

**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 – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs.*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities.*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program.*

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:
Illinois State Board of Education

Address:
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777-0001

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Connie Wise
Telephone: 217-782-3950
Fax: 217-524-7784
e-mail: cwise@isbe.net

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Christopher A. Koch

Signature _____ Thursday, March 01, 2007, 4:57:51 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

The Illinois Learning Standards were adopted by the Illinois State Board of Education in 1997, and no changes have been made to the standards since their initial adoption. The Illinois Learning Standards define what students in all Illinois public elementary and secondary schools are expected to know and be able to demonstrate in the following content areas: English language arts (reading, writing, speaking, and listening), mathematics, science, social science, physical development and health, fine arts, and foreign languages. In addition to the Illinois Learning Standards, the Illinois State Board of Education convened a working group of content-specific experts in each respective area to develop the Illinois Performance Descriptors. The Illinois Performance Descriptors were disseminated in 2002 as grade-level resources to further clarify and support the rigor of the standards. State assessments are aligned with the academic content standards in language arts, mathematics, and science so that students are assessed on the content taught.

More information about the Illinois Learning Standards and the Illinois Performance Descriptors can be accessed from the Illinois State Board of Education Web site at: <http://www.isbe.net/ils/Default.htm>.

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

Illinois has five state tests currently approved by USDE and designed to meet the academic performance requirements of NCLB and state law. Each test has an advisory committee of educators with expertise in the various content areas to assist in test development and administration. Standard setting for Illinois tests use a form modified Angoff technique.

ISAT-The Illinois Standards Achievement Test measures individual student achievement relative to the Illinois Learning Standards; results reported to parents, teachers, and schools. The standards apply to all students taking ISAT (<http://www.isbe.net/ils/>). Grades 3-8-reading and mathematics; grades 4 and 7-science.

Challenge-Content Standards: Assessment frameworks demonstrating the cognitive complexity of assessment by grade-<http://www.isbe.net/assessment/IAFIndex.htm>.

Challenge-Achievement Standards: Through the frameworks, ISAT is a direct implementation of the standards. Student performance levels-academic warning, below standards, meets, and exceeds.

IMAGE-The Illinois Measure of Annual Growth in English measures the progress of LEP students in reading and mathematics in grades 3-8, and 11 through simplified language.

Challenge-Content Standards: Mathematics frameworks same (see above website).

Challenge-Achievement Standards: A committee of bilingual educators set ranges of IMAGE scores within which test takers have a particular likelihood of succeeding on ISAT.

PSAE-The Prairie State Achievement Examination measures individual student achievement relative to the standards; results reported to parents, teachers, and schools. The standards apply to all students taking the PSAE. Grade 11-addresses reading, mathematics, and science.

Challenge-Content Standards: The PSAE frameworks describe what students are supposed to know by grade 11, and illustrate that the standards are rigorous and encourage teaching advanced skills.

Challenge-Achievement Standards: Through the frameworks, PSAE is a direct implementation of the standards. Student performance levels-academic warning, below standards, meets, and exceeds.

Grade 2 Assessment-Measures individual student achievement relative to standards for students in Title I-funded schools that serve grade 2 as the highest grade; results reported to parents, teachers, and schools. The mathematics standards apply to all students taking this assessment.

Subjects: Reading and mathematics.

Challenge-Achievement Standards: Two performance levels-below standards and meets standards.

IAA-The Illinois Alternate Assessment measures the individual student achievement in reading, mathematics, and science of students in grades 3-8 and 11 with significant cognitive disabilities; results reported to parents, teachers, and schools.

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

The Illinois Learning Standards for English language arts, mathematics, science, social science, physical development and health, fine arts, and foreign languages were adopted in 1997.

