

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 Street
Malden, MA 02148-5023

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

4/14/2006 8:36 AM EST

Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART II

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

2.1.1 Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools

2.1.1.1 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 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. 196

2.1.1.2 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 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. 289

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following:

2.1.2.1 Total Number of Title I schools in the State 1068

2.1.2.2 Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State 599

2.1.2.3 Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State 469

2.1.3 Title I, Part A Student Participation**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 2004-2005 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.

2.1.3.1.1 Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs 2004-2005 School Year

	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	54872
Limited English Proficient	38281
Homeless	
Migrant	860

2.1.3.1.2 Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group 2004-2005 School Year

	Number of Students Served
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1147
Asian/Pacific Islander	17592
Black, non-Hispanic	62122
Hispanic	90175
White, non-Hispanic	111085

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.

2.1.3.2 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 2004-2005 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level 2004-2005 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	442	7766	19	10	8237	2.9
K	1663	22147	275	30	24115	8.4
1	5151	23882	698	44	29775	10.3
2	5153	22526	587	57	28323	9.8
3	4986	22371	553	52	27962	9.7
4	4503	22913	500	87	28003	9.7
5	3409	22087	398	110	26004	9.0
6	3218	20990	265	125	24598	8.6
7	2425	17838	114	160	20263	7.2
8	1730	17638	101	227	19696	6.9
9	4912	13853	43	358	19166	6.7
10	1884	10361	21	284	10666	4.3
11	731	8841	12	181	9765	3.4
12	383	8318	21	91	8813	3.1
Ungraded	0	0	4	0	4	0.0
TOTALS	40590	241531	3611	1816	287548	100.0

2.1.3.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services - 2004-2005 School Year

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 2004-2005 school year.

Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	24163
Reading/Language Arts	34147
Science	942
Social Studies	116
Vocational/Career	3
Other (specify)	0
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	143
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	3191
Other (specify)	0

2.1.4 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs - 2004-2005 School Year

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 2004-2005 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.

	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	61
Teachers	859
Teacher Aides	356
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	45
Other (specify)	127

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)**2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following information:

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

1. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State 23

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

("Participating" means participating in all required core services and following any period of preparation.)

1. Total number of families participating 601
 2. Total number of adults participating
 ("Adults" includes teen parents.) 622
 3. Total number of adults participating who are limited English proficient 456
 4. Total number of children participating 653

2.2.1.3 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.)

1. Number of newly enrolled families 402
 2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants 405
 3. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal poverty level 32.0
 4. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED 69.0
 5. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade 43.0

2.2.1.4 Percent of families that have remained in the program

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

1. From 0 to 3 months	<u>19.0</u>
2. From 4 to 6 months	<u>21.0</u>
3. From 7 to 12 months	<u>30.0</u>
4. More than 12 months	<u>30.0</u>

2.2.2 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.

Indicator	Measure 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	Explanation of Progress
1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	TABE: TABE: At least 50% of ABE adult learners will make a 27 scale score gain.	TABE: 85.0	TABE: 41.0	TABE: N/A
	CASAS: N/A	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS: N/A
2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition	TABE: BEST Plus: At least 50% of LEP adult learners will make a 33 scale score gain. Cohort: 208 Result: 119 REEP: At least 50% of LEP adult learners will make a .4 scale score gain. Cohort: 45 Result: 26	TABE:	TABE:	TABE: BEST Plus: N/A REEP: N/A
	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS: N/A
3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	N/A for all columns.			N/A
	*Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED
4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	20% of adults who have a short-term goal of a high school diploma or GED will earn one during the program year.	31.0	11.0	N/A
	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED
5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Children will make a gain score of 4 standard points.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: 81.0	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: 54.0	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: N/A
6. The average number of letters	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask	Subtask: 2004-2005: This instrument was not used.	Subtask: N/A	Subtask	2005-2006: This instrument is being administered this year and will report achievement for 2005-2006.
7. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level	80% of elementary children (grades 1-5) will improve their ability to read on grade level.	86.0	61.0	N/A
	Please indicate source. WorkSampling; Checklist/Language and Literacy Domain; Teacher Questionnaire	Please indicate source. WorkSampling; Checklist/Language and Literacy Domain; Teacher Questionnaire	Please indicate source. WorkSampling; Checklist/Language and Literacy Domain; Teacher Questionnaire	Please indicate source. N/A
8. 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) 75% of parents will show improvement in these areas. SAPP Instrument: Staff Assessment on Parent Progress <u>Cohort and Result</u> 330 parents participated and 237 met the achievement goal.	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP) The SAPP instrument did not yield reliable data. As a result, Massachusetts is piloting the Parent Education Profile (PEP) on Scales 1 and II for the 2005-2006 report.

1. MA uses the TABE and not the CASAS. 2. MA uses BEST Plus and REEP for LEP adults. See Cohort and Result in Measure column. 8. See Cohort and Result in the Measure column.

2.3 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 2004-2005**.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

Table 2.3.1.1 Population Data

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.1 (on the next page) 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 2004-2005 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.

