

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



**PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006**

**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 is 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:

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 2006** , requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- o **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.

- o **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.
- o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- o **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 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 school year, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "2004-2005 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
 Part I, 2004-2005 Part II, 2004-2005

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

Address:
350 Main St.
Malden, MA 02184

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Carole Thomson
Telephone: (781) 338-6201
Fax: (781)338-3371
e-mail: cthomson@doe.mass.edu

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): David P. Driscoll

Signature

3/7/2006 4:35 PM EST
Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006

1.1. STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

In December 2000, the Massachusetts Board of Education adopted the *Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework*. The *Framework* was based on a previous *Science and Technology Curriculum Framework*, adopted by the Massachusetts Board of Education in February, 1995. Revisions to the 1995 document were released for public comment in June 2000. Public comment continued until October 2000, and was considered in a special meeting of the Board in November 2000. The current *Framework* was distributed in May 2001.

The current *Framework* divides grade spans for science standards into PreK-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-11. Science content strands at the PreK-8 level include Earth and Space Science, Life Science, Physical Science, and Technology/Engineering.

In February 2006, the Board of Education voted to adopt revised high school science and technology/engineering standards. The standards (located online at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/current.html>) replace the high school standards in the 2001 *Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework*.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

STATE RESPONSE

Currently, the Department of Education has operational MCAS tests in reading at grade 3, English language arts at grades 4, 7 and 10, mathematics at grades 4, 6, 8 and 10, and science in grades 5 and 8.

The Department administered question tryouts for new assessments required in mathematics (grades 3, 5 and 7) and in reading (grades 5, 6 and 8). These assessments have been custom-developed based on the Massachusetts *Curriculum Framework* standards. Operational tests in these areas will be administered in spring 2006. Performance standards will be set for these new tests in summer 2006.

The Department has had operational science tests at grades 5 and 8 in place since 2004. Tests in biology, chemistry, physics and technology/engineering will be administered for the second time in 2006, however these tests are aligned to the 2001 high school *Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework* standards. As described in Section 1.1.1., these standards were recently revised. Accordingly, the high school science tests that will be administered in spring 2007 will be based on the recently revised standards. Following standard setting in the summer of 2007, we will report scaled scores and performance level results at the student, school, district and state level for new high school end of course science tests in fall 2007.

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

STATE RESPONSE

MCAS standard setting was carried out in 1998 for the tests in grades 4, 8, and 10 for English language arts, mathematics, and science and technology. A grade 7 ELA test was introduced in 2001; the grade 8 ELA test was eliminated in 2002. In 2001, standard setting was conducted for tests introduced that year—grade 3 reading, grade 7 English language arts, and grade 6 mathematics. Also that year, performance standards for the grade 4 English language arts test were reset.

Science tests at grades 5 and 8 that were introduced in 1998 were discontinued in 2001 in response to revisions to the *Massachusetts Science and Technology Curriculum Framework*. Performance standards were set in 2003 for the new grade 5 and 8 tests that were introduced that year.

Massachusetts' plans for setting standards for new NCLB tests remain unchanged from the plan presented in 2003. A timeline and milestones are shown below.

Timeline and Milestones for Setting Performance Standards for New NCLB-Required Reading and Mathematics MCAS Tests

Winter 2005	Draft performance level definitions
Spring 2006	Performance level definitions finalized
Spring 2006	Standard-Setting panelists are recruited and selected
	Separate panels are established for each new test (3 panels for math, 3 panels for reading)
Summer 2006	Standard-setting conducted
Fall 2006	Full reporting of results (student, school, district, and state)

MCAS-Alternate Assessment

Cut scores for the existing MCAS-Alt program were established in 2000.

Student performance on MCAS-Alt is judged and reported according the standard MCAS performance levels: *Advanced*, *Proficient*, and *Needs Improvement*, with performance at the lowest MCAS performance level—Failing/Warning—subdivided into 4 discrete levels: *Progressing*, *Emerging*, *Awareness*, and *Incomplete*. Cut scores for performance on the MCAS-Alt were established based upon a methodology—developed specifically for the MCAS Alt—which uses scoring rubrics to evaluate student performance on four dimensions: completeness, complexity, accuracy, and independence.

