarded Title V grants. Highlights of the types of programs and services made possible through Title V in these districts is described below.

- More than forty percent (40%) of the districts focused at least 20% of their Title V funds on student achievement in reading and math (area 1 under XI.B below). In this area, a total of more than \$1.2M (\$1,200,000) was spent, and more than 120,000 students and 12,000 teachers participated.
- More than one-quarter (25%) of the districts spent at least 20% of their funds on teacher quality (area 2). A total of more than \$820,000 was spent, and more than 56,000 students and 6,000 teachers participated.
- Fewer than 10% of the districts spent at least 20% or more of their funds towards safe and drug free schools (area 3). Approximately \$30,000 was spent, and more than 5,000 students and approximately 300 teachers participated.
- Fewer than 20% of the districts spent at least 20% of their funds on increasing access for all students to a quality education (area 4). A total of nearly \$1M (\$950,000) was spent, and more than 30,000 students and 300 teachers participated.
- Fewer than 2% (5) of the school systems did not use at least 20% of their funds on at least one of the four areas noted above. Nearly all of these districts used this money for improving parental involvement. Of these districts all of them made AYP in the aggregate for both English language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics.
- Approximately 5% of the districts did not make AYP in the aggregate in at least one subject area. One-quarter (25%) of these schools focused funding on student achievement in reading and math (Area 1), one-fifth (20%) on teacher quality (Area II), and nearly one-tenth (10%) on increasing access for all students to a quality education (Area IV).
- Close to 95% of the districts made AYP.

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 math, **(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 2003-2004 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 these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: Student Achievement in Reading and Math	137	134	1,204,597
Area 2: Teacher Quality	81	79	56,910
Area 3: Safe and Drug Free Schools	5	5	5,182
Area 4: Increase Access for all Students	24	24	30,304
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 2003-2004, 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. ____5____

B.2 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2003-2004. ____5____

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)

**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 2003-2004 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. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2003-2004 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	1
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	1
Parental involvement activities	1
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	2
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	2

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

Two districts qualify for the Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) in Massachusetts. The goals and objectives for improved performance by students are established by applying the rules for setting performance and improvement targets under the unitary Massachusetts school and district accountability system. Adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward meeting performance and improvement targets is determined for students in the aggregate and for subgroups. For 2004 determinations, one of the two

districts participating in the RLIS program received an affirmative AYP determination in the aggregate and for all subgroups for English Language Arts and Mathematics except for the Hispanic subgroup in the area of Mathematics. The other participating district received an affirmative AYP determination in English Language Arts in the aggregate and for all subgroups except for the Low-Income subgroup. This district did not receive an affirmative AYP determination in Mathematics in the aggregate or for the subgroups.

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 2003-2004 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 2003-2004 school year. ___51_____
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)	11	\$229,036
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	9	117,990
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	3	12,900
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	25	517,955
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	14	202,983

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)	25	\$609,375
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	12	67,022
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	28	366,988
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	8	37,479