The Illinois Learning Standards are located on the Illinois State Board of Education Web site at:

www.isbe.net/ils/ela/standards.htm (English language arts)

www.isbe.net/ils/math/standards.htm (mathematics)

www.isbe.net/ils/science/standards.htm (science)

www.isbe.net/ils/social_science.htm (social science)

www.isbe.net/pdh/standards.htm (physical development and health)

www.isbe.net/ils/fine_arts.htm (fine arts)

www.isbe.net/ils/foreign_languages/standards.htm (foreign language)

In 2005-2006, reading and mathematics were assessed at grades 3-8 and 11. Science was assessed at grades 4, 7, and 11. The Illinois Assessment Frameworks were developed to define what elements of the Illinois Learning Standards would be assessed at each grade. The Frameworks can be accessed at:

www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/iaf_math.pdf (grades 3-8) www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/iaf_math_PSAEFinal.pdf (grade 11)

www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/_science.pdf (grades 4 and 7)

www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/iaf_science_PSAEFinal.pdf (grade 11)

www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/iaf_reading.pdf. (grades 3-8)

(Reading Assessment Frameworks for grade 11 are currently under revision.)

Cut scores for each assessment were set between 1999 and 2001. The cut scores can be accessed at: www.isbe.net/assessment/htmls/ISAT_cut_points_05.htm. Performance Definitions of the four performance levels (Exceeds Standards, Meets Standards, Below Standards, Academic Warning) can be accessed at: www.isbe.net/assessment/htmls/per_def.htm.

The Illinois Alternate Assessment is a portfolio assessment given to students who have significant cognitive disabilities. The Alternate Assessment uses a portfolio format to measure the proficiency of students in grades 3-8 and grade 11 for reading and mathematics. In grades 4, 7, and 11, science is also assessed with this portfolio. The Alternate Performance Indicators for reading, mathematics, and science can be accessed at:

www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/API_reading_0506.pdf (reading)

www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/API_math_0506.pdf (mathematics)

www.isbe.net/pdfs/API_science_0506.pdf. In 2008 (science)

A new events-based assessment will be given in place of the portfolio in school year 2007-2008. The Alternate

Assessment Framework Priorities will be used in place of the Alternate Performance Indicators and can be accessed for reading, writing, mathematics, and science at: www.isbe.net/assessment/iaa.htm.

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**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	1096397	99.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	2469	99.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	41147	99.50
Black, non-Hispanic	218307	98.70
Hispanic	200637	99.30
White, non-Hispanic	609114	99.70
Students with Disabilities	158949	99.10
Limited English Proficient	67678	99.60
Economically Disadvantaged	457515	99.10
Migrant	390	98.10
Male	559971	99.50
Female	535903	99.60

Comments: Multiracial: 19546 tested; 99.6%

- 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

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	1096397	99.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	2469	99.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	41147	99.50
Black, non-Hispanic	218307	98.70
Hispanic	200637	99.30
White, non-Hispanic	609114	99.70
Students with Disabilities	158949	99.10
Limited English Proficient	67678	99.60
Economically Disadvantaged	457515	99.10
Migrant	390	98.10
Male	559971	99.50
Female	535903	99.60

Comments: Multiracial: 19546 tested; 99.6%

- 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	148688	99.10
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	10261	99.10
Comments: Illinois does not administer an alternate assessment aligned with grade-level achievement standards.		

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	148688	99.10
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	10261	99.10
Comments: Illinois does not administer an alternate assessment aligned with grade-level achievement standards.		

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

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	155119	83.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	311	86.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	6052	94.30
Black, non-Hispanic	31402	66.50
Hispanic	32036	74.70
White, non-Hispanic	81152	92.70
Students with Disabilities	22362	65.00
Limited English Proficient	18287	68.70
Economically Disadvantaged	71494	72.50
Migrant	80	79.50
Male	79427	83.00
Female	75605	83.90

Comments: Multiracial: 3630 tested; 83.9%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	155119	70.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	311	74.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	6052	86.20
Black, non-Hispanic	31402	48.50
Hispanic	32036	62.90
White, non-Hispanic	81152	80.30
Students with Disabilities	22362	41.50
Limited English Proficient	18287	65.70
Economically Disadvantaged	71494	56.20
Migrant	80	52.60
Male	79427	66.30
Female	75605	74.20

