

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).

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

Since 1993, the Louisiana Department of Education has engaged in significant reform efforts. Louisiana's education reform initiatives are built on the concept of rigorous and challenging content standards. In the early 1990s, Louisiana began a process of raising these academic standards. The Louisiana Department of Education was awarded a grant from the U.S. Department of Education to begin development of content standards in Mathematics and Science. Additionally, in 1996, the Department of Education convened committees of Louisiana educators to develop content standards in the other core subject areas in addition to mathematics and science, standards were also developed in English language arts, social studies, the arts, and foreign languages. After several rounds of development by committees representing teachers, school administrators, business and industry, and parents, drafts of these documents were presented to the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) during the fall of 1996.

In addition to development and review by the content standards committees, a team of external evaluators reviewed the standards. The State Education Improvement Partnership (SEIP) coordinated this effort. Also, numerous public forums, focus groups, and public meetings were held to gather public input before the content standards and benchmarks were finalized. Approximately 25,000 surveys were distributed to educators statewide during the public review process.

In 1997, the Louisiana State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) approved the content standards for English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, foreign languages, and the arts. These content standards have been used as the basis for local curriculum and the state's standards-based assessment program. The standards are clustered into benchmarks for grades K-4, 5-8, and 9-12.

Since the adoption of content standards in 1997, the State has also developed Grade-Level Expectations. The development of Grade-Level Expectations (GLEs) in 2003 in English language arts, mathematics, science and social studies was a continuation of Louisiana's effort to expand and extend the content standards. GLEs identify what all students should know or be able to do by the end of a given grade level from prekindergarten through grade 12 in these four content areas.

Each grade-level expectation is meant to further define a content standard and benchmark(s). There is a progression of specificity; the standards represent broad statements, benchmarks are more specific, and GLEs provide the most detail. Grade-level expectations have been developed from prekindergarten through grade 12.

GLEs do not represent the entire curriculum for a given grade or course. Rather, they represent the core content that should be mastered by the end of a given year by all students. For mastery to be achieved at a given level, it may be necessary for those skills to be introduced at an earlier grade. Similarly, skills will need to be maintained after mastery has occurred.

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

To meet the NCLB assessment requirements, the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) will use a comprehensive assessment system including criterion-referenced tests (CRT), augmented norm-referenced tests (NRT), and alternate assessments (AA). The LDE is on target to have these assessments fully implemented by the spring of 2006, in accordance with NCLB timelines. Although the LDE's comprehensive assessment system goes beyond the NCLB required subjects and grades the tests required NCLB are detailed below.

Assessments in Reading and Math, Gr. 3-8 & high school

CRTs in English Language Arts (Reading) and Math

The LDE's existing CRTs meet the assessment requirements at gr. 4, 8, and high school (gr. 10). The tests in gr. 4th and 8th - Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) - are given in the spring of each year and have been used in the LDE's accountability system since they were implemented.

Augmented NRTs in English Language Arts (Reading) and Math

The LDE has developed augmented NRTs in ELA (Reading) and Math in gr. 3, 5, 6, and 7 (and gr. 9, though not required). These new tests, known as iLEAP (for integrated LEAP), include an NRT component (The Iowa Tests) with the addition of a CRT component that measures the state standards not measured on the Iowa Tests. iLEAP is an integrated LEAP because it combines NRT and CRT items. iLEAP replaced the previous NRT in gr. 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9.

The iLEAP ELA and mathematics tests include a short form (survey form) of the Iowa Tests augmented with standards-based items. Through a multiyear contract, the LDE has developed and field tested augmented NRTs for ELA and mathematics. These tests were implemented in spring of 2006. The major procedures in the development process included:

• Using grade-level expectations (GLEs) to develop assessment frameworks and test blueprints

• Analyzing the relationship between NRTs and GLEs in ELA and mathematics,

• Developing additional ELA and mathematics items for GLEs not addressed on the Iowa Tests,

• Constructing field test forms,

• Administering a field test in spring 2005,

• Developing iLEAP Assessment Guides for gr. 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9,

• Administering the first operational test in spring 2006,

• Setting performance standards for gr. 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9 in 2006, and

• Reporting results in terms of achievement levels (Basic, Mastery, etc.)