Cut scores for student performance on the MCAS-Alt at the new NCLB-required grade levels will be established in summer 2006, and will be based upon the same methodology used to set cut scores for existing MCAS Alternate Assessments.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2004-2005 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2004-2005 school year academic assessments.

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

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2004-2005 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	295299	99.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	933	99.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	13623	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	26332	98.6
Hispanic	33134	98.6
White, non-Hispanic	220924	99.4
Students with Disabilities	49876	98.3
Limited English Proficient	19380	98.9
Economically Disadvantaged	83371	98.8
Migrant	366	93.8
Male	144992	99.3
Female	150307	99.2

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

1.2.1.2 2004-2005 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	291413	99.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	914	99.5
Asian/ Pacific Islander	13843	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	25601	98.4
Hispanic	33183	98.6
White, non-Hispanic	217598	99.4
Students with Disabilities	48569	98.2
Limited English Proficient	21197	98.8
Economically Disadvantaged	82843	98.8
Migrant	371	93.7
Male	145093	99.3
Female	146320	99.2

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

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

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	46116	90.7
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	170	0.3
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3316	6.5

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	45618	92.0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	100	0.2
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3320	6.7

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2004-2005 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2004-2005 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2004-2005 school year.

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Massachusetts did not offer a grade 3 Mathematics assessment in the 2004-2005 school year. The 2005-2006 school year will be the first year a grade 3 Mathematics assessment will be administered.

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	71463	62.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	221	54.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3641	62.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6130	38.0
Hispanic	8608	31.0
White, non-Hispanic	52809	70.0
Students with Disabilities	12762	34.0
Limited English Proficient	3856	26.0
Economically Disadvantaged	21694	38.0
Migrant	88	38.0
Male	36771	60.0
Female	34526	65.0

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	72831	41.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	248	28.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3587	53.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6547	17.0
Hispanic	8622	16.0
White, non-Hispanic	53725	46.0
Students with Disabilities	14065	15.0
Limited English Proficient	2424	14.0
Economically Disadvantaged	22206	19.0
Migrant	87	16.0
Male	37422	41.0
Female	35055	41.0

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	72780	50.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	248	36.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3582	57.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6586	27.0
Hispanic	8605	22.0
White, non-Hispanic	53710	56.0
Students with Disabilities	14049	18.0
Limited English Proficient	2424	14.0
Economically Disadvantaged	22176	26.0
Migrant	87	20.0
Male	37404	43.0
Female	35062	56.0

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Massachusetts did not offer a grade Mathematics assessment in the 2004-2005 school year. The 2005-2006 school year will be the first year a grade 5 Mathematics assessment will be administered.

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Massachusetts did not offer a grade 5 ELA assessment in the 2004-2005 school year. The 2005-2006 school year will be the first year a grade 5 ELA assessment will be administered.

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	74789	46.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	241	36.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3317	63.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6933	21.0
Hispanic	9005	19.0
White, non-Hispanic	55220	53.0
Students with Disabilities	14429	15.0
Limited English Proficient	2093	15.0
Economically Disadvantaged	22883	23.0
Migrant	121	13.0
Male	32573	46.0
Female	35896	46.0

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

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Massachusetts did not offer a grade 6 ELA assessment in the 2004-2005 school year. The 2005-2006 school year will be the first year a grade 6 ELA assessment will be administered.

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	0	
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	
Black, non-Hispanic	0	
Hispanic	0	
White, non-Hispanic	0	
Students with Disabilities	0	
Limited English Proficient	0	
Economically Disadvantaged	0	
Migrant	0	
Male	0	
Female	0	

Massachusetts did not offer a grade 7 Mathematics assessment in the 2004-2005 school year. The 2005-2006 school year will be the first year a grade 7 Mathematics assessment will be administered.

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	76717	66.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	247	59.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3388	71.0
Black, non-Hispanic	7095	42.0
Hispanic	9312	36.0
White, non-Hispanic	56578	73.0
Students with Disabilities	14361	29.0
Limited English Proficient	1952	19.0
Economically Disadvantaged	23187	41.0
Migrant	112	42.0
Male	39506	60.0
Female	36943	73.0

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	77026	39.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	247	33.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3478	43.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6964	14.0
Hispanic	8811	13.0
White, non-Hispanic	57246	45.0
Students with Disabilities	14154	9.0
Limited English Proficient	2064	10.0
Economically Disadvantaged	22418	17.0
Migrant	92	14.0
Male	39755	38.0
Female	37148	30.0

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Massachusetts did not offer a grade 8 ELA assessment in the 2004-2005 school year. The 2005-2006 school year will be the first year a grade 8 ELA assessment will be administered.