Comments: Multiracial: 3630 tested; 68.5%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	154700	82.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	350	88.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	5916	93.40
Black, non-Hispanic	30750	64.10
Hispanic	31451	75.60
White, non-Hispanic	82382	91.70
Students with Disabilities	23225	60.60
Limited English Proficient	14307	64.70
Economically Disadvantaged	69783	71.50
Migrant	71	75.70
Male	79187	82.10
Female	75439	83.60

Comments: Multiracial: 3427 tested; 84.9%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	154700	72.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	350	78.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	5916	87.70
Black, non-Hispanic	30750	50.10
Hispanic	31451	68.40
White, non-Hispanic	82382	81.70
Students with Disabilities	23225	41.70
Limited English Proficient	14307	70.00
Economically Disadvantaged	69783	59.60
Migrant	71	64.30
Male	79187	68.30
Female	75439	77.40

Comments: Multiracial: 3427 tested; 73.4%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	159248	76.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	381	81.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	5833	91.10
Black, non-Hispanic	32541	52.20
Hispanic	31312	68.00
White, non-Hispanic	85418	87.70
Students with Disabilities	23528	49.80
Limited English Proficient	11765	50.30
Economically Disadvantaged	71105	61.90
Migrant	67	65.20
Male	81812	76.10
Female	77367	76.70

Comments: Multiracial: 3223 tested; 78.4%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	159248	68.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	381	73.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	5833	85.60
Black, non-Hispanic	32541	42.40
Hispanic	31312	65.30
White, non-Hispanic	85418	79.10
Students with Disabilities	23528	34.00
Limited English Proficient	11765	72.00
Economically Disadvantaged	71105	54.20
Migrant	67	56.30
Male	81812	65.20
Female	77367	72.70

Comments: Multiracial: 3223 tested; 69.9%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	162678	78.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	369	82.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	5851	92.00
Black, non-Hispanic	35261	55.90
Hispanic	30746	70.60
White, non-Hispanic	86809	88.70
Students with Disabilities	23953	46.50
Limited English Proficient	7645	49.30
Economically Disadvantaged	72382	64.30
Migrant	42	59.50
Male	83772	76.50
Female	78854	79.50

Comments: Multiracial: 3023 tested; 80.2%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	162678	72.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	369	76.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	5851	87.60
Black, non-Hispanic	35261	54.30
Hispanic	30746	61.20
White, non-Hispanic	86809	82.90
Students with Disabilities	23953	35.30
Limited English Proficient	7645	52.70
Economically Disadvantaged	72382	58.20
Migrant	42	47.60
Male	83772	68.00
Female	78854	77.30

Comments: Multiracial: 3023 tested; 75.3%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	159961	75.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	410	78.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	5702	91.40
Black, non-Hispanic	33114	52.30
Hispanic	28899	66.80
White, non-Hispanic	88636	85.50
Students with Disabilities	23878	37.50
Limited English Proficient	6431	46.80
Economically Disadvantaged	67610	60.30
Migrant	54	55.60
Male	82160	73.70
Female	77733	76.70

Comments: Multiracial: 2526 tested; 75.0%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	159961	71.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	410	78.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	5702	87.20
Black, non-Hispanic	33114	52.70
Hispanic	28899	62.40
White, non-Hispanic	88636	80.70
Students with Disabilities	23878	32.10
Limited English Proficient	6431	50.10
Economically Disadvantaged	67610	57.20
Migrant	54	61.50
Male	82160	68.00
Female	77733	75.40

Comments: Multiracial: 2526 tested; 72.2%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	160808	77.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	375	81.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	5709	91.30
Black, non-Hispanic	32598	56.10
Hispanic	27719	68.80
White, non-Hispanic	91367	86.70
Students with Disabilities	24236	39.00
Limited English Proficient	5565	47.10
Economically Disadvantaged	64910	63.00
Migrant	44	68.20
Male	82385	75.90
Female	78365	78.80