2.3.1.1 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
1. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN																			
1.	All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	0	132	79	79	63	74	67	72	70	65	45	58	28	28	21	11	687	1579
2. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																			
1.	All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"		26	19	46	36	44	35	38	35	32	25	33	19	14	10	6	92	512
3. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																			
1.	Migrant Children who are LEP		2	30	47	32	44	39	43	35	26	14	19	13	11	8	3	11	377
4. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION																			
1.	Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	0	0	3	2	7	9	7	10	9	11	4	2	4	3	1	2	9	83
5. MOBILITY																			
1.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	25	12	6	1	4	5	3	3	6	4	5	1	0	0	4	206	285
2.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 - 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	32	16	16	9	14	12	15	11	11	10	7	2	3	3	5	303	469
3.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 - 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	54	33	36	33	29	29	32	25	28	14	21	19	9	11	1	121	495
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	90	52	45	34	36	38	42	30	34	21	27	17	7	12	10	545	1040

2.3.1.2 Academic Status

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.2 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 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row

	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
1. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school completion <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																		
1. <i>Dropped out of school</i>										0	1	2	0	0	2	7		12
2. Obtained GED																		0
2. 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 - 1. Reading/Language Arts)						57	57	0	0	51	0	0	26	0	0	0		191
Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts 2. (State Assessment)						53	54	0	0	46	0	0	25	0	0	0		178
Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment - 3. Mathematics)						0	57	0	61	0	38	0	26	0	0	0		182
Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State 4. Assessment)						0	54	0	58	0	35	0	25	0	0	0		172

2.3.1.3.1 MEP Participation - Regular School Year

Table 2.3.1.3.1 (on the next page) 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 2004-2005 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.

Continuation of Services. In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the regular school year.

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 a referred service. 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 funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds. (Do not count the number of service interventions per child).

2.3.1.3.2 MEP Participation -Summer/Intersession Term

Instructions Table 2.3.1.3.2 (on the next page) 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.

Continuation of Services . In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the summer term.

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 a referred service. 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 funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

2.3.1.4 SCHOOL DATA

Table 2.3.1.4 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 2.3.1.4, 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

2.3.1.4. STUDENT ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 123	b. 344
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 0	b. 0

2.3.1.5 MEP Project Data

2.3.1.5.1 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.

2.3.1.5.1. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (All MEP Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 0	b. 0
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All MEP Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 8	b. 249
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 7	b. 1398
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (All MEP Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 0	b. 0

2.3.1.5.2 KEY MEP PERSONNEL

For each school term, enter both the actual number and *full-time-equivalent* number of staff that are paid by the MEP. Report both the actual number and FTE number 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 .) **Use only the percentage of an FTE paid by the MEP in calculating the total FTE numbers to be reported below for each job classification.**

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs where MEP funds are combined with those of other programs.

	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR (a)	FTE IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR 1 FTE = $\frac{180}{\text{Days}}$ (b)	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION (c)	FTE IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION 1 FTE = $\frac{50}{\text{Days}}$ (d)
2.3.1.5.2. KEY MEP PERSONNEL				
1. State Director	1	36	0	0
2. Teachers	2	234	43	340
3. Counselors	0	0	0	0
4. All Paraprofessionals	48	594	43	230
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	0	0	0	0
6. Recruiters	13	1476	13	412
7. Records Transfer Staff	4	0	0	0

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

2.4.1 General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 1

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.

General Instructions for Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 Tables:

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year.

Instructions: State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all State Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including neglected programs, detention facilities, juvenile correction facilities, and adult correction centers.

In the second column, indicate the duplicated number of neglected or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students *more than* once if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program more than once during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the unduplicated number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. An unduplicated count is one that counts students *only once*, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

Note: Throughout Table I, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 3. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds for only one area, count it only once.

2.4.1.1 State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities

Facility/Program type	Number of facilities/ programs	Number of N or D students (Duplicated)	Average length of stay (days)	Number of N or D students (Unduplicated)
1. Neglected Programs	0	0	0	
2. Delinquent (Total)	14	3011	NA	
2.1. Juvenile Detention				
2.2. Juvenile Corrections	2	450	199	
2.3. Adult Corrections	12	2561	214	
3. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: <u> 0 </u>				

The data collected do not differentiate between Juvenile Detention Centers and Juvenile Correction facilities. Also, the data collected were not able to represent an unduplicated count of students.

2.4.1.2 Student Demographics

Report demographic data on neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 1. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

	Number in neglected programs	Number in juvenile detention	Number in juvenile correction	Number in adult correction
All Students	0		450	2561
Race/ethnicity				
American Indian or Native Alaskan	0		2	4
Asian or Pacific Islander	0		6	49
Black, non-Hispanic	0		176	879
Hispanic	0		181	764
White, non-Hispanic	0		85	865
Gender				
Male	0		287	2423
Female	0		163	138
Age				
5-10 years old				
11-15 years old				
16-18 years old				
19 years and older				

The data collected do not differentiate between Juvenile Detention Centers and Juvenile Correction facilities and we currently do not collect age data in the manner necessary to meet these reporting requirements.

Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, juvenile corrections and detention facilities, and adult correction facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

2.4.1.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes

1. Facility Academic Offerings	Number of Facilities/Programs		
	Number of Neglected Programs (a)	Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities (b)	Number of Adult Corrections Facilities (c)
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)			
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)			
3. Awarded GED(s)			
2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes	Number of Students		
	Number in Neglected Programs	Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention	Number in Adult Corrections
1. Academic			
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>			
1. Earned high school course credits			
2. Were enrolled in a GED program			
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>			
3. Enrolled in their local district school			
4. Earned a GED			
5. Obtained high school diploma			
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education			
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education			
2. Vocational			
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>			
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs			
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>			
2. Enrolled in external job training education			
3. Obtained employment			

The MADOE will begin to collect this data at the end of the 2006-07 school year.

Instructions: Academic Performance Tables

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 students in neglected programs, juvenile corrections/detention, or adult corrections who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004 , to June 30, 2005

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs (**N**), students in juvenile corrections or detention (**JC**), and students in adult corrections (**AC**). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for both the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more the one of these change categories

2.4.1.4 Academic Performance in Reading

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students								
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days			In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days			In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days		
	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)									
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.									
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams									
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams									
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams									
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams									
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams									
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams									

The MADOE will begin to collect this data at the end of the 2006-07 school year.

2.4.1.5 Academic Performance in Math

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students								
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days			In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days			In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days		
	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)									
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.									
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams									
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams									
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams									
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams									
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams									
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams									

The MADOE will begin to collect this data at the end of the 2006-07 school year.

End Subpart 1 Reporting Form

2.4.2 General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 2

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, **defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.**

General Instructions For Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 Tables:

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year.

At-risk students are reported only in the facility/program and demographic counts. They are **not** reported in the outcome or academic performance tables.

Instructions: Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities And Students

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all Local Education Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including at-risk programs, neglected programs, detention facilities, and juvenile correction facilities.

In the second column, indicate the duplicated number of at-risk, neglected, or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students more than once if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program *more than once* during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the unduplicated number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. An unduplicated count is one that counts students *only once*, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

Note: Throughout this table, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 4. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds for only one area, count it only once.

2.4.2.1 Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students

Facility/Program type	Number of facilities/ programs	Number of at-risk or N or D Students (Duplicated)	Average length of stay (days)	Number of at-risk or N or D students (Unduplicated)
1. At-Risk Programs			NA	
2. Neglected Programs	36	1812	136	
3. Delinquent (Total)	0	0	NA	
4. Juvenile Detention	0	0		
5. Juvenile Corrections	0	0		
6. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: <u> 0 </u>				

The data collected do not differentiate between Juvenile Detention Centers and Juvenile Correction facilities. Also, the data collected were not able to represent an unduplicated count of students.

Instructions: Student Demographics

Report demographic data on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 2. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

2.4.2.2 STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

	Number in at-risk programs	Number in neglected programs	Number in juvenile detention	Number in juvenile correction
All Students		1812		
Race/ethnicity				
American Indian or Native Alaskan		4		
Asian or Pacific Islander		17		
Black, non-Hispanic		293		
Hispanic		347		
<i>White, non-Hispanic</i>		1151		
Gender				
<i>Male</i>		1173		
<i>Female</i>		639		
Age				
5-10 years old				
11-15 years old				
16-18 years old				
19 years and older				

The MADOE will begin to collect this data at the end of the 2006-07 school year.

Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table, items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, and juvenile corrections and detention facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

2.4.2.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes

1. Facility Academic Offerings	Number of Facilities	
	Number of Neglected Programs	Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)		
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)		
3. Awarded GED(s)		
2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes	Number of Students	
	Number in Neglected Programs	Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention
1. Academic		
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>		
1. Earned high school course credits		
2. Were enrolled in a GED program		
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>		
3. Enrolled in their local district school		
4. Earned a GED		
5. Obtained high school diploma		
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education		
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education		
2. Vocational		
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>		
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>		
2. Enrolled in external job training education		
3. Obtained employment		

The MADOE will begin to collect this data at the end of the 2006-07 school year.

Instructions: Academic Performance Tables

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 students in neglected programs or juvenile corrections/detention who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005.

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs (**N**) and students in juvenile corrections or detention (**JC**). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for both the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more than one of these change categories.

2.4.2.4 Academic Performance In Reading

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students					
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days		In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days		In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days	
	N	JC	N	JC	N	JC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)						
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.						
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams						
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams						

The MADOE will begin to collect this data at the end of the 2006-07 school year.

2.4.2.5 Academic Performance In Math

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students					
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days		In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days		In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days	
	N	JC	N	JC	N	JC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)						
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.						
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams						
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams						
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams						
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams						
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams						
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams						

The MADOE will begin to collect this data at the end of the 2006-07 school year.

