

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

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

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



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

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

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

## PART I

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

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

## PART II

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

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614  
Expiration Date: 07/31/2007

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, 2005-2006

Part II, 2005-2006

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

Address:  
2066 Twin Towers East  
Atlanta, GA 30334

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Jeff Gagne  
Telephone: 404-656-3348  
Fax: 404-651-6867  
e-mail: jgagne@doe.k12.ga.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Stuart Bennett, Chief Deputy

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tuesday, February 27, 2007, 3:53:48 PM  
Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I**

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



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006**

## **1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

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

**State Response**

Georgia's science standards were revised and approved by the State Board of Education in July of 2004. The revision of the standards involved a Science Advisory Committee and an Educator Writing Team. Once the draft of the curriculum was complete, it was posted for public review for approximately six months. The public was given opportunity to submit comments via the GDOE website. The role of public comment was critical to the revision of the standards. Each comment was read and addressed within the committee meetings. The Georgia Association of Curriculum, Instruction and Supervision reviewed the document and presented its findings to the GDOE. The GDOE also contracted with the Council for State Science Supervisors to review and make comments on the science standards. All comments were taken back to the writing and advisory committees. Revisions were made based on feed back from the field and stakeholders.

The state currently has annual operational science assessments in grades 3 through 8 and in high school grades that are fully aligned to the state's academic content standards. The Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT) in science, grades 3 through 8, were administered for the first time in spring 2002. The Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHS GT) in science is administered in the spring of the eleventh grade. The test became operational in 1998, and a passing score is required as part of the graduation requirement. Additionally, the state has developed science End of Course Tests (EOCT) in Biology and Physical Science. Students must take these tests once they complete each course. The EOCT became operational in December 2003.

The current Georgia Performance Standards follow the language set forth in the conference report. The curriculum is based on the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Benchmarks for Scientific Literacy and the National Research Council's, National Science Education Standards. Both of these documents are recognized as national curriculum frameworks and specifically deal with controversial issues and the Nature of Science itself. That is to say, the curriculum recognizes science as a human endeavor that must be dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge, free of bias. It recognizes that science can take a great deal of time to change and that discoveries made through scientific means can profoundly impact our society.



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

#### **State Response**

Georgia is in compliance with the requirements of section 1111(b)(3). The state has been working to establish its current State Education Accountability System since July 2000, when a comprehensive State education law was enacted to improve student achievement and school completion. With the enactment of No Child Left Behind, the state has sought to incorporate all federal requirements into the accountability system. Today, Georgia has in place operational criterion-referenced assessments aligned to the state's curriculum in grades 3 through 8 and grade 11. These assessments address the content areas of reading, English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Additionally, the state has an alternative assessment designed for students with significant/severe cognitive disabilities. All districts, schools, and students (including special education and limited English proficient) participate in the assessment program.

The Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT) became operational in the spring of 2000 with administration occurring in grades 4, 6, and 8 in reading, English/language arts, and math. In 2002, the additional grades of 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7 were added, as were the content areas of science and social studies in grades 3 through 8.

The Georgia High School Graduation Tests (GHS GT) are administered to students in grade 11. The program consists of four content area tests and a writing assessment. The tests in the content areas of English/language arts, mathematics, and writing assessment became operational in 1994, while the social studies test became operational in 1997, and the science test became operational in 1998. The assessments cover the core knowledge and skills that have been identified by Georgia educators and citizens as constituting a comprehensive high school education. Passage of the tests is required prior to graduation.

The Georgia Alternate Assessment (GAA) is administered to those special education students who receive services and instruction based on an alternate/functional curriculum according to their Individualized Education Plans. Any student (regardless of grade) who is unable to participate in the regular assessment program (outlined above), due to his/her disability, must participate in this alternate assessment. The assessment began in 2000.

During the 2005-2006 school year, the State worked with committees of Georgia educators to redevelop the GAA. The new GAA, a portfolio assessment measuring student process on alternate achievement standards aligned to the state academic curriculum, was piloted in 42 school systems across the state. Implementation of the redeveloped GAA is occurring during the 2006-2007 school year, replacing the GAA administered in the 2005-2006 school year.

Most students with disabilities are included in statewide assessments with appropriate accommodations as determined by each student's Individual Education Program (IEP) team. To facilitate access to the new GPS, the state has developed a manual on differentiating instruction for the grade level content standards so that most students have access to the general curriculum. The State has not identified a need to develop an alternate assessment that is aligned with grade-level content standards.

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

**State Response**

Georgia is in full compliance with the requirements of section 1111(b)(1) for the regular assessment program. Georgia is working towards full compliance for the alternate assessment.