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	34872	62.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	202	48.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3302	74.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6166	29.0
Hispanic	7069	29.0
White, non-Hispanic	55258	68.0
Students with Disabilities	11842	28.0
Limited English Proficient	1814	25.0
Economically Disadvantaged	16599	35.0
Migrant	70	28.0
Male	35468	63.0
Female	34872	62.0

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

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	34833	71.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	202	56.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3295	65.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6148	37.0
Hispanic	7050	31.0
White, non-Hispanic	55203	72.0
Students with Disabilities	11820	27.0
Limited English Proficient	1812	10.0
Economically Disadvantaged	16560	37.0
Migrant	69	29.0
Male	35427	60.0
Female	34833	71.0

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

- 1.4.1** For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	1756	999	56.9

The 1,756 schools represent the number of schools that received an AYP determination for the 2004-05 school year. There were a small number of schools that did not receive a determination because their enrollments were too small to make a reliable AYP determination or they did not enroll students in grades above kindergarten.

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	377	148	39.3

The 377 districts represent the number of districts that received an AYP determination for the 2004-05 school year. There were a small number of districts that did not receive a determination because their enrollments were too small to make a reliable AYP determination or they did not contain a tested grade.

- 1.4.2** For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	1050	499	47.5

The 1,050 schools represent the number of Title I schools that received an AYP determination for the 2004-05 school year. There were a small number of Title I schools that did not receive a determination because their enrollments were too small to make a reliable AYP determination or they did not enroll students in grades above kindergarten.

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	334	117	35.0

The 334 districts represent the number of Title I districts that received an AYP determination for the 2004-05 school year. There were a small number of Title I districts that did not receive a determination because their enrollments were too small

to a make a reliable AYP determination or they did not contain a tested grade.

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2005-2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2005 - 2006 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP 2004-2005."

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Districts with schools identified for improvement received priority for state and federal competitive grants and were targeted for training in Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM), an intensive, data-driven, results-oriented school improvement planning model for low-performing schools. PIM is a 10-step process that allows school leadership teams to set student performance goals aligned with state and federal performance targets, investigate the causes of low achievement in their student groups, and develop strategies and action plans that map how schools will provide students with the learning experiences that address their specific gaps in skills and knowledge. The PIM process is a systematic approach that:

- Uses student performance and other data analysis as the foundation for all decision-making and planning at the school
- Targets key teaching and learning issues that are within the school's control
- Draws clear connections between identified problems in student performance and planned improvement strategies, using solid evidence and justification, and
- Tracks and updates implementation and outcomes for continuous improvement.

Districts that receive training in PIM are provided follow-up support by Department of Education trainers to promote effective and sustained implementation of the PIM model.

In addition, ten urban districts, which together contain nearly half of the schools in improvement status in the state, receive funds to pay the salary of a school support specialist whose role is to coordinate and implement the district's system of support to schools identified for improvement. MADOE provides the school support specialists with monthly training on the facilitation of the PIM process and best practices in school improvement and inter-district networking opportunities.

Schools in Corrective Action and Restructuring

Since 2000, the MADOE accountability system has conducted an intensive school review process. The current focus of these reviews is schools in corrective action and restructuring. These schools are visited by a MADOE review panel, which evaluates whether the school has a sound plan for improvement and whether the conditions are in place to implement the plan successfully. If the panel finds the school plan or conditions for implementation to be inadequate, the school is declared under-performing. Each under-performing school receives a diagnostic fact finding review to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the school's leadership, curriculum and instruction, school climate, and organizational structures and management.

After the fact-finding review, under-performing schools receive facilitation and financial support from MADOE to conduct the PIM process using the results of the fact finding as a guide. The resulting plans are presented to the State Board of Education for approval, beginning a two-year period of state oversight. MADOE provides the schools with ongoing funding and routinely monitors the implementation of the improvement initiatives.