2.5 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM (TITLE I, PART F)

2.5.1 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 2004-2005 school year. 27.2

2.5.2 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 2004-2005 school year. 29.6

2.5.3 How many schools in the State have or have been awarded a CSR grant since 1998? 237

2.6 ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY (TITLE II, PART D)**Funding Year: FY 2003****School Years: 2003-2004 AND 2004-2005****2.6.1 FY 2003 Program Information**

State (Approved) Technology Plan (YES/NO)	Yes <u>X</u> No ___ (circle one)
Year last updated:	<u>2003</u> (year)
Date of State Approval:	<u>2003</u> MM/DD/YY
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 your State defines the following:

2.6.2.1.1 Curriculum Integration

Massachusetts defines curriculum integration as teachers and students using appropriate technologies on a regular basis to teach and learn the content areas in the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and to meet the needs of all students. The document Local Technology Plan Guidelines (School Year 2004-2005 through 2006-2007) provides a set of guidelines for schools in technology planning for teaching and learning. http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/tplanguide04_07.html

2.6.2.1.2 Technology literacy

In Massachusetts, student technology literacy is defined as what students should know and be able to do in order to use technologies for learning at three grade span levels: PreK-4, Grades 5-8, and Grades 9-12. The document, Massachusetts Recommended PreK-12 Instructional Technology Standards <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/standards/itstand.pdf> provides the description of the skills. Teacher technology literacy in Massachusetts is defined as the mastery of skills needed to use technology in teaching. The different levels of proficiency in the use of technology are identified in the Massachusetts Technology Self-Assessment Tool (TSAT). <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/standards/tool.pdf> In Massachusetts, administrator technology literacy is defined as the mastery of skills to perform the leadership role of implementing appropriate technology in the schools. These skills are identified in the document, Sample Administrator Technology Self-Assessment Tool. http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/standards/tsat_sampadmin.html

2.6.2.2 Goals, Objectives, Targets

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, <u>Program Goals, Performance Indicators, and Performance Objectives.</u></p> <p>“The goal is to improve access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement.” This year we have developed three sub-goals to support this main goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educators will demonstrate technology proficiency and will show evidence of using technology across the curriculum to impact student learning. • Students will demonstrate technology proficiency and will show evidence of using technology across the curriculum with evidence of impact on their learning. • Districts will demonstrate providing high quality professional development in curriculum integration and technology literacy for educators.
<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 shows how Massachusetts Title IID goals are related to the statutory goals of the Enhancing Education Through Technology Act:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statutory Goal: To improve student academic achievement through the use of technology Massachusetts Goal: 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. Statutory Goal: 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 Massachusetts Goal: 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. Statutory Goal: To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development Massachusetts Goal: 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>Last year, we updated the program objective 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 online, and 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 productivity in schools and systems.... Using these tools, educational information will be easily accessed and easily interrelated for purposes of analysis and decision-making.”

We continue to follow the above objectives with the following addition:

. By 2007-2008, 85% of students* will demonstrate technology proficiency and will show evidence of using technology across the curriculum with evidence of impact on their learning.

. By 2007-2008, 85% of educators* will demonstrate technology proficiency and will show evidence of using technology across the curriculum to impact student learning.

. By 2007-2008, the district will have one FTE technology integration support person for 40-80 instructional staff.*

. By 2007-2008, 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.

* Massachusetts STaR Chart, developed by the state's Educational Technology Advisory Council (ETAC)
<http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/sac/edtech/star.xls>

* Massachusetts STaR Chart, developed by the state's Educational Technology Advisory Council (ETAC)
<http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/sac/edtech/star.xls>

* Local Technology Plan Guidelines (School year 2004-2005), Recommended Benchmark 2, B. Staffing
http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/tplanguide04_07.html

* The Massachusetts Department of Education Content Institutes require at least 45 hours of quality professional development activities for each institute. This objective is aligned to this requirement.
http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/Grants/grants06/rfp/171_151.html

Indicator

(Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)

In addition to the indicators listed on page 55 of the Consolidated Plan, additional indicators have been included:

- The percentage of students who meet all or parts of the State's recommended instructional technology standards for students
- The percentage of students who use computers for learning in the school and outside the school during various time periods
- The percentage of teachers who meet the proficiency levels that are identified in the State's Technology Self-Assessment Tool
- The percentage of administrators who meet all or parts of the skills identified in the State's Sample Administrator Technology Self-Assessment Tool
- The percentage of teachers who use computers to teach and perform classroom management tasks in the school and outside the school during various time periods
- The percentage of administrators who use computers to support their leadership role of implementing appropriate technology in the school and outside the school during various time period
- The percentage of districts that have one curriculum integration person supporting 40 to 80 instructional staff
- The percentage of staff who receive at least 45 hours of high quality professional development

Target

Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).

BASELINE DATA

The following data is from the publication, Technology in Massachusetts Schools 2002-2003 <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/etreport/2003.pdf> published by the Massachusetts Department of Education:

. 41% of teachers used technology "nearly every day," 27% of teachers used technology "about once a week," 17% of teachers used technology "about once a month," 14% "rarely or never" used technology.