Louisiana educators from across the state were involved throughout the item development phase and in setting the performance standards for iLEAP. A brief summary of those meetings is provided below.

Achievement Level Descriptors Committees

Grade-level committees of teachers and other educators met to review and approve the Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) that served as a basis for item development.

Item Review Committees

Grade- and content-specific committees convened to review, reject, approve, or make revisions to the items.

Bias Review Committees

Bias Review Committees composed of various subgroups (e.g., ESL, minorities, parents) reviewed the items for bias and sensitive material.

In summer of 2005, the Item Review Committees returned to review the field test data and make final selections of items to be used on iLEAP. Spring of 2006 marked the implementation of the new assessments.

iLEAP Standard Setting Committees

In July of 2006, the LDE convened a statewide committee of educators to set performance standards for iLEAP using the modified bookmark method. Students, schools, and districts received iLEAP results in September 2006; the results are reported based on the five achievement levels (Advanced, Mastery, Basic, Approaching Basic, and Unsatisfactory) used to report LEAP and GEE results.

Assessments in Science

CRTs in Science (grades 4, 8, and 11)

The LDE's existing CRTs meet the assessment requirements at gr. 4, 8, and high school (gr. 11). The tests for gr. 4 and 8 (LEAP) are given in the spring of each year. These tests have been used in the LDE's accountability system since they were implemented.

Alternate Assessments

LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1)

LAA 1, which focuses on the most basic components and critical functions of the content standards, was developed for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The LEAP Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria serve as guidelines for school IEP teams who determine students' eligibility to take LAA 1, which has been implemented for several years. The test is based, to the extent possible, on the grade-level content standards; however, students are not working toward grade-level achievement standards. Alternate achievement standards are used instead. LAA 1 students are included in all school and district accountability calculations.

LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 2 (LAA 2)

The State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) further directed the LDE to develop an additional alternate assessment. The LAA 2 is designed for students with persistent academic disabilities who are not eligible for the LAA 1 but are not cognitively able to successfully participate in the general statewide assessments (iLEAP and GEE). Based on input received from the Louisiana Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the assessment will be based on the grade-level content standards and be scored against modified achievement standards. BESE approved this plan. The LAA 2 is being developed and implemented for the same grades and subjects that are included the regular statewide assessments. The tests would include:

Gr 3-8: ELA, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies

Gr 9 and 10: ELA and Mathematics

Gr 11: Science and Social Studies

Spring of 2006 marked the first implementation of the LAA 2 assessments for gr. 4, 8, and 10 in ELA and mathematics and the gr. 11 assessments in science and social studies. Teachers were involved in the review and selection of items to be included on the LAA 2 assessments. As described in the 2004-05 CSPR, the same process was used for developing these assessments as the one used for developing other Louisiana assessments. Content

and grade-level committees of teachers (general and special education) reviewed selected items from Louisiana's existing item banks to determine their appropriateness for this student population. The testing contractor facilitated the meetings developed the test forms for gr. 4, 8, 10, and 11 for final review and approval. LAA 2 assessments in ELA and mathematics for gr. 5, 6, 7, and 9 are being developed for administration in spring of 2007. The grade-level forms for science and social studies will be developed in 2006-2007 for implementation in 2008.

LAA 2 Standard Setting

In June of 2006, the LDE convened a statewide committee of educators to set performance standards for LAA 2. Using the data from the spring administration of LAA 2, testing contractor Data Recognition Corporation facilitated the process using a modified bookmark procedure. Students, schools, and districts received LAA 2 results in September, 2006. The results are reported in terms of four achievement levels: Basic, Approaching Basic, Foundational, and Pre-foundational. The top two levels are equivalent to the performance levels of LEAP and GEE (i.e., a LAA 2 student performing at these two levels would show similar performance to a student performing at these levels on the state general assessment). The lower two levels (Foundational and Pre-Foundational) were established to better differentiate groups of students that would fall into the Unsatisfactory achievement level on LEAP and GEE.

Participation in LAA 2 is based on eligibility criteria that have been developed. We assume the criteria would ultimately result in about 1-2% of the student population participating in the program (approximately 6,000 students). Students meeting the eligibility criteria take the tests for the grade in which they are enrolled.