CRCT academic achievement standards were set in June of 2000 for grades 4, 6, and 8 in reading, English/language arts, and mathematics. In July of 2002 standards were set in grades 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7 in reading, English/language arts, mathematics as well as in science and social studies for grades 3 through 8. The state employed the Modified Angoff procedure for setting the academic achievement standards; Georgia educators served on the standard setting committees. Three performance levels were established: Does Not Meet Standard (e.g., basic), Meets Standard (e.g., proficient), and Exceeds Standard (e.g., advanced). In February of 2006, new achievement standards were established, using the Modified Angoff procedure, for those grades and content areas that transitioned to the state's new curriculum, the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS). New achievement standards were set for the CRCT in reading, grades 1 through 8, English/language arts, grades 1 through 8, Mathematics, grade 6, and Science, grades 6 and 7. Georgia educators served on the standard setting committees.

GHSQT academic achievement standards were set after the first operational administration of each content area test. The Modified Angoff method was employed and Georgia educators served on the standard setting committees. Beginning in the spring of 2004, additional items were added to the English/language arts and math tests in order to increase the alignment and rigor for state, system, and school accountability purposes (i.e., Adequate Yearly Progress). Two additional standards/performance levels of student performance, proficient and advanced, were identified by teams of Georgia educators in a standard setting exercise. For this standard setting the Bookmark procedure was employed. The standards of proficient and advanced are used for state, system and school accountability (i.e., AYP).

Georgia has defined students with most the significant cognitive disabilities as students with disabilities who are IDEA eligible, whose cognitive disabilities prevent them from attaining grade level achievement standards even when the very best instruction has been provided, and who are unable to participate in the general state assessments even with appropriate accommodations. Currently, less than 1% of students with disabilities participate in the current GAA.

During the 2005-2006 school year, the State worked with committees of Georgia educators to redevelop the GAA. The new GAA, a portfolio assessment measuring student process on alternate achievement standards aligned to the state academic curriculum, was piloted in 42 school systems across the state. Implementation of the redeveloped GAA is occurring during the 2006-2007 school year, replacing the GAA administered in the 2005-2006 school year. New academic achievement standards will be established for the new GAA in Spring 2007.

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

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

**1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration****1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	1060985	94.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1473	91.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	30166	94.50
Black, non-Hispanic	400645	94.10
Hispanic	94682	92.70
White, non-Hispanic	506337	95.40
Students with Disabilities	138799	94.40
Limited English Proficient	54894	92.50
Economically Disadvantaged	524824	95.30
Migrant	3842	90.00
Male	540807	94.20
Female	520178	95.00

**Comments:** Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 27,682 and percentage of total Multi-racial population is 93.4.

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	1057863	98.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1469	95.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	29690	97.90
Black, non-Hispanic	400566	98.50
Hispanic	92325	92.80
White, non-Hispanic	506150	95.40
Students with Disabilities	138814	97.80
Limited English Proficient	51672	88.90
Economically Disadvantaged	523081	98.20
Migrant	3706	88.20
Male	539194	98.20
Female	518669	99.50

**Comments:** Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 27,656 and percentage of total Multi-racial population is 96.0.

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

## 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

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

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

### 1.2.2

#### 1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	128572	86.90
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	10529	7.10

**Comments:**

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	128397	86.80
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	10529	7.10

**Comments:**

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

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

**1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	121290	91.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	160	91.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	3495	97.30
Black, non-Hispanic	45013	86.80
Hispanic	12119	87.20
White, non-Hispanic	56864	95.40
Students with Disabilities	17214	78.10
Limited English Proficient	7676	82.00
Economically Disadvantaged	63131	87.40
Migrant	495	84.60
Male	62166	90.50
Female	59124	92.30

**Comments:** The number reported has been verified and is correct.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 3614 with 93% scoring proficient.

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	120893	82.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	159	86.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	3421	92.30
Black, non-Hispanic	45019	74.70
Hispanic	11814	74.20
White, non-Hispanic	56842	90.20
Students with Disabilities	17208	68.60
Limited English Proficient	7248	65.70
Economically Disadvantaged	62904	75.10
Migrant	477	71.40
Male	61951	80.10
Female	58942	85.70

**Comments:** The number reported has been verified and is correct.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 3611 with 85.6% scoring proficient.

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

**1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	118919	79.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	166	87.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	3496	93.40
Black, non-Hispanic	44101	69.80
Hispanic	11438	73.20
White, non-Hispanic	56456	87.40
Students with Disabilities	17048	54.50
Limited English Proficient	6083	61.40
Economically Disadvantaged	61462	70.80
Migrant	460	64.10
Male	61113	77.90
Female	57806	81.30

**Comments:** Numbers have been verified and are correct.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 3242 with 82% scoring proficient.

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	118510	81.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	166	91.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	3417	90.40
Black, non-Hispanic	44090	70.50
Hispanic	11141	71.40
White, non-Hispanic	56437	90.20
Students with Disabilities	17058	63.10
Limited English Proficient	5653	56.40
Economically Disadvantaged	61251	71.80
Migrant	443	59.40
Male	60903	78.60
Female	57607	83.50

**Comments:** Numbers have been verified and are correct.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 3239 with 82% scoring proficient.