- 18% of districts had .5 FTE curriculum integration person supporting more than 120 instructional staff, 24% districts had .5 FTE curriculum integration person supporting 61 to 120 instructional staff, 30% districts had .5 FTE curriculum integration person supporting 31 to 60 instructional staff, 14% districts had .5 FTE curriculum integration person supporting 10 to 30 instructional staff, 14% districts had no technology curriculum integration person supporting any instructional staff.

- 61% of districts had provided technology professional development to their staff, but there were no data on the number of hours of professional development. The types of professional development included 52% for computer applications, 37% for curriculum integration, 8% for maintenance and network operations, 3% for other.

Note:

. No data on student technology literacy or the use of computers in the school and outside the school were collected in this year.

. No data on teacher and administrator technology literacy and the use of computers in the school and outside the school were collected this year

Target

Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year

The following data is from the publication, Technology in Massachusetts Schools 2003-2004 <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/etreport/2004.pdf> published by the Massachusetts Department of Education:

- 50% of districts indicated that they surveyed either students or teachers to determine students' level of technological literacy, approximately 17% of districts developed their own assessments, and less than half provided data. For those that provided the data, 61% of students were reported to be proficient.
- 37% of teachers used technology "nearly every day," 32% of teachers used technology "about once a week," 20% of teachers used technology "about once a month," and 11% "rarely or never" used technology.
- For those teachers that used the state's Technology Self-Assessment 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.
- 33% districts had 1 FTE curriculum integration person supporting more than 160 instructional staff, 22% districts had 1 FTE curriculum integration person supporting 81 to 160 instructional staff, 26% districts had 1 FTE curriculum integration person supporting 20 to 80 instructional staff, 6% districts had 1 FTE curriculum integration person supporting fewer than 20 instructional staff, and 13% districts had no technology curriculum integration person supporting any instructional staff.
- 71% of districts had provided technology professional development to their staff, but there were no data to indicate if they had provided 45 hours of quality professional development. The types of professional development included 53% for computer applications, 36% for curriculum integration, 7% for maintenance and network operations, and 4% for other.

Note:

- No data on student technology literacy or the use of computers in the school and outside the school were collected in this year.
- No data on teacher and administrator technology literacy and the use of computers in the school and outside the school were collected this year.

Target

Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.

The Massachusetts Department of Education is tabulating the results of the 2004-2005 technology data. Based on the submitted data, we have the following results:

STUDENT DATA

A. Measurement of Student Technology Literacy: 104 districts did not answer the question, 55 districts used a student technology assessment, 55 districts used a survey of students about their technology proficiency, 144 districts used a survey of teachers about students' technology proficiency, 47 districts used "other," and some districts used more than one method.

B. Mastery of Technology Standards (not all districts contain all grades):

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 12 (270 districts) - 57% of students have mastered all or nearly all of MA standards, 29% of students have mastered half or more than half of MA standards, 13% of students have mastered less than half of MA standards. • Grade 8 (269 districts) - 56% of students have mastered all or nearly all of MA standards, 30% of students have mastered half or more than half of MA standards, 14% of students have mastered less than half of MA standards. • grade 4 (292 districts) - 48% of students have mastered all or nearly all of MA standards, 33% of students have mastered half or more than half of MA standards, 19% of students have mastered less than half of MA standards. <p>TEACHER DATA</p> <p>A. <u>Teacher Use of Technology in the Classroom</u>: 40% indicated nearly every day, 30% indicated once a week, 18% indicated once a month, 12% indicated rarely.</p> <p>B. <u>Teacher Technology Literacy</u>: 23% indicated Early Tech Level, 30% indicated Developing Tech Level, 32% indicated Proficient Level, 15% indicated Advanced Level.</p> <p>C. <u>Curriculum Integration Support</u>: 7% indicated supporting fewer than 20 staff, 37% indicated supporting 20 to 80 staff, 18% indicated supporting 81 to 160 staff, 24% indicated supporting more than 160 staff, 15% indicated supporting no support.</p> <p>Professional Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Massachusetts, 74% of districts had provided technology professional development to their staff. The types of professional development included 51% for computer applications, 38% for curriculum integration, 6% for maintenance and network operations, 5% for other. • Through the Title IID Competitive Grant Program, we collected data on the 45 hours of high quality professional development this year. Report on the data can be found in the documents: <u>Massachusetts Title IID Model Technology Integration Grants (Fund Code 165)</u> http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/grants/fy05/fc165_yearendsum.pdf and the <u>Massachusetts Title IID Technology enhancement Competitive Grants (Fund Code 170B)</u> http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/grants/fy06/170B_05yearendreport.pdf
<p>Target <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p>	<p>There have been continued funding cuts for EETT. In 2004-2005, there was a 25% cut because of the decrease in Massachusetts's Title I students. In 2005-2006, there was an overall cut of 28% on Title IID funds. We will try our best to reach our program objectives using the indicators as stated above.</p>
<p>Target <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p>	<p>If funding is stable, we expect to see improvement in meeting the program objectives. (However, Title IID funds have been eliminated under the President's budget for 2006-2007.)</p>
<p>Target <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p>If funding is stable, we expect to see improvement in meeting the program objectives. (However, Title IID funds have been eliminated under the President's budget for 2006-2007.)</p>
<p>Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) <i>Target met</i> (2) <i>Target not met</i></p>	<p>(1) Target met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Massachusetts is meeting most of the targets, particularly in professional development. • Massachusetts is starting to make progress in student technology literacy and teacher/administrator technology skills. <p>(2) Target not met. Massachusetts is not advancing as targeted in teacher use of technology and technology integration.</p>
<p>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We use the data from the annual state's Tech Plan Implementation Report submitted via electronic forms through the state's Security Portal. http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/techplan/form_sample.pdf . Districts use the tools developed by the Massachusetts Department of Education to gather data and reporting:- Technology Self-Assessment Tool (TSAT) http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/standards/tool.pdf - Sample Administrator Self-Assessment Tool http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/standards/tsat_sampadmin.html - Teacher Technology Use Survey http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/techplan/teachersurvey.pdf