Comments: Multiracial: 2373 tested; 78.4%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	160808	78.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	375	81.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	5709	89.60
Black, non-Hispanic	32598	63.50
Hispanic	27719	69.30
White, non-Hispanic	91367	86.10
Students with Disabilities	24236	39.50
Limited English Proficient	5565	51.70
Economically Disadvantaged	64910	66.20
Migrant	44	55.80
Male	82385	75.50
Female	78365	81.80

Comments: Multiracial: 2373 tested; 80.0%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	135631	53.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	253	49.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	5868	74.90
Black, non-Hispanic	21504	21.30
Hispanic	17732	31.90
White, non-Hispanic	87504	63.50
Students with Disabilities	16593	17.50
Limited English Proficient	3509	26.30
Economically Disadvantaged	37192	27.80
Migrant	31	22.60
Male	67075	55.50
Female	68442	50.80

Comments: Multiracial: 1054 tested; 48.9%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	13561	58.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	253	52.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	5868	72.30
Black, non-Hispanic	21504	33.80
Hispanic	17732	39.70
White, non-Hispanic	87504	67.10
Students with Disabilities	16593	22.10
Limited English Proficient	3509	47.90
Economically Disadvantaged	37192	36.40
Migrant	31	32.30
Male	67075	55.90
Female	68442	61.00

Comments: Multiracial: 1054 tested; 58.3%

NOTE: The number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, the Percentage of Students Proficient or Advanced column indicates the percentage of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

- 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	3890	3078	81.70

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	872	669	76.70

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	2355	1730	77.20

Comments: PLEASE NOTE: Of the 2355 schools designated as Title I in Illinois for school year 2005-2006, there was no possibility for 113 of the schools to make AYP because they did not have tested grades. The data included here are calculated based on the 2242 Title I schools that did have tested grades in school year 2005-2006, and therefore did have the possibility of making AYP.

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	780	591	75.80

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.

Illinois and federal laws require that the Illinois State Board of Education provide technical assistance to schools and districts that are determined to be in academic early warning status (AEWS) and academic watch status (AWS). Beginning in 2003, to help schools and districts improve their academic performance, especially in reading and mathematics, the Illinois State Board of Education established a regional system of support. Each regional service provider (RESPRO) offers its services to the schools and districts in its

region that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP), especially those in AEWS and AWS.

Regarding federal sanctions, RESPRO priorities are to provide support and assistance to districts with schools subject to 1) restructuring and corrective action (AWS) and 2) school improvement (AEWS). As resources allow, RESPROs also serve Title I schools whose academic performance is marginal.

The RESPRO system of support includes specific activities that:

*focus on the school improvement plan (SIP) and district improvement plan (DIP);

*target proven approaches and standardized processes to specific improvement components;

*customize services to differences among regions, districts, and schools;

*coordinate programs, services, and funding;

*deploy state, regional, and local staff and resources efficiently and effectively; and

*use AYP, defined by state and federal laws, as the "bottom line" measure of effectiveness in helping schools and districts.

Proven approaches and standardized processes for specific improvement components--

The RESPRO system of support emphasizes school improvement programs and processes that have a record of success. RESPROs select those that are most likely to improve the academic achievement of students when tailored to the districts and schools they serve.

Broadly, RESPROs provide districts and schools in their regions with programs and processes representing best practices in four improvement components:

1. Data analysis and SIP/DIP development.
2. Standards-aligned curriculum, instruction, and classroom assessment.
3. Teacher and administrator enhancement.
4. Student, family, and community support services.

Customization for regional and local differences among schools and districts--

The RESPRO system of support is not a "one-size-fits-all" service approach for academically poor performing schools or districts. Rather, in addition to standard offerings or best practices, RESPROs offer interventions based on a data analysis and review of currently successful practices in each school or district. The analysis seeks to determine which, if any, of the four improvement components in a district or school are adequate and at what level of effectiveness.

For those schools and districts with adequate improvement initiatives in place, a RESPRO customizes its offerings to

supplement and strengthen those programs and activities. To address weaknesses, RESPROs offer interventions tailored to specific needs. In some instances, a RESPRO may partner with other educational service providers or agents (e.g., universities) to provide needed services to districts or schools.