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

Academic achievement standards have been completed for all required grades and subjects of the regular statewide assessments. These descriptions, known as Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) in Louisiana, were completed in two phases.

LEAP and GEE

The academic achievement standards for English (Reading) and Math for LEAP at grades 4 and 8, and for English (Reading) and Math for GEE at high school (grade 10) were developed as part of the state's standard-setting process when those tests were developed and implemented several years ago. These documents have been circulated and are posted on the state's web site for public use. The academic achievement standards for science at three grade levels (4, 8, and 11) were also completed on the same timetable.

iLEAP

The academic achievement standards for English (Reading) and Math for iLEAP at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 were completed in 2004. These documents were completed through a collaborative effort of the Department staff, the assessment vendor, and committees of teachers who reviewed and revised the draft documents.

LAA1

In the fall of 2005, committees of special education teachers convened to review draft documents of academic achievement standards for the LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1). Committees representing each content (English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) reviewed academic achievement standards that defined performance at different levels for the skills on which LAA 1 students are assessed. Committee members categorized the standards for each skill according to difficulty (easy to difficult). The results of this activity were used to set the alternate achievement standards.

LAA 2

Modified academic achievement standards for the LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 2 (LAA 2) are content and grade-level specific criteria that describe what Louisiana students taking the LAA 2 should know and be able to do at each achievement level. The academic achievement standards for Approaching Basic and Basic are adaptations of those for LEAP/GEE, while the standards for Foundational and Pre-Foundational were developed in spring 2006 by Louisiana educators. The modified academic achievement standards were used extensively to guide the panelists who set the cut scores.

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	262578	99.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	2127	99.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	2582	99.80
Black, non-Hispanic	112557	99.70
Hispanic	3868	99.90
White, non-Hispanic	141444	99.90
Students with Disabilities	33046	99.60
Limited English Proficient	2131	99.80
Economically Disadvantaged	163484	99.80
Migrant	978	99.60
Male	133120	99.80
Female	129458	99.90

Comments:

- 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	262618	99.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	2127	99.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	2581	99.80
Black, non-Hispanic	112585	99.70
Hispanic	3871	99.90
White, non-Hispanic	141454	99.90
Students with Disabilities	33047	99.60
Limited English Proficient	2130	99.80
Economically Disadvantaged	163520	99.80
Migrant	980	99.70
Male	133149	99.80
Female	129469	99.90

Comments:

- 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	29737	99.60
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	986	99.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2323	99.10

Comments:

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	29736	99.60
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	988	99.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2323	99.10

Comments:

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	38950	63.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	312	63.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	384	85.10
Black, non-Hispanic	17307	46.90
Hispanic	599	66.30
White, non-Hispanic	20348	77.90
Students with Disabilities	5712	40.60
Limited English Proficient	415	67.00
Economically Disadvantaged	26226	55.00
Migrant	183	58.50
Male	19937	63.90
Female	19013	63.90

Comments:

- 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	38947	64.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	312	67.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	384	81.50
Black, non-Hispanic	17309	51.00
Hispanic	599	64.80
White, non-Hispanic	20343	75.80
Students with Disabilities	5710	37.60
Limited English Proficient	415	62.60
Economically Disadvantaged	26224	56.20
Migrant	183	50.30
Male	19935	58.90
Female	19012	70.60

Comments:

- 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	37334	65.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	330	66.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	397	88.20
Black, non-Hispanic	16089	49.80
Hispanic	603	64.30
White, non-Hispanic	19915	78.40
Students with Disabilities	5471	37.20
Limited English Proficient	363	65.20
Economically Disadvantaged	24512	56.80
Migrant	139	50.00
Male	19195	65.00
Female	18139	66.80

Comments: Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.

- 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	37330	68.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	330	70.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	397	82.60
Black, non-Hispanic	16087	53.80
Hispanic	603	66.80
White, non-Hispanic	19913	79.10
Students with Disabilities	5472	33.20
Limited English Proficient	363	60.70
Economically Disadvantaged	24511	59.00
Migrant	139	54.30
Male	19193	63.20
Female	18139	73.00

Comments: Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.