If for any reason 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 (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	Modification or Additions
<p>Original 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, <u>Program Goals, Performance Indicators, and Performance Objectives.</u></p> <p>“The goal is to improve access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement.”</p>	<p>Additional Goals:</p> <p>This year, we developed three sub-goals to support this main goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educators will demonstrate technology proficiency and will show evidence of using technology across the curriculum to impact student learning. • Students will demonstrate technology proficiency and will show evidence of using technology across the curriculum with evidence of impact on their learning. • Districts will demonstrate providing high quality professional development in curriculum integration and technology literacy for educators.
<p>Objectives:</p> <p>Last year, we updated the program objective 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 online, and 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 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>Additional Objectives:</p> <p>We continue to follow the above objectives with the following addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 2007-2008, 85% of students* will demonstrate technology proficiency and will show evidence of using technology across the curriculum with evidence of impact on their learning. • By 2007-2008, 85% of educators* will demonstrate technology proficiency and will show evidence of using technology across the curriculum to impact student learning. • By 2007-2008, the district will have one FTE technology integration support person for 40-80 instructional staff.* • By 2007-2008, 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. <p>Note:</p> <p>* Massachusetts STaR Chart, developed by the state's Educational Technology Advisory Council (ETAC) http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/sac/edtech/star.xls</p> <p>* Massachusetts STaR Chart, developed by the state's Educational Technology Advisory Council (ETAC) http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/sac/edtech/star.xls</p> <p>* Local Technology Plan Guidelines (School Year 2004-2005), Recommended Benchmark 2, B. Staffing http://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/tplanguide04_07.html</p> <p>* The Massachusetts Department of Education Content Institutes requires at least 45 hours of quality professional development activities for each institute. This objective is aligned to this requirement.</p>

Indicators:	Additional Indicators:
<p>The original indicators are located on page 55 of the Consolidated Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The percentage of students who meet all or parts of the State's recommended instructional technology standards for students . The percentage of students who use computers for learning in the school and outside the school during various time periods . The percentage of teachers who meet the proficiency levels that are identified in the State's Technology Self-Assessment Tool . The percentage of administrators who meet all or parts of the skills identified in the State's Sample Administrator Technology Self-Assessment Tool . The percentage of teachers who use computers to teach and perform classroom management tasks in the school and outside the school during various time periods . The percentage of administrators who use computers to support their leadership role of implementing appropriate technology in the school and outside the school during various time period . The percentage of districts that have one curriculum integration person supporting 40 to 80 instructional staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Percentage of staff who receive at least 45 hours of high quality professional development
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

It is very difficult to show the progress because this reporting format does not allow us to show tables and graphs.

2.7 SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)

2.7.1 Performance Measures

Instructions: In the following chart, please identify:

- o Each of your State indicators as submitted in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application;
- o The instrument or data source used to measure the indicator;
- o The frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection;
- o The baseline data and year the baseline was established; and
- o Targets for the years in which your State has established targets.