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.

Illinois and federal laws require that the Illinois State Board of Education provide technical assistance to schools and districts that are determined to be in academic early warning status (AEWS) and academic watch status (AWS). Beginning in 2003, to help schools and districts improve their academic performance, especially in reading and mathematics, the Illinois State Board of Education established a regional system of support. Each regional service provider (RESPRO) offers its services to the schools and districts in its

region that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP), especially those in AEWS and AWS.

Regarding federal sanctions, RESPRO priorities are to provide support and assistance to districts with schools subject to 1) restructuring and corrective action (AWS) and 2) school improvement (AEWS). As resources allow, RESPROs also serve Title I schools whose academic performance is marginal.

The RESPRO system of support includes specific activities that:

*focus on the school improvement plan (SIP) and district improvement plan (DIP);

*target proven approaches and standardized processes to specific improvement components;

*customize services to differences among regions, districts, and schools;

*coordinate programs, services, and funding;

*deploy state, regional, and local staff and resources efficiently and effectively; and

*use AYP, defined by state and federal laws, as the "bottom line" measure of effectiveness in helping schools and districts.

Proven approaches and standardized processes for specific improvement components--

The RESPRO system of support emphasizes school improvement programs and processes that have a record of success. RESPROs select those that are most likely to improve the academic achievement of students when tailored to the districts and schools they serve.

Broadly, RESPROs provide districts and schools in their regions with programs and processes representing best practices in four improvement components:

1. Data analysis and SIP/DIP development.
2. Standards-aligned curriculum, instruction, and classroom assessment.
3. Teacher and administrator enhancement.
4. Student, family, and community support services.

Customization for regional and local differences among schools and districts--

The RESPRO system of support is not a "one-size-fits-all" service approach for academically poor performing schools or districts. Rather, in addition to standard offerings or best practices, RESPROs offer interventions based on a data analysis and review of currently successful practices in each school or district. The analysis seeks to determine which, if any, of the four improvement components in a district or school are adequate and at what level of effectiveness.

For those schools and districts with adequate improvement initiatives in place, a RESPRO customizes its offerings to

supplement and strengthen those programs and activities. To address weaknesses, RESPROs offer interventions tailored to specific needs. In some instances, a RESPRO may partner with other educational service providers or agents (e.g., universities) to provide needed services to districts or schools.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
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.	174
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.	149
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	1048
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.	114230
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2487
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.	5855
Comments:	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
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.	1120
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	50579
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.	170702
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	82027
Comments:	

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.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	149221	143448	96.10
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	21557	18053	83.70
Low-Poverty Schools	36900	36809	99.80
All Elementary Schools	111284	107066	96.20
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	9236	7813	84.60
Low-Poverty Schools	13619	13606	99.90
All Secondary Schools	37937	36382	95.90
Comments:			

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).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
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	13.60
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	0.90
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	29.40
d) Other (please explain)	
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
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)	9.10
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	3.70
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.40
d) Other (please explain)	40.90
Comments: "Other" means long-term substitutes or bilingual teachers with provisional certificates. The Secondary School "Other" category includes Elementary School data because Illinois did not collect this information in separate elementary and secondary school categories for school year 2005-2006.	

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 %)
Elementary Schools	66.90	16.10
Poverty Metric Used	Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.	
Secondary Schools	43.80	13.60
Poverty Metric Used	Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.	

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	86.60

Comments: Total = 8010

Qualified = 6938

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

Illinois is part of the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium and adopted the English Language Proficiency Standards for K-12 English language learners (ELLs) in 2004. The K-12 English Language Proficiency Standards represent an amalgam of the thinking of educators of ELLs participating in the WIDA Consortium.