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



**1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	120191	88.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	139	89.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	3414	96.80
Black, non-Hispanic	45687	83.50
Hispanic	10818	82.80
White, non-Hispanic	57007	93.20
Students with Disabilities	16459	64.60
Limited English Proficient	5351	72.70
Economically Disadvantaged	61675	83.50
Migrant	434	73.90
Male	61398	87.20
Female	58793	90.20

**Comments:** Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 3100 with 91.3% scoring proficient.

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	119796	81.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	139	86.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	3355	90.30
Black, non-Hispanic	45679	72.20
Hispanic	10512	71.20
White, non-Hispanic	56985	89.60
Students with Disabilities	16463	61.70
Limited English Proficient	4949	53.80
Economically Disadvantaged	61452	72.60
Migrant	421	97.10
Male	61197	79.30
Female	58599	83.30

**Comments:** Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 3100 with 85.4% scoring proficient.

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

**1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	120935	62.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	179	67.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	3348	87.00
Black, non-Hispanic	47522	48.00
Hispanic	10244	53.70
White, non-Hispanic	56712	73.80
Students with Disabilities	15825	32.30
Limited English Proficient	4546	39.90
Economically Disadvantaged	61415	48.70
Migrant	417	45.00
Male	62453	59.50
Female	58482	65.00

**Comments:** Numbers have been verified and are correct.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 414 with 45.1% scoring proficient.

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	120658	86.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	179	92.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	3292	92.80
Black, non-Hispanic	47553	80.30
Hispanic	10012	78.00
White, non-Hispanic	56697	92.60
Students with Disabilities	15830	67.50
Limited English Proficient	4217	61.10
Economically Disadvantaged	61268	80.20
Migrant	403	71.10
Male	62320	83.10
Female	58338	90.20

**Comments:** Numbers have been verified and are correct.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 400 with 71% scoring proficient.

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

**1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	123409	81.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	158	84.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3262	94.60
Black, non-Hispanic	49214	72.10
Hispanic	9934	73.50
White, non-Hispanic	58183	88.90
Students with Disabilities	15689	50.50
Limited English Proficient	4507	56.30
Economically Disadvantaged	62039	72.70
Migrant	416	61.00
Male	63142	78.80
Female	60267	83.30

**Comments:** The numbers have been verified and are correct.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 412 with 61.1% scoring proficient.

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	123093	80.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	159	84.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	3220	89.80
Black, non-Hispanic	49256	71.90
Hispanic	9616	70.40
White, non-Hispanic	58183	88.50
Students with Disabilities	15710	54.30
Limited English Proficient	4102	47.50
Economically Disadvantaged	61878	71.40
Migrant	394	56.00
Male	62992	76.60
Female	60101	84.40

**Comments:** The numbers have been verified and are correct.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 390 with 55% scoring proficient.

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

**1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	121911	77.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	83.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	3279	93.20
Black, non-Hispanic	48143	66.90
Hispanic	9168	68.10
White, non-Hispanic	58693	86.80
Students with Disabilities	15285	44.80
Limited English Proficient	3969	50.70
Economically Disadvantaged	58651	67.50
Migrant	369	56.00
Male	61820	75.90
Female	60091	79.50

**Comments:** The numbers have been verified and are correct.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 364 with 56.2% scoring proficient.

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	121694	89.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	92.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3240	93.20
Black, non-Hispanic	48169	84.80
Hispanic	8962	79.10
White, non-Hispanic	58694	94.80
Students with Disabilities	15311	67.90
Limited English Proficient	3683	57.80
Economically Disadvantaged	58519	83.80
Migrant	345	66.00
Male	61704	87.30
Female	59990	92.00

**Comments:** The numbers have been verified and are correct.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 344 with 66.8% scoring proficient.

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

**1.3.13 High School - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	87510	92.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	95.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2910	97.60
Black, non-Hispanic	31983	86.10
Hispanic	4084	89.10
White, non-Hispanic	47023	96.30
Students with Disabilities	7966	61.90
Limited English Proficient	1789	78.90
Economically Disadvantaged	30047	86.20
Migrant	102	85.00
Male	41798	92.10
Female	45712	92.40

**Comments:** The numbers have been verified and are correct.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 1373 with 94.7% scoring proficient.

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

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

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	87452	95.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	95.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2904	96.20
Black, non-Hispanic	31970	93.10
Hispanic	4058	89.80
White, non-Hispanic	47014	97.90
Students with Disabilities	7957	76.20
Limited English Proficient	1749	74.00
Economically Disadvantaged	30010	92.20
Migrant	101	83.00
Male	41763	94.70
Female	45689	96.60

**Comments:** The numbers have been entered correctly.

Multi- Racial category - Total tested is 1369 with 97.4% scoring proficient.