2.7.1 Performance Measures

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: <u>Every other year</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>26.7</u> 2004-2005 <u>25.4</u> 2005-2006 <u>24.2</u> 2006-2007 <u>22.9</u> 2007-2008 <u>21.7</u>	2003-2004 <u>25.2</u> 2004-2005 <u>22.0</u> Baseline: <u>27.9</u> Year established: <u>2001</u>
Lifetime Alcohol use will be reduced by 5% by June 2007	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: <u>Every other year</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>80.0</u> 2004-2005 <u>78.7</u> 2005-2006 <u>77.4</u> 2006-2007 <u>76.2</u> 2007-2008 <u>75.0</u>	2003-2004 <u>75.2</u> 2004-2005 <u>76.4</u> Baseline: <u>81.2</u> Year established: <u>2001</u>
Binge drinking will be reduced by 3% by June 2007	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: <u>Every other year</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>32.0</u> 2004-2005 <u>31.2</u> 2005-2006 <u>30.4</u> 2006-2007 <u>29.7</u> 2007-2008 <u>29.0</u>	2003-2004 <u>26.9</u> 2004-2005 <u>26.5</u> Baseline: <u>32.7</u> Year established: <u>2001</u>
Physical fighting among high school students will be reduced by 3% by 2007	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: <u>Every year</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>32.4</u> 2004-2005 <u>31.7</u> 2005-2006 <u>31.0</u> 2006-2007 <u>30.2</u> 2007-2008 <u>29.5</u>	2003-2004 <u>30.7</u> 2004-2005 <u>28.6</u> Baseline: <u>33.2</u> Year established: <u>2001</u>
Rate of Weapon carrying will be reduced by 4% by 2007	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: <u>Every other year</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>12.2</u> 2004-2005 <u>11.2</u> 2005-2006 <u>10.2</u> 2006-2007 <u>9.2</u> 2007-2008 <u>8.2</u>	2003-2004 <u>13.5</u> 2004-2005 <u>15.2</u> Baseline: <u>13.2</u> Year established: <u>2001</u>
Lifetime marijuana use will decrease by 4% by 2007	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	Frequency: <u>Every other year</u> Year of most recent collection: <u>2005</u>	2003-2004 <u>49.4</u> 2004-2005 <u>48.4</u> 2005-2006 <u>47.4</u> 2006-2007 <u>46.4</u> 2007-2008 <u>45.4</u>	2003-2004 <u>46.7</u> 2004-2005 <u>45.2</u> Baseline: <u>50.4</u> Year established: <u>2001</u>

2.7.2 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	A public school providing educational instruction starting at grade one and ending at a grade not higher than grade eight. Preschool or kindergarten may be included as well.
Middle School	A public school administered as a separate entity between the elementary and secondary levels. The grade span typically begins at grade 5, 6, and/or 7 and continues on through grades 8 or 9.
High School	A public school having the ability to graduate students upon completion of grades 10, 11, and/or 12. The grade span typically starts at grades 7 or 9 and continues through grade 12.

2.7.2.2 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 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	1608	386
Middle	3326	386
High School	4161	386

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	0	386
Middle	0	386
High School	6	386

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

State definition of weapons: __

Any instrument or object possessed or used to inflict harm on another person, or to intimidate any person. Examples include firearms of any kind (operable or inoperable, loaded or unloaded); all types of knives, chains, pipes, razor blades or similar instruments with sharp cutting edges; ice picks, dirks, other pointed instruments (including pencils, pens); nunchakus; brass knuckles; Chinese stars; billy clubs; tear gas guns; electrical weapons or devices (stun guns); BB or pellet guns; and explosives or propellants.

—

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	406	386
Middle	564	386
High School	678	386

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	5	386
Middle	13	386
High School	40	386

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

State definition of alcohol-related: __

Having alcoholic beverages in one’s pocket(s), bag(s), car, locker, etc. or consuming alcoholic beverages.

—

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	11	386
Middle	96	386
High School	756	386

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	0	386
Middle	1	386
High School	1	386

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

State definition of illicit-drug related: All illegal drugs (marijuana, hallucinogens, cocaine, ecstasy, etc) and also the illegal use of substances that may be legal elsewhere (e.g., prescription drugs, steroids, inhalants).

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year		Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	34		386
Middle	309		386
High School	1879		386

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year		Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	2		386
Middle	2		386
High School	65		386

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

Instructions: Section 4116 of ESEA 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.

Massachusetts Department of Education staff are actively involved with the following:

- o The Governor's Interagency Council on Substance Abuse and Prevention, which provides information on substance use prevention, intervention and treatment to parents and families;
- o The Youth Interagency Working Group, which provides resources to parents on issues of substance use prevention, addiction and treatment for adolescents;
- o The Massachusetts Inhalant Task Force, which has designed resources specifically for parents on inhalant use prevention and awareness;
- o Children's Trust Fund Board, which is responsible for statewide child abuse prevention programs and campaigns for parents;
- o Statewide Advisory Committee for Community-based Prevention and Intervention SAMHSA grants;
- o Statewide Fatherhood Involvement Project "Dads Make A Difference," which provides technical assistance and resources for families on the issues of safety and substance use; and
- o Collaboration with local District Attorneys' Offices on parent programs implemented in their counties

Additionally, Safe and Drug-Free Schools staff interview parents as part of the program review process and provide resources and technical assistance to school districts regarding parent involvement in substance and violence prevention programs. Substance and violence related YRBS data is publicly available on the Massachusetts DOE website.

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS(TITLE V, PART A)

- 2.8.1 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).

Using Federal Fiscal Year 2004 funds, Massachusetts used state-level funds to support initiatives and staff salaries for conducting activities related to the following three categories:

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

- Support for the planning, design, and initial implementation of charter schools as described in part B.

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

- Statewide education reform, school improvement programs, technical assistance, and direct grants to local educational agencies, which assist such agencies under section 5131.

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

- Support for the design and implementation of high-quality yearly student assessments.

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

TITLE V STATE-LEVEL ACTIVITIES

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

SECONDARY SCHOOL REFORM INITIATIVE

Components of the initiative included the following:

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

- **Aligning high school (HS) standards with what is expected of students in their freshman year of college.** We are conducting a study, in partnership with higher education, to review the relationship of the 11th and 12th grade learning standards in the state Curriculum Frameworks with what students will be expected to know after high school graduation in college or the workplace. The published results will help school districts realign programs of study, raise student and teacher expectations, and provide clear examples of college ready assignments and course curricula.