In school year 2005-2006, as in 2004-2005, regional workshops and multiple technical assistance sessions were provided to assist school districts with implementation of the English Language Proficiency Standards. Nine sessions on rules, regulations, and standards were held during the 2005-2006 school year. Paper copies and CDs of the English Language Proficiency Standards were distributed to every Illinois school district during the previous school year, and Illinois continues to make copies available. In addition, the Illinois State Board of Education continues to post the Illinois English Language Proficiency Standards on the agency website at <http://www.isbe.net/bilingual/htmls/standards.htm> to ensure that every classroom teacher has access to these standards at all times. The Illinois Learning Standards and the Illinois Spanish Language Arts Standards are also available on the agency website.

All four domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) overlay those associated with academic achievement (the content areas of language arts/reading, mathematics, science, and social studies). In 2005-2006, Illinois teachers continued to apply the English Language Proficiency Standards that were first implemented in the 2004-2005 school year.

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

Each English Language Proficiency Standard addresses a specific context for language acquisition (social and instructional settings, as well as language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) and is divided into four grade-level clusters: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Overall, the English Language Proficiency Standards center on the language needed and used by English language learners to succeed in school.

English Language Proficiency Standard 1:

English language learners communicate in English for SOCIAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL purposes within the school setting.

English Language Proficiency Standard 2:

English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of LANGUAGE ARTS.

English Language Proficiency Standard 3:

English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of MATHEMATICS.

English Language Proficiency Standard 4:

English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of SCIENCE.

English Language Proficiency Standard 5:

English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of SOCIAL STUDIES.

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 No
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

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

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

In 2004, the Illinois State Board of Education, along with other members of the WIDA Consortium, determined that ACCESS for ELLs would be the statewide assessment instrument for the mandated annual assessment of English language proficiency. In Illinois, teachers must be trained and must pass a test to become certified in ACCESS for ELLs; only those who are certified may administer the test.

ACCESS for ELLs is a standards-based, criterion-referenced English language proficiency test designed to measure English language learners' social and academic proficiency in English. It assesses social and instructional English, as well as the language associated with language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies within the school context across the language domains. It was developed based on the English Language Proficiency Standards for the classroom framework, which in turn incorporates state academic content standards.

Beginning in January 2006, every Illinois K-12 student identified as an English language learner was assessed with ACCESS for ELLs. The next annual assessment is scheduled for January 2007.

Independent Alignment Study--

The WIDA Consortium has contracted with Dr. Gary Cook from the Wisconsin Center for Education Research to conduct an independent alignment study of the alignment between the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards (adopted by the Illinois State Board of Education) and the ACCESS for ELLs English language proficiency assessment, the Illinois measure of English proficiency growth. The alignment will be conducted by teachers from Illinois and the 14 other WIDA Consortium states in Madison, Wisconsin, on December 4-5, 2006. Dr. Norman Webb's alignment procedures will be used and the teachers will enter their findings into the Web 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. Dr. Cook has adapted the Webb system for use with English proficiency standards and English language proficiency tests. Dr. Cook is one of the leading authorities in this area. Dr. Cook will analyze and synthesize the teachers' findings and write the summary report on the degree of alignment, including any recommendations for changes to the standards or the assessment. The report should be available by March 1, 2007, and will be shared with all WIDA member states and USDE.

Other Evidence--

Illinois teachers were involved in the process of developing the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards and model performance indicators. A content match procedure was used at the time the English Language Proficiency Standards were developed.

New NCLB Compliant ELP Assessment--

1. Illinois uses the ACCESS for ELLs English language proficiency assessment. The test provides annual, secure

forms for kindergarten through grade 12 (grade-clustered tested are K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12). Thirty-three percent of the test items are changed annually based on the English Language Proficiency Standards and test blueprint guidelines. Test item development is conducted at the Center for Applied Linguistics.

2. ACCESS for ELLs tests four separate domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and provides score reports in those four domains, plus comprehension (based on the listening and reading domains).

3. ACCESS for ELLs is aligned with the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards adopted by the Illinois State Board of Education.

4. ACCESS for ELLs has undergone rigorous pilot, field testing, and annual assessments of technical quality. The WIDA Consortium has an active technical advisory council with national experts to assist with ensuring the highest standards of validity and reliability.