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

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

**1.4.1** For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	2071	1642	79.00

**Comments:**

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	184	65	35.00

**Comments:**

**1.4.2** For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1196	949	79.00

**Comments:**

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	184	65	35.00

**Comments:**

### **1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

**1.4.3.1** Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

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

Since July 2003, the GaDOE Division of School Improvement (SI) has designed and

implemented a sustained statewide system of support for school improvement.

#### Goals

Â· Provide local education agencies (LEAs) and schools with tools and resources that provide intensive support for schools not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) that are classified as being in "needs improvement," "corrective action," and "restructuring."

Â· Preparing intensive services to schools that could be classified as "contract monitored" or "contract managed," in accordance with Georgia's Single Statewide Accountability System

(SSAS). To this end, SI provides the following services, tools, and resources.

Â· SI works with Georgia's 16 RESAs and other partners to support LEAs and schools not making AYP.

Â· Five Regional Support Teams, SI staff, Title I and Curriculum and Instruction staff, RESA School Improvement Specialists, Professional Standards Commission Title IIA Regional Staff, Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS) Regional Representatives, Education Technology Training Center (ETTC) Regional Representatives, and College and University Representatives, have been formed to provide regional support, school improvement services, and school improvement process training across the state.

Â· SI prioritizes statewide support by analyzing school performance and reform efforts.

Â· Schools in NI Years 1-7 receive support from the GaDOE. Schools in priority NI status receive the support of a distinguished K-12 educator who serves as a GaDOE Leadership Facilitator (on-site coach).

Â· SI and RESAs have identified Regional Support Team members and distinguished K-12 educators to serve all schools having made AYP only one year and who need targeted assistance to make AYP another year to be removed from Needs Improvement status.

Â· During the 2005-2006 school year, a total of \$18,291,456 in Title I School Improvement Funds supported school improvement initiatives and activities for Title I schools identified as being in the various levels of needs improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Â· SI offers assistance to LEAs and schools in Georgia using the following Continuum of Services.

Â· Analysis & Planning. Provides tools for collecting and analyzing qualitative and quantitative data, guidance for analyzing causes and establishing improvement priorities, as well as a model for action planning and matching needs to resources.

Â· Collaborative Implementation: Provides an online resource guide of research-based programs and strategies, serves as a broker of programs and interventions to facilitate goal attainment, and provides technical assistance with implementation.

Â· Professional Learning: Coordinates programs to build LEA/school capacity, brokers services to facilitate training and development, and guides implementation of national professional development standards.

Â· Quality Assurance: Disaggregates and analyzes school and student outcomes and

status, analyzes policies, reports impact on student achievement, provides guidelines for program evaluation, and recommends action.



Â· Leader Quality: Provides focused leadership training and development to support the Georgia Performance Standards implementation, provides guidance and ongoing training and support for GaDOE Leadership Facilitators, and coordinates the systematic use of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Leadership Modules targeting standards-based education and research-based school improvement priorities. Secondary Redesign: Serves to raise student achievement and increase graduation rates by facilitating the implementation of research-based best practices in middle schools and high schools.

The SI Division utilizes web and print media to publish high quality tools and resources that include the following. Complete information and documentation regarding Georgia's comprehensive system of school improvement services and support, as well as copies of these and other tools and resources, may be found on the School Improvement Webpage and associated links. ([http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/tss\\_school.aspx](http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/tss_school.aspx)).

---

**1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.**

**1.4.4.1** Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

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

Because school districts' Needs Improvement status ultimately hinges on the status of the schools within the school district, all of the school improvement resources, services, and structures identified in 1.4.3.2 that are directed to and are available to schools provide assistance to school districts as well. Additionally, for the 11 school districts in Georgia that have been identified for improvement (none have been identified for corrective action), district-level services are provided by the five School Improvement Regional Support Teams. These services revolve around the contents of the System Improvement Fieldbook and the Data Utilization Guide and include assistance and resources in district-level school improvement planning, data utilization, and plan implementation. Services also include capacity building in school districts to enable the school districts to provide services to Needs Improvement schools within the district.

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

<b>1.4.5.1 Public School Choice</b>	
	<b>Number</b>
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	129
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	123
How many of these schools were charter schools?	3
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	4902
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	135214
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	6869
<b>Comments:</b>	

<b>1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services</b>	
	<b>Number</b>
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	154
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	9670
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	93308
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	13091
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY**

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

<b>School Type</b>	<b>Total Number of Core Academic Classes</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>
<b>All Schools in State</b>	260956	246578	94.80
<b>Elementary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	13862	13051	94.10
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	31668	30481	96.30
<b>All Elementary Schools</b>	77507	74632	96.30
<b>Secondary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	24618	21065	85.60
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	87169	80317	95.20
<b>All Secondary Schools</b>	183449	171946	93.70
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Definitions and Instructions**

*What are the core academic subjects?*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

<b>Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	25.00
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	1.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	74.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
<b>SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	36.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	2.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	62.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
<b>Elementary Schools</b>	75.00	36.80
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program.	
<b>Secondary Schools</b>	74.90	36.50
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program.	