- 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	37730	65.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	311	68.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	371	84.00
Black, non-Hispanic	16266	48.50
Hispanic	562	73.00
White, non-Hispanic	20220	78.70
Students with Disabilities	5081	37.60
Limited English Proficient	338	69.00
Economically Disadvantaged	24566	56.50
Migrant	148	59.50
Male	19364	66.00
Female	18366	65.20

Comments:

- 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	37733	62.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	311	62.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	371	78.80
Black, non-Hispanic	16271	48.10
Hispanic	562	67.20
White, non-Hispanic	20218	74.20
Students with Disabilities	5079	30.30
Limited English Proficient	338	59.90
Economically Disadvantaged	24573	53.10
Migrant	148	48.60
Male	19363	57.80
Female	18370	68.00

Comments:

- 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	38130	64.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	322	63.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	327	86.90
Black, non-Hispanic	16702	47.40
Hispanic	545	67.30
White, non-Hispanic	20234	77.30
Students with Disabilities	4851	32.10
Limited English Proficient	266	62.90
Economically Disadvantaged	24583	54.80
Migrant	157	65.40
Male	19627	62.50
Female	18503	65.70

Comments:

- 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	38127	66.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	322	67.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	327	83.80
Black, non-Hispanic	16698	52.40
Hispanic	545	67.10
White, non-Hispanic	20235	78.10
Students with Disabilities	4844	31.00
Limited English Proficient	266	56.20
Economically Disadvantaged	24583	57.70
Migrant	157	63.50
Male	19622	60.30
Female	18505	73.40

Comments:

- 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	40074	57.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	339	56.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	377	82.80
Black, non-Hispanic	17784	39.30
Hispanic	560	59.80
White, non-Hispanic	21014	71.80
Students with Disabilities	4746	24.80
Limited English Proficient	269	59.10
Economically Disadvantaged	25354	47.00
Migrant	138	47.80
Male	20498	57.00
Female	19576	57.40

Comments:

- 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	40105	62.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	339	60.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	377	77.70
Black, non-Hispanic	17809	48.40
Hispanic	562	64.30
White, non-Hispanic	21018	74.30
Students with Disabilities	4746	25.00
Limited English Proficient	270	55.10
Economically Disadvantaged	25379	53.60
Migrant	139	48.90
Male	20523	55.80
Female	19582	69.70

Comments:

- 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	38243	57.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	292	50.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	352	82.40
Black, non-Hispanic	16499	38.90
Hispanic	577	61.00
White, non-Hispanic	20523	72.30
Students with Disabilities	4610	19.80
Limited English Proficient	263	55.30
Economically Disadvantaged	22943	46.50
Migrant	137	50.00
Male	19289	59.40
Female	18954	55.90

Comments: Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.

- 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	38261	57.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	292	54.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	352	72.40
Black, non-Hispanic	16510	41.00
Hispanic	577	58.70
White, non-Hispanic	20530	69.60
Students with Disabilities	4620	15.90
Limited English Proficient	263	43.30
Economically Disadvantaged	22957	45.90
Migrant	138	43.10
Male	19301	51.80
Female	18960	62.40

Comments: Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.

- 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	32117	68.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	68.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	374	83.60
Black, non-Hispanic	11910	50.00
Hispanic	422	64.90
White, non-Hispanic	19190	79.00
Students with Disabilities	2575	30.30
Limited English Proficient	217	55.50
Economically Disadvantaged	15300	56.40
Migrant	76	55.30
Male	15210	70.80
Female	16907	65.60

Comments: Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.

- 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	32115	66.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	63.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	373	74.10
Black, non-Hispanic	11901	51.00
Hispanic	423	63.60
White, non-Hispanic	19197	75.20
Students with Disabilities	2476	25.30
Limited English Proficient	215	45.30
Economically Disadvantaged	15293	54.70
Migrant	76	40.80
Male	15212	60.30
Female	16903	71.10

Comments: Based on flexibility afforded to Louisiana from the USDOE all displaced students results were included in a separate subgroup and excluded from the listed subgroups. This flexibility was afforded us due to the two severe hurricanes Louisiana suffered in the fall of 2005.