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	258558	204803	79.20	32717	26.50	28691	23.20	39270	31.80	18825	15.30	3911	3.20
Comments: ACCESS for ELLs has six proficiency levels; the data included here in Level 5 includes Levels 5 and 6 ACCESS for ELLs data.													
Numbers and percentages include only LEP students who have ACCESS for ELLs scores.													

- (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.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	131764	81.00
2. Polish	6680	4.10
3. Arabic	2733	1.70
4. Urdu	2097	1.30
5. Korean	1623	1.00
6. Cantonese (Chinese)	1611	1.00
7. Pilipino (Tagalog)	1314	0.80
8. Gujarati	1165	0.70
9. Vietnamese	1134	0.70
10. Russian	1000	0.60
Comments:		

- 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.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data															
2005-2006 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III															
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency										Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (8)		
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5 (7)				
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
ACCESS for ELLs	155810	95.90	31802	26.80	27649	23.30	37594	31.60	18076	15.20	3660	3.10	12118	8.00	
Comments: ACCESS for ELLs has six proficiency levels; the data included here in Level 5 includes Levels 5 and 6 ACCESS for ELLs data.															
Numbers and percentages include only LEP students who have ACCESS for ELLs scores.															

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year.
- (3-7) In columns three-seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2005-2006 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (8) In column eight, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

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**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
59343	18620	83

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.)

There is no discernible change or trend.

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

School year 2005-2006 marked the first administration of the ACCESS for ELLs annual test in Illinois. All K-12 students identified as English language learners were assessed using the new state-approved English Language Proficiency Standards assessment instrument.

Proficiency in English is defined as scoring at or above a composite cut score of 4.0 for the four domains. Listening and speaking are weighted at 15 percent. Reading and writing are weighted at 35 percent. Comprehension is computed by using the average of the listening and reading scores.

No other criteria are required at the state level. However, school districts are allowed to use additional criteria, such as local tests, class performance, teacher evaluation, and parental input.

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

For school year 2004-2005, Illinois used the scores attained by LEP students from the four commercially available state-approved language proficiency tests-Language Assessment Scale (LAS), Idea Proficiency Test (IPT), Language Proficiency Test Series (LPTS), and Maculaitis II (MACII). School year 2004-2005 was the last school year that Illinois allowed LEAs to use these four tests to measure the English language proficiency of LEP students.

School year 2005-2006 marked the first administration of the ACCESS for ELLs assessment of students in Illinois. ACCESS for ELLs is now the only state-approved English language proficiency assessment instrument used in Illinois.

Because the same assessment instruments were not used during both school years, it became necessary to conduct a study to bridge the scores between the four commercially available state-approved English language proficiency instruments previously used and the ACCESS for ELLs test. The Center for Applied Linguistics for the WIDA Consortium conducted the bridge study, for which Illinois provided the largest number of student scores.

The regression equations generated were used to convert scores from local tests in listening, speaking, reading, and writing to ACCESS for ELLs. The converted 2005 local test scores were then compared with the 2006 ACCESS for ELLs scores to calculate progress. ACCESS for ELLs has six levels of proficiency, 1 being the lowest and 6 being the highest.

To make progress in the English language, an LEP student must:

1. achieve a 6.0 proficiency level in any one of the four domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) from his/her 2005 ACCESS converted scores, or
2. achieve a 6.0 proficiency level in any one of the four domains from his/her 2006 ACCESS scores, or
3. achieve a 0.5 increase in the proficiency level in 2006 from 2005 in any one of the four domains.

To meet AMAO-Progress a school district must have:

1. at least 30 students with valid scores for both 2005 and 2006, and
2. 85 percent of students that made progress, as defined above.

A 95 percent confidence interval is applied in calculating the percentage of students in the school district making progress.

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

A cohort is defined as those students taking comparative assessments for two consecutive years. Progress made in English language proficiency by LEP students in Illinois is determined from such a cohort.