After under-performing schools implement their plans for two years, they receive follow-up reviews to determine whether the under-performing status should be removed. Those schools that fail to show improvement at the two-year review are declared chronically under-performing. These schools receive additional financial resources and are paired with a turnaround partner organization to accelerate their improvement efforts.

All districts with schools in corrective action and restructuring are required to submit documentation of the actions that they have taken in those schools to improve performance.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.

1.4.4.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2005 - 2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action). Additionally for any Title I district identified for improvement or corrective action for the 2005 - 2006 school year that made AYP based on data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP for 2004-2005."

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

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

Training, Tools, and Ongoing Planning and Implementation Support

One third of the districts identified for improvement participated in an NCLB District Consolidated Planning pilot using data-driven planning tools to address key district-wide performance issues. In addition, school district's identified for improvement with multiple schools in improvement status are offered training and support in Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM), an intensive, data-driven, results-oriented school improvement planning model developed by the state.

A state-funded School Support Specialist Network is maintained by MADOE to provide training and planning assistance to ten urban districts identified for improvement that together are comprised of almost half of the state's schools in improvement status. School support specialists assist with planning and support the implementation of improvements in schools within these districts.

MADOE considers effective planning to be key to addressing problems and prioritizes trainings and tools to assist with planning in low-performing districts.

Networking for Urban Superintendents

Superintendents from the state's 20 largest districts, all of which are identified for improvement, meet monthly with Department of Education administrators to share information and resources on practices and programs that will improve the performance of students in their districts. The network provides opportunities to address issues of common concern to urban school district leaders through partnering on policy and program development, analysis of data and barriers to improvement, as well as collaborating on shared solutions.

District Turnaround Partners

Three districts identified for improvement were declared under-performing after a state audit. The state linked each of these districts with an independent educational organization or consultant as a "Turnaround Partner" and provided funding.

Targeted Financial Assistance

Districts identified for improvement or corrective action are given priority consideration for competitive grants such as the Comprehensive School Reform grants, Title IIB and grants that provide school support specialists to low-performing districts.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 46
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 55 How many of these schools were charter schools? 0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 412
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 114579

Optional Information :

5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 998

7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2004-2005 school year.

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 54

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 3411

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 20859

Optional Information :

If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 3740

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	57501	53478	93.0
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	10335	9178	88.8
Low-Poverty Schools	9934	9401	94.6
All Elementary Schools	40803	38112	93.4
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	4035	3469	86.0
Low-Poverty Schools	4893	4583	93.7
All Secondary Schools	16697	15366	92.0

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

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

How is a teacher defined?

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

How is a class defined?

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

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

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2005, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Massachusetts Department of Education currently is not able to disaggregate its teacher data to provide this information. School districts report their highly qualified data to the Department in the aggregate. We are in the process of developing an educator database that will allow us to collect information by individual educator at which time we will have more detailed data related to the failure to meet highly qualified requirements.

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

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Elementary Schools	More than <u>53.6%</u>	Less than <u>6.1%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Massachusetts used the percentage of students that qualified for free or reduced price lunch as the poverty metric for this section.	
Secondary Schools	More than <u>37.0%</u>	Less than <u>5.8%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Massachusetts used the percentage of students that qualified for free or reduced price lunch as the poverty metric for this section.	

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

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

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

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

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

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

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2004-2005 School Year	47.1

1.6 English Language Proficiency

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

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

Developed Yes No

Approved, adopted, sanctioned Yes No

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

In 2001, the Massachusetts Department of Education established a statewide committee of ESL and Bilingual Education practitioners from across the Commonwealth to develop English Language Proficiency standards in speaking, listening, reading and writing. In June 2003 the State Board of Education approved these standards. The document containing these standards is entitled the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes (ELPBO) and is posted on the Department's website. Link: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/benchmark.pdf>

Between 2003 and 2005, several initiatives were implemented to familiarize districts with the contents of the ELPBO document. They are briefly described below.