**Comments:**

### **Definitions and Instructions**

*How are the poverty quartiles determined?*

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

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

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

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

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

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	95.00

**Comments:**

**1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**

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

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

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

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

Beginning in February 2004 up until October of 2005, Georgia was a member of the English Language Development Assessment consortium led by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). During this period, Georgia researched the TESOL standards as well as those developed by the ELDA states, Florida, California, Texas and New York. During this process, Georgia began developing its own English language proficiency standards aligned with its state standards for reading/language arts.

In November 2005, the Ga DOE left the ELDA consortium to join the World Class Instructional Design Assessment (WIDA) consortium. This decision was prompted by the fact that the ELDA development schedule was experiencing delays. Developers were unable to assure release of the K-1 test in time for administration in January 2006 with results K-12 available in May prior to the close of school in Georgia. Accordingly, Georgia formally adopted the WIDA proficiency assessment, known as ACCESS for ELLs. The assessment was complete and had already been fully field-tested the year prior. As members of the WIDA consortium, Georgia adopted the English language proficiency (ELP) standards developed by WIDA under the direction of Dr. Margo Gottlieb and the Center for Applied Linguistics. The standards are derived from the four language domains of speaking, listening, reading and writing. The standards can be found at:

[http://www.wida.us/Resources/standards\\_organization](http://www.wida.us/Resources/standards_organization)

In partnership with WIDA, the DOE facilitated turnkey training for Title III program coordinators on how to implement the standards in their districts. Follow-up training was provided for teachers statewide in August and September 2006.

The WIDA standards are aligned with the state curriculum, known as the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS). All ELLs are taught the GPS with accommodations as needed.

**1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards**

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

Phase I: As a new member of the WIDA consortium in November 2005, Georgia was required to have an alignment study. The study was completed by the University of Illinois on February 22, 2006. It aligned the English language proficiency standards developed by Dr. Margo Gottlieb and the Center for Applied Linguistics with Georgia's academic achievement standards in English/language arts/reading and mathematics as well as social studies and science. The standards were submitted to the Office of English Language Acquisition as part of Georgia's Title III program review.

Phase II: The WIDA Consortium has contracted with Dr. Gary Cook from the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER) to conduct an independent alignment study of the alignment between the WIDA ELP Standards (adopted by Georgia) and the ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment, Georgia's measure of English proficiency growth. The alignment will be conducted by teachers from Georgia and the 14 other WIDA Consortium states in Madison, Wisconsin, December 4-5, 2006. Dr. Norman Webb's alignment procedures will be used and teachers will enter their findings in the Webb Alignment Tool, a federally funded online alignment framework that identifies match, depth of knowledge, and balance between the standards and the assessment. Webb's system is one of four federally recognized methodologies for conducting alignments. The report should be available by March 1, 2007 and will be shared with all WIDA member states and the US Department of Education.

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

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

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

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

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

**STATE RESPONSE****ENTRY**

Students are required, upon entry into a school in Georgia, to be administered a Home Language Survey or an equivalent to determine if a language other than English is their native language, home language, or first language. All students whose native language, home language, or first language is other than English shall be assessed for English language proficiency using the state adopted English proficiency measure, the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) and the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) or WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT) for service eligibility.

INITIAL ELIGIBILITY for language assistance services is determined by student's score on the state-adopted language proficiency measure. Eligibility decisions of new students are based on LAB tests administered by any school system in Georgia. The LAB has been used the past twelve months and will continue until spring 2007, whereupon the W-APT will become the screening tool. Students tested with the LAB who have an English language proficiency score below proficient, 25th percentile, on the State-adopted proficiency measure shall receive the status of English Language Learners (ELL) and shall be eligible for language assistance services. Students tested with the LAB who have an English language proficiency score at or above proficient on the state-adopted English proficiency measure and above the 40th percentile in reading shall be considered English proficient and shall not be eligible for language assistance. All data related to student legibility is maintained in the student's permanent file.

**CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY AND EXIT**

All ELLs shall be assessed annually on the state-adopted English proficiency measure ACCESS to determine English language proficiency. In 2005-2006, Georgia administered the ACCESS to students in grades K-12 for the first time to measure English proficiency. The ACCESS measures listening, reading, speaking and writing. Students scoring at level 4 and below for their grade are entitled to ESOL services without further assessment. All ELL students are administered the ACCESS every winter to re-establish eligibility or determine readiness to exit, and to measure progress. Students who have an English language proficiency score below proficient, Level 4 and below, as determined on the state-adopted proficiency measure shall continue to be eligible for Language assistance services. Students who score at the proficient level, Level 5 and above, on both the state-adopted English proficiency measure and on the state reading assessment shall be considered English proficient are eligible to exit the program of services. Students who score at the proficient level on either the state-adopted English proficiency measure or the state reading assessment but not both, shall have their continued eligibility for language assistance determined through a Language Assessment Conference (LAC). These scores must be kept on file to document eligibility and accountability.