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

- **Creating a recommended “Curriculum for College and Work Readiness” that defines the courses that all HS students should take.** We are building on the alignment work, the Curriculum Frameworks companion documents, and the courses required by the MA Board of Higher Education’s admissions standards. The curriculum will help teachers illustrate to students what they will need to know to succeed in higher education and the workplace.

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

- Collaborating with *Achieve* and its partners to **develop an end of course Algebra II assessment that can be used in Massachusetts and in other states.** Algebra II is considered a strong predictor of college enrollment and completion, so we will emphasize its importance and ensure all students are better prepared for higher education. We are considering a variety of incentives for students who participate and pass, including scholarship opportunities or a HS diploma performance endorsement.

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

- **Redesigning and restoring the state’s dual enrollment program, with a particular focus on mathematics and science.** This will help more closely align the work of HS and college, and build on the increased academic focus on science as our state readies for the

upcoming science exit exam for the class of 2010. The MA School Counselors Association will play a key role in this initiative as we strive to encourage under-represented students to participate as a way to urge them to attend and complete college.

- **Increasing the number of students, especially minorities, who enroll in AP courses and succeed on AP, PSAT and SAT exams.** Strategies to increase this number include reassessing the alignment of middle school and hs programming, reducing or waiving the test fees for low-income students, and encouraging all schools to offer more AP-level courses.

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

- **Organizing conferences** that provide a forum for faculty and administrators to learn about and share practices for creating high performing, academically challenging, and personalized schools that successfully educate all students.

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

CHARTER SCHOOL OFFICE ACTIVITIES

Title V funds were used by the Charter School Office to fund educational innovation through support and accountability activities. The staff funded through Title V help implement the accountability system, which includes annual site visits to schools, the charter renewal process, and the management of charter amendments and policies. Additionally, staff provide financial oversight through annual audits and technical assistance regarding funding, as well as facilitation of the annual cycle of applications for new charter schools and the preparation for the opening of schools granted charters.

<!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]-->

SINGAPORE MATH PILOT PROGRAM

Supporting education reform in the realm of improved mathematics achievement and assessment, Title V has funded a pilot project with ten school districts using the Singapore Math curriculum. \$40,000 funded implementation, training, and research and assessment regarding the impact of this program on student achievement in mathematics.

2.8.2 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 2004-2005 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	132	44	162987
Area 2: Teacher Quality	113	36	94454
Area 3: Safe and Drug Free Schools	4	0	2733
Area 4: Increase Access for all Students	43	7	45673
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).			

For the 2003-2004 CSPR report, a district was counted as making AYP if it made AYP in the Aggregate for both mathematics and English language arts. For the above chart on 2004-2005 programs, a district additionally needed to make AYP for all subgroups in both mathematics and English language arts to be counted as making AYP. As a result, it would be difficult to compare the numbers in the middle column on this page to those from the 2003-04 report.

2.8.3 Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2004-2005, 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. 6

2.8.4 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2004-2005. 2

2.8.5 Indicate the percentage of Title V funds, including funds transferred from other programs into Title V that LEAs used for the four strategic priorities. 88.0

[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)

- 2.8.6** Indicate the percentage of LEAs that completed needs assessments that the State determined to be meaningful and credible. 100.0
- 2.8.7** Describe how decisions were made regarding the local uses of funds.

In the spring of 2004, before submitting their Title V program proposals, districts determined which locally identified needs they wanted to address with Title V funds. Many chose to address areas identified through a previously developed local needs assessment process. Districts took into consideration information from their annual Title V evaluations when making these decisions. District superintendents or their designees consulted with and took into consideration input from administrators, school councils, parent and teacher groups, and others regarding which area(s) to address with Title V funds. This consultation process provided information regarding specific programs and activities Title V could fund that would help the district with the relevant goals and would contribute to improving student academic achievement or the quality of education for students. Before making final decisions regarding their Title V grant proposal, districts consulted with private schools in their region to determine their needs and come to mutual agreement on equitable services for private schools.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B)**2.9.1 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 2004-2005 school year. 0

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

2.9.2.1 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 2004-2005 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

- 2.9.2.2** 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 and Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) in Massachusetts. The goals and objectives for improved student achievement 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 NCLB-defined subgroups. For 2005 determinations, each of the two districts participating in the RLIS program received an affirmative AYP determination in the aggregate for English Language Arts and Mathematics. Despite the fact that progress is being made by subgroups in both districts, not all subgroups achieved enough improvement to make AYP in 2005.

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)**2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2004-2005 school year? No

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds

2.10.2.1 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 2004-2005 school year. 55

2.10.2.2 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)	6	67392
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	4	68403
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	2	47496
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	42	628033
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	26	322129

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)	33	659786
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	13	50030
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	29	404780
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	5	18857

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.

2.11 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS(TITLE IV, PART B)

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