1. Approximately 20,000 copies of the ELPBO have been printed and distributed at no cost to teachers or districts.
2. Approximately 15,000 copies of a 2' x 3' glossy poster were printed and distributed to districts, often to be used as part of an introductory workshop in the ELPBO for ESL practitioners. This poster presents all four modalities, at four different grade spans and four performance levels. In each of these sections, representative standards are grouped as descriptors of student performance at the different grade levels, performance levels and grade spans. The poster was very enthusiastically received and is now posted in many offices and classrooms across the state.
3. Department staff developed an introductory workshop and delivered this workshop at meetings, conferences and by invitation. This workshop was delivered approximately 50 times to approximately 2,500 teachers and administrators. District ELL directors developed their own introductory workshop, based on the Department's workshop, which they delivered in their own district.
4. In July 2005 the Department convened a statewide group of ELL educators to develop a document to be used to guide English Language Development curriculum development at the district level. The first phase of this project is a Scope and Sequence document, is written at four grade spans and four performance levels and includes all standards in the English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes. The first draft of this document has been released for public comment. A final draft of this document will be completed this summer and be ready for use in districts in September 2006. At that time Department staff will develop and present statewide workshops in district and regional settings on how to use the document.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

Linkage to ELA standards: During the development of the English Proficiency Standards 2001-2003, the English language arts standards were used as the backbone for all reading and writing standards. Many English proficiency standards in reading and writing are, in fact, parts of ELA standards, and notation in the ELPBO documents this as appropriate. An example appears below, and a brief description follows:

EXAMPLE

R.3 Comprehension: Students will read English fluently and identify facts and evidence in order to interpret and analyze text.

TOPIC: THEME**BENCHMARKS**

- a. Compare examples of familiar themes and topics. (link to ELA 11.4)
- b. Explain how a theme differs from a topic.
- c. Explain how a stated theme refers to the main idea of a text.
(link to ELA 11.3)
- d. Provide evidence that an implied theme refers to the main idea of a text. (link to ELA 11.3)
- e. Provide evidence that a theme is present in more than one text.
(link to ELA 11.4)

STANDARD/OUTCOME

- 11. Analyze and provide evidence from a text to support understanding of theme.
(link to ELA 11)

As you can see in the example above, each "ELA" notation directs the reader to a standard within the ELA Curriculum Framework. The phrase "link to" indicates that one aspect of the ELA standard has been addressed in the ELP standard, and not the ELA standard in its entirety. This "deconstruction" of an ELA standard to create more than one ELP standard was done to encourage explicit attention to each skill or concept required to meet an ELA standard.

Linkage to mathematics standards: Throughout the *English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes* document there is reference to language associated with subject matter content.

EXAMPLES (question and page numbers are references to the ELPBO):

25. (p. 15) Demonstrate comprehension in a variety of settings of specific, technical and/or abstract words and phrases of grade-level, academic content in various *Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*.

7. (p. 29) Give formal oral presentations that focus on specified academic content, using appropriate vocabulary and syntax, recognizable organization, clear pronunciation, eye contact, and appropriate volume and intonation.

17e. (pg. 38) Identify structures used in academic content areas, such as: Math, *passive voice, comparative forms*

15b, (pg. 86) Identify and use vocabulary words and phrases in ways specific to academic content (such as *table, sense, compound in science*).

There is not explicit linkage to mathematics standards in the ELPBO document, such as that described above for ELA standards. An initiative will begin during Summer 2006 to outline what such a linkage document would look like. The Department anticipates producing a first draft of such a linkage document during 2007.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113(b)(2) is spring 2006 . Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:
 - An independent alignment study No
 - Other evidence of alignment Yes
2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:
 - The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
 - The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
 - ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
 - Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

Statewide Assessment of K-2 LEP Students

K-2: Speaking and Listening Assessment

Massachusetts mandates that the speaking and listening skills of all K-2 LEP students be tested by the Massachusetts English Language Assessment –Oral (MELA-O). Districts are required to submit MELA-O scores (for speaking and listening) for each enrolled K-2 LEP student via the Department's online security portal. Scores for all other students were submitted via answer booklets used for the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) reading and writing test.

K-2 Reading and Writing Assessments

K-2 Reading

The Department is in the process of conducting a pilot of the Group Reading and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) reading assessment for K-2 students. The GRADE is a norm-referenced assessment of reading skills that is designed to be group administered to children beginning at the pre-kindergarten level. While not designed specifically for limited English proficient (LEP) students, the GRADE has been widely administered to LEP students to evaluate their reading performance and progress.