Non-English language background students who score at or above the 25th percentile on the LAB will be assessed by a norm-referenced achievement test in reading/reading comprehension to determine if they have the cognitive-academic language proficiency in English for classroom success. To maintain consistency across all Georgia school systems, GA DOE recommends that local systems use the reading/reading comprehension tests currently used to

meet state assessment requirements. The score from the norm-referenced test places the student into one of three categories:

â€¢ | Students ready to be exited.

â€¢ | Students still in need of services.

â€¢ | Students who are borderline and whose educational placement need to be considered through a Language Assessment Conference (LAC).

In 2005 Georgia joined the WIDA Consortia to ensure that the state could assess all eligible ELLs and receive results prior to the end of the school year.

### 1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

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

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

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data													
2005-2006 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State													
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP (3)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency									
				Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (4)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (5)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (7)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5 (8)	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Access for ELLs	56465	56465	100.00	15707	28.00	14382	25.00	17769	31.00	6795	12.00	1812	3.00
<b>Comments:</b>													

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



<b>1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State</b>		
<b>2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs</b>		
<b>Language</b>	<b>Number of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>	<b>Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>
1. Spanish	44998	81.00
2. Korean	1520	3.00
3. Other African	1361	2.00
4. Vietnamese	1359	2.00
5. Other European	774	1.00
6. Portuguese	755	1.00
7. Other Asian	690	1.00
8. Chinese	682	1.00
9. French	482	1.00
10. Russian/Other Indian	417	1.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

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



**1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data**

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

**Definitions:**

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

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

<b># Immigrants enrolled in the State</b>	<b># Immigrants served by Title III</b>	<b># Immigrant subgrants</b>
33168	33168	74

**Comments:**

**STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)**

Georgia experienced a decline in the number of immigrant students, totaling 6,746 students, this year, quite possibly due to legislative changes specifically written for immigrants. We also increased in the number of subgrants from 19 to 74 last year due to relocation of our immigrant population to areas with increased opportunities for work.

**1.6.5 Definition of Proficient**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

In 2005-2006, Georgia used the ACCESS for ELLs English Language Proficiency Test to assess English proficiency. All K-12 students who are non-English speakers are administered the appropriate grade level and tier of the ACCESS for ELLs English Language Proficiency Test. The grade levels are K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12. Each grade level test is available in three tiers, A, B and C. Tier A is for students new to the country with little or no English proficiency. Tier B is for students who are progressing with their English proficiency, but need additional time and support. Tier C is for students who demonstrate proficiency both in social and academic language and who need little or no language support. Students must take Tier C in order to be eligible for exiting ESOL services.

Students are tested on the ACCESS for ELLs in the domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Results are reported for each domain with an additional composite score which attributes more weight to reading and writing than to listening and speaking.

Students in grades 1 through 12 should be ready to exit language support services when they score at level 5 on Tier C of the ACCESS for ELLs and score at the proficient level on the state assessments of reading/reading comprehension; or on grade level for approved local assessments of reading/reading comprehension. These students should have the skills necessary to perform in the regular classroom.

Kindergarten students may be ready to exit language support services when they receive the maximum composite score of 3.4 on the ACCESS for ELLs. In using the composite score as a criterion for making programmatic decisions for kindergarteners, educators are advised to review their students' results in context, paying particular attention to the Oral Language Score (listening and speaking) as well as other criteria used locally.

**1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

The 2005-2006 school year marked a transition for Georgia in assessing English language learner progress. It was the first time Georgia administered ACCESS for ELLs, its new test for English language proficiency. In prior years, Georgia administered the Language Assessment Battery (LAB). Although both tests measure student performance in the areas of listening, speaking, reading and writing, the two tests are quite different. The LAB was designed as a placement test and is not sensitive to small learning gains. For purposes of analysis, results are interpreted at three levels, Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced. The ACCESS is a proficiency test designed to show language acquisition over five instructional levels: Entering, Beginning, Developing, Expanding, and Bridging.

With Georgia joining the WIDA Consortium in 2005-2006 and adopting the ACCESS for ELLs English Language Proficiency Test, the definition of making progress has changed and is now aligned with the definition of progress as outlined in the WIDA framework. This framework recognizes the continuum of language development within four domains with five proficiency levels.

Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Level 4 Level 5

Entering Beginning Developing Expanding Bridging

These levels describe the spectrum of an ELLs progression from minimal English language knowledge to acquiring the English skills necessary to be successful in an English-only mainstream classroom without further language support services. The language proficiency levels outline expected performance and describe what English language learners can do within each domain of the standards. Progress is measured as students transition from one level to the next.

To determine how student progressed in this transition year, Georgia conducted a comparability study between the LAB results of 2004-2005 and the ACCESS results of 2005-2006 using matched pairs. That is, only those students who took ACCESS and had LAB scores for 2004-2005 were reviewed.

The following process was used for equipercentile equating:

- \* matched 04-05 LAB file to 05-06 ACCESS file
- \* deleted missing cases and null (total) score values
- \* summed LAB raw scores across domains to create a total score/used ACCESS composite score
- \* separated file into the following grade clusters: 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12, using ACCESS (2006) grades
- \* created cumulative frequency distributions (CFDs) for LAB total score and ACCESS composite
- \* located LAB score at the cumulate percent (percentile) that was closest to the percentile of the cutscore (minimum scale threshold) on each of performance levels 2-6 of the ACCESS test

The results of the LAB/ ACCESS equipercentile equating are below:

LAB Cutscores that Correspond to ACCESS Performance Levels

Performance Level

Grade Cluster 2 3 4 5 6

K-2 4 24 44 54 73

3-5 26 55 94 105 110

6-8 36 73 106 121 129

9-12 60 95 119 126 133

---

**1.6.7 Definition of Cohort**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

**STATE RESPONSE**

The State has changed the grade spans used to define cohort for making progress and for attaining proficiency since the last Consolidated State Performance Report. The change was needed in order to align results with the grade spans used in the State's new language proficiency assessment, known as ACCESS for ELLs, and to more appropriately target the subgroup expected to attain proficiency,

In analyzing ELL progress toward acquiring English, the State is using the following grade spans:

K

1-2

3-5

6-8

9-12

In analyzing attainment of proficiency, the State is using ELL results on the ACCESS at levels 3 through 5 starting with grade 1.

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

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

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

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 45.00	# 25490	% 62.00	# 40758	% 24.00	# 13551	% 21.00	# 8607

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



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

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

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

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

#### TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

#### Definitions:

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

<b>1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants</b>			
	<b>2005-2006</b>		
	<b>AMAO TARGET</b>	<b>ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS</b>	
	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>MAKING PROGRESS</b>	45.00	32151	60.00
<b>DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS</b>		15707	
<b>ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>	24.00	8607	21.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		56465	

**Explanation of data for Table**

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

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

\* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

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

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

Provide the count for each year.

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

**Title III Subgrantee Information**

	<b>2005-2006</b>
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	83
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>making progress</b>	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>attaining</b> English proficiency	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>AYP</b>	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet <b>any</b> AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the <b>State</b> meet <b>all</b> three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No Response</u>

**Comments:** We do not collect the test data on the basis of whether or not a subgrantee receives Title III funding.

\* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

**1.6.11** On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	2304	84.00
4	1265	78.00
5	1137	80.00
6	1075	83.00
7	927	77.00
8	841	83.00
H.S.	367	92.00

**Comments:**

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	2585	95.00
4	1342	82.00
5	1271	90.00
6	775	60.00
7	986	81.00
8	766	75.00
H.S.	364	90.00

**Comments:**

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

**Comments:**

**1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES**

**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

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

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

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

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

<b>1.8.1 Graduation Rates</b>	
<b>High School Graduates</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>2004-2005 School Year</b>
All Students	69.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	72.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	80.40
Black, non-Hispanic	61.90
Hispanic	55.30
White, non-Hispanic	75.00
Students with Disabilities	29.40
Limited English Proficient	37.70
Economically Disadvantaged	60.10
Migrant	47.40
Male	65.70
Female	73.10
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-racial - 73.8	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rate

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

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

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	5.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.40
Black, non-Hispanic	5.40
Hispanic	7.20
White, non-Hispanic	4.70
Students with Disabilities	5.90
Limited English Proficient	7.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5.40
Migrant	7.00
Male	6.00
Female	4.10
<b>Comments:</b> Multi-racial is 4.8	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

### 1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

#### 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

**1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").**

##### STATE RESPONSE

180 instructional days for students

Georgia State Board of Education Rules

Code: AE

160-5-1-.01 SCHOOL YEAR.

(1) DEFINITIONS.

(a) School fiscal year - the period from July 1 through the following June 30.

(b) School year for certified staff - a minimum of 190 days.

(c) School year for students - a minimum of 180 school days as defined in Rule

160-5-1-.02 School Day for Students.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.

(a) The local board of education shall adhere to the definitions of school fiscal year, school year for certified staff, and school year for students except under emergency conditions as defined in state law.

(b) Each school system shall submit an annual school calendar to the department.