With ACCESS for ELLs and the advent of the Illinois Student Identification System, it will be possible to track student performance in the English language across time. It is anticipated that extracting a cohort for longitudinal studies will become possible beginning with administration of the 2008 ACCESS for ELLs assessment.

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? No

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	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#

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.

In 2004-2005 Illinois did not measure the progress made by ALL LEP students in learning English and attaining English language proficiency because school districts that did not receive bilingual funds did not assess students via state-approved assessments. Since there are no 2004-2005 data to compare with 2005-2006 data, there is no validity in making data comparisons.

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.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	85.00	68518	81.20
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		15826	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	10.00	21736	18.30
TOTAL		106080	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? No

* 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

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	203
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	104
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	169
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	117
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	76
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	35
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	2
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	29
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	48
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments: 90 of the 203 subgrantees did not have the minimum N size required for calculations and therefore are not included in these AMAO calculations.

* 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	320	66.40
4	261	58.50
5	299	45.70
6	560	26.30
7	416	26.60
8	414	32.40
H.S.	75	18.60

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	413	85.30
4	331	74.20
5	409	62.20
6	1045	49.30
7	635	40.60
8	546	42.80
H.S.	121	29.90

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.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	87.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	86.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.40
Black, non-Hispanic	77.70
Hispanic	76.00
White, non-Hispanic	92.20
Students with Disabilities	76.10
Limited English Proficient	62.80
Economically Disadvantaged	75.80
Migrant	75.60
Male	85.40
Female	89.40
Comments: Multiracial - 91.7%	
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	4.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.30
Black, non-Hispanic	9.30
Hispanic	8.10
White, non-Hispanic	2.40
Students with Disabilities	6.10
Limited English Proficient	7.20
Economically Disadvantaged	5.90
Migrant	8.10
Male	5.10
Female	4.00
Comments: Multiracial - 2.04%	
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

The school year begins on July 1 and ends on June 30 each year.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	872	791
LEAs with Subgrants	1	1

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	744	417
1	789	858
2	676	870
3	674	946
4	618	810
5	669	847
6	570	893
7	561	772
8	545	688
9	513	1019
10	386	817
11	370	559
12	411	747

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 without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	1176	2004
Doubled-up	4981	8239
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	149	0
Hotels/Motels	587	0
Unknown	633	0

Comments:

* 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	417
1	858
2	870
3	946
4	810
5	847
6	893
7	772
8	688
9	1019
10	817
11	559
12	747

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

273

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

0

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

0

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

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

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	1509
English Language Learners (ELL)	181
Gifted and Talented	181
Vocational Education	402

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

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

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	1
Expedited evaluations	1
Staff professional development and awareness	1
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	1
Transportation	1
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	1
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	1
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	1
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	1
Coordination between schools and agencies	1
Counseling	1
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	1
Clothing to meet a school requirement	1
School supplies	1
Referral to other programs and services	1
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	1
Other (optional)	0

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.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School selection	0
Transportation	0
School records	0
Immunizations or other medical records	0
Other enrollment issues	0

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

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

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier

Comments: None noted.

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	1098	440
Grade 4	Yes	979	450
Grade 5	Yes	1027	341
Grade 6	Yes	1017	488
Grade 7	Yes	893	433
Grade 8	Yes	899	538
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	469	119
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments: NOTE: Column B indicates the number of students who took the test. HOWEVER, the number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, Column C indicates the number of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

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	1098	631
Grade 4	Yes	979	568
Grade 5	Yes	1027	424
Grade 6	Yes	1017	505
Grade 7	Yes	893	408
Grade 8	Yes	899	414
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	469	70
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments: NOTE: Column B indicates the number of students who took the test. HOWEVER, the number of students who take a test does not necessarily equal the number of students who take a test AND receive a score. Illinois reports information on the percentage of students meeting/exceeding based on the number of test takers receiving scores, NOT on the number of test takers. Therefore, Column C indicates the number of students who took the test, AND received a test score, AND met or exceeded state proficiency.

* 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.