The pilot involves approximately 116 Title I districts that will administer the GRADE in spring 2006 as part of Massachusetts' Reading First and John Silber Early Reading programs. This pilot involves approximately 21% of the LEP students in kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 statewide.

The purpose of the pilot is to examine the appropriateness of the GRADE for measuring the reading proficiency of non-native English speaking students and to assess the resources the state will need for teacher training, administration support and scoring.

Depending upon the outcome of this pilot, the Department may require GRADE to be administered to *all* LEP students (K-2) beginning in the 2006-2007 school year. Alternatively, the Department may consider issuing a Request for Responses (RFR) to solicit prospective contractors for the development of custom K-2 MEPA reading and writing assessments for LEP students. This second option will depend upon the outcome of the GRADE pilot in 2005-2006, and the adequacy of federal funds for this possible initiative.

The Department will review and report progress by comparing 2004-05 baseline results against 2005-06 performance for selected pilot schools. A report of results will be available later in 2006 following the reporting of spring 2006 GRADE results.

K-2: Writing

The Department has not yet identified a developmentally appropriate instrument for assessing writing skills of K-2 LEP students. The Department invites the U.S. Department of Education to identify developmentally appropriate and cost-effective instruments for

our consideration.

Grades 3-12

The Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) program annually tests all LEP students in grades 3-12 in reading, writing, speaking and listening. These tests are based on the Massachusetts *English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes for English Language Learners*. This document identifies English proficiency content standards in reading comprehension, writing, listening comprehension and speaking. For more information about the MEPA program, including test design, test administration guidelines and reports of results, see <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/epa/>. A technical report for the MEPA program will be released in spring 2006.

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2004-2005** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

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

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State											
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency							
		Number and Percentage at Level 1 (3)	Number and Percentage at Level 2 (4)	Number and Percentage at Level 3 (5)	Number and Percentage at Level 4 (6)	Number and Percentage at Level 5 (7)	Number and Percentage at Level 6 (8)	Number and Percentage at Level 7 (9)	Number and Percentage at Level 8 (10)	Number and Percentage at Level 9 (11)	Number and Percentage at Level 10 (12)
Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (G.3-MELA-O (Speaking, G.K-2)	31659	27708	87.5	4661	16.8	3653	13.2	8656	31.2	10738	38.8
MELA-O (Listening, G.K-2)	17273	16339	94.6	1322	8.1	2394	14.7	4793	29.3	7830	48.0
MELA-O (Listening, G.K-2)	17273	16339	94.6	989	6.1	1899	11.6	4263	26.1	9188	56.2

The MEPA is a G.3-12 assessment only, but it does encompass all elements of the MELA-O (Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening). More information is available at: www.doe.mass.edu/ell/assess.html. Column #2 represents the number of students that were locally evaluated and found to be LEP in the spring of 2005. Column #3 represents the number of those students that were fully assessed on the MEPA (incl. MELA-O) or MELA-O (only) (fall & spring) and received a performance level in the spring.

- (1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
- (3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
- (4-7) In columns four-seven, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State

2004-2005 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number and Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State	
1. Spanish	27973	56.2
2. Portuguese	4587	9.2
3. Khmer	2080	4.2
4. Creole	2029	4.1
5. Vietnamese	1836	3.7
6. Chinese	1711	3.4
7. Cape Verdean	1416	2.8
8. Russian	878	1.8
9. Canton Dialect	677	1.4
10. Arabic	595	1.2

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.4.1.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III												
Name of ELP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency								Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (7)	
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)			
Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA)	25361	81.2	4429	17.5	3424	13.5	7986	31.5	9522	37.5	8028	25.7
MELA-O (Speaking)	15203	90.2	1270	8.4	2266	14.9	4414	29.0	7253	47.7	2540	15.0
MELA-O (Listening)	15203	90.2	958	6.3	1777	11.7	3944	25.9	8524	56.0	2540	15.0

1. Students being tested for English proficiency in grades 3-12 are administered the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA). 2. Students being tested for English proficiency in grades K-2 are administered the Massachusetts English Language Assessment - Oral (MELA-O). 3. The data in column #7 are independent of students tested, as the data represent the number and percentage of Title III students who were transitioned out of a Title III class during the 2004-05 school year.