The calendar shall specify:

1. Beginning and ending dates of the school year.
2. 180 full-length days for students.
3. 190 full-length days for certified staff, including 10 for planning.
4. Holidays as determined by the school system.

(i) Local boards of education may provide for the closure of schools on November 11 of each year to enable students, teachers, and administrators to participate in Veterans Day programs to honor veterans of the armed forces.



(c) If changes are made in the school system calendar, an amended calendar shall be submitted to the department.

(d) High school graduation exercises shall be held after the completion of the 180-day school year unless the school year has been shortened because of emergency conditions as defined in state law. Any exceptions shall require advance approval by the state school superintendent.

160-5-1-.01 (Continued)

(e) School systems not operating the approved number of student days shall receive a prorated reduction of state funds.

Authority O.C.G.A. Â§ 20-2-168(c).

Adopted: September 14, 2000 Effective: October 5, 2000

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

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	144	144
LEAs with Subgrants	36	36

**Comments:**

**1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	928	2451
1	928	2423
2	852	2312
3	773	2282
4	752	2258
5	544	2132
6	613	2019
7	603	1971
8	586	1902
9	567	2049
10	586	1416
11	552	1149
12	256	966

**Comments:**

**1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth**

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>without</b> subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>with</b> subgrants
Shelters	1630	17324
Doubled-up	5555	15670
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	30	45
Hotels/Motels	1700	8566
Unknown		

**Comments:** The total above does not match #2 because the count includes the primary night time residences of all children identified in the LEA as well as those enrolled in the LEA.

Douglas County numbers for "Doubled-up" were excluded because they were incorrectly collected and reported. We are currently verifying their numbers.

\* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

**1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**

**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	2451
1	2423
2	2312
3	2282
4	2258
5	2132
6	2019
7	1971
8	1902
9	2049
10	1416
11	1149
12	966

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children**

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

**Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006**

1079

**Comments:**

<p><b>1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths</b></p> <p>Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.</p> <p><b>Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006</b></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Data not available for 2005-2006</p>
--

<p><b>1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served</b></p> <p>Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.</p> <p><b>Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)</b></p> <p>1044</p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p>
---

<p><b>1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services</b></p> <p>Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Educational and school related activities and services</b></th> <th><b>Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Special Education (IDEA)</td> <td>203</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Language Learners (ELL)</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gifted and Talented</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vocational Education</td> <td>33</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Comments:</b></p>	<b>Educational and school related activities and services</b>	<b>Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services</b>	Special Education (IDEA)	203	English Language Learners (ELL)	100	Gifted and Talented	23	Vocational Education	33
<b>Educational and school related activities and services</b>	<b>Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services</b>									
Special Education (IDEA)	203									
English Language Learners (ELL)	100									
Gifted and Talented	23									
Vocational Education	33									

**1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services**

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

<b>Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program</b>	<b>Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	5101
Expedited evaluations	1787
Staff professional development and awareness	339
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	2044
Transportation	5149
Early childhood programs	665
Assistance with participation in school programs	361
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	4048
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	5149
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	4118
Coordination between schools and agencies	
Counseling	12985
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6306
Clothing to meet a school requirement	952
School supplies	12455
Referral to other programs and services	69
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3434
Other (optional)	

**Comments:**

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

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

<b>Barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	132
School selection	0
Transportation	97
School records	329
Immunizations or other medical records	319
Other enrollment issues	351

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)**

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

<b>List other barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Clothing	953
Staff Developmenet	339

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

**Reading Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	106	72
Grade 4	Yes	113	73
Grade 5	Yes	119	85
Grade 6	Yes	63	41
Grade 7	Yes	49	36
Grade 8	Yes	54	39
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	N/A	0	0
Grade 11	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

**Comments:** Georgia requires all students to participate in its statewide testing. The 2005-2006 data reported is based on the first time collection of data on homeless students through Georgia's student information system. The Georgia Department of Education has enhanced its data collection efforts for the 2006-2007 school year and has conducted several technical assistance workshops on data collection and quality as provided in the U.S. Department of Education guidance on data quality. NOTE: Some numbers were fractions because some students have Participation/ Proficiency only in Reading and not in English Language Arts or vice versa. They have been rounded up.

**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	108	90
Grade 4	Yes	113	74
Grade 5	Yes	120	95
Grade 6	Yes	63	15
Grade 7	Yes	49	34
Grade 8	Yes	53	27
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	N/A	0	0
Grade 11	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

**Comments:** Georgia requires all students to participate in its statewide testing. The 2005-2006 data reported is based on the first time collection of data on homeless students through Georgia's student information system. The Georgia Department of Education has enhanced its data collection efforts for the 2006-2007 school year and has conducted several technical assistance workshops on data collection and quality as provided in the U.S. Department of Education guidance on data quality. NOTE: Some numbers were fractions because some students have Participation/ Proficiency only in Reading and not in English Language Arts or vice versa. They have been rounded up.

\* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.

---