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year.
- (3-6) In columns three-six, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2004-2005 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-6 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (7) In column seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111©:

1.6.4.1	Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2004-2005	<u>22481</u>
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	<u>20107</u>
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	<u>0</u>

These data come from the Student Information Management System (SIMS) and represent the number of students that were reported as being eligible for the "Emergency Immigrant Education Program." The second answer represents those students coded as immigrant and served in a Title III district.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

Scaled Score Ranges for Low and High Achievement Level Categories				
	Grades 3-4	Grades 5-6	Grades 7-8	Grades 9-12
Beginning-Low	300-312	300-312	300-312	300-312
Beginning-High	313-324	313-324	313-324	313-324
Early Intermediate-Low	325-336	325-335	325-335	325-333
Early Intermediate-High	337-348	336-345	336-345	334-342
Intermediate-Low	349-361	346-360	346-360	343-358
Intermediate-High	362-374	361-374	361-374	359-374
Transitioning	375-400	375-400	375-400	375-400

Massachusetts uses "Transitioning" rather than "Proficient" to describe the performance of English language learners whose test scores suggest that they may be ready to perform ordinary course work in English without transitional support in their native language.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

The cut scores associated with the performance levels and sublevels have been provided in 1.6.5 above. In the 2004-2005 school year, the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) was administered in both October and in March. The Department determined that students should be able to improve by one or more performance levels during a school year up until they reach the transitioning stage in order to be "Making Progress." In order to avoid the problem of rewarding minimal growth across an achievement level threshold, the Department decided to split each of the lower three achievement levels in half and require student growth across two or more half-achievement levels. Therefore, "Making Progress" is technically defined when a student: A. improves by two or more half-achievement levels; or B. reaches the transitioning level.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

Attainment Target: Attainment of English language proficiency is defined as scoring at the "Transitioning" level on the MEPA. The 2005 English language proficiency attainment targets for students in grades 3-12 at various stages of language study appear below.

Years in US Schools	Attainment target (% attaining transitioning level)
1	10
2	25
3 or more	40

Progress Target: The Department has defined progress toward acquiring English language proficiency as advancing by two or more performance level steps on the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA). Each of the first three performance levels on the MEPA has been divided into two steps. The target for 2005 was for fifty percent (50%) of LEP students to make progress toward acquiring English proficiency.

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

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

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

Yes No

AMAOs were applied to students in grades 3-12 who took the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA).

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	50.0	12122	57.0	13822	34.5	8362	41.1	9969

If **no**, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

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

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	50.0	11082	56.1	12431	34.5	7661	39.9	8843

1.6.10 Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2004-2005 School Year

	Number:
Number of Title III subgrantees	53
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	6
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	47

There were an additional six districts that met the progress and attainment portions and did not receive an AYP determination because their subgroup size did not meet the minimum N requirements.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2004-2005, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2004-2005 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	764	43.4
4	1325	41.4
5		
6		
7	1705	48.1
8		
H.S.	803	31.6

The Department did not offer an ELA test in grades 5, 6 and 8 in the 2004-05 school year.

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3		
4	853	26.6
5		
6	965	27.8
7		
8	760	22.0
H.S.	1001	39.4

The Department did not offer a Mathematics test in grades 3, 5 and 7 in the 2004-05 school year.

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2005 - 2006 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2005-2006 School Year	0

1.8 Graduation and Dropout Rates

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

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

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2003-2004 school year.

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

High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	96.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	94.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic	87.8
Hispanic	85.0
White, non-Hispanic	97.8
Students with Disabilities	83.8
Limited English Proficient	78.1
Economically Disadvantaged	89.1
Migrant	
Male	95.5
Female	96.7

As a transitional measure, the Department used a Competency Determination (CD) rate. This measures the percentage of enrolled 12th grade students that met or exceeded the Needs Improvement threshold score of 220 on either the English Language Arts and Mathematics MCAS grade 10 tests or subsequent retest opportunities. The Department will begin to calculate a cohort graduation rate in 2007 when the requisite amounts of student-level data are available.

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

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

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

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2003-2004 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	3.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	6.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.7
Black, non-Hispanic	6.3
Hispanic	8.2
White, non-Hispanic	2.8
Students with Disabilities	5.4
Limited English Proficient	7.6
Economically Disadvantaged	5.7
Migrant	6.9
Male	4.3
Female	3.1

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