- 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	1220	1107	90.70
Comments: Approximately 110 schools are not included in this year's report because of one (1) year waivers due to 2005 hurricane impact.			
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	67	41	61.20
Comments: Louisiana has 68 school districts. Several of these are eligible for exclusion from accountability considerations this year because of one (1) year waivers due to 2005 hurricane impact. Only one (1) LEA needed the exclusion for AYP considerations.			

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	884	800	90.50
Comments: As noted in 1.4.1, several schools were excluded or eligible for exclusion from accountability this year due to the 2005 hurricanes. As noted in the Aug. 2, 2006 letter from Henry Johnson to Superintendent Cecil Picard, schools/districts that made AYP are to be included in accountability while those that did not make AYP are given the one year waiver. The Title 1 schools that are waived for the year were open, had students enrolled, and received funds and would be reported as such. They are not included in accountability results (as allowed in Mr. Johnson's letter). The 884 Title 1 schools in the above table are those included in accountability reporting, and for this year, will not equal the number of Title 1 schools in the state.			
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	67	67	100.00
Comments: Louisiana has 68 school districts. Several of these are eligible for exclusion from accountability considerations this year because of one (1) year waivers due to 2005 hurricane impact. Only one (1) LEA needed the exclusion for AYP considerations.			

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.

SI 1. On initial identification for school improvement, schools are required to submit a school improvement plan that has been developed under the supervision of a district assistance team (DAT). The DAT members are required to have undergone approximately 5 days of training in the comprehensive reform process, data analysis, accountability, and the coordination of resources. Local superintendents are required to verify that the plan was developed according to policy, has been reviewed by district personnel, and is of high quality. School Choice is required.

SI 2. A school advancing to level 2 is visited by an external team for a Scholastic Audit. Such an audit develops a comprehensive report that is to be used to drive school reform for several years. Upon receipt of the report, the district may enter an agreement with the LDE to have a Distinguished Educator (DE) placed at the school. The DE is a highly trained career educator who assists the school with writing and implementing a school improvement plan to address the audit findings. Supplemental Educational Services are required of Title 1 schools.

SI 3. Level 3 requires a second visit from the Scholastic Audit team and a check for an appropriate response to the audit findings. If parties agree, the DE may remain at the school. The school must add a remedy from a menu of Corrective Actions and the district must submit a Reconstitution Plan to BESE and the LDE if the school advances to level 3 as a result of the SPS component. The plan must be evaluated as acceptable by the LDE or funds may be withheld.

SI 4. Schools advancing to level 4 because of SPS failure must implement the Reconstitution Plan or lose funding. Title 1 schools failing the Subgroup Component must develop an alternate governance plan, Non-Title 1 schools must develop a targeted reconstitution plan (a plan that reconstitutes the educational component responsible for the school's failure).

SI 5. Non-title 1 schools that enter level 5 because of the Subgroup Component must implement their targeted reconstitution plans. All other schools entering level 5 must operate under alternate governance.

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.

Louisiana has 68 school districts. Several of these are eligible for exclusion from accountability considerations this year because of one (1) year waivers due to 2005 hurricane impact. Only one LEA needed the exclusion for AYP considerations.

Districts failing AYP one (1) year must do a self-analysis and submit it to the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE). The LDE reviews each plan and may recommend that the district present its findings to the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE). A second year of failure requires the district to write a district improvement plan based on the results of the self-study. The plan is submitted to the LDE and reviewed for approval. The LDE recommends that SBESE call the district personnel in for a "district dialogue" - a discussion of how the district intends to implement the improvement plan and address the academic deficiencies. A third year of failure triggers a fiscal and academic audit and a review of all support services. A fourth year of failure requires BESE to take action on the prior year's audit. Each time BESE is involved for 1-4 years of failure it discusses and recommends solutions to the specific problems of the district.

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.	79
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.	222
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.	2219
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.	43146
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.	
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.	
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.	51
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	1861
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.	25578
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.	
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	175631	139488	79.40
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	22719	19355	85.20
Low-Poverty Schools	20284	18471	91.10
All Elementary Schools	85637	74412	86.90
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	24103	15189	63.00
Low-Poverty Schools	22713	18679	82.20
All Secondary Schools	89994	65076	72.30
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	34.00
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	7.60
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	58.40
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
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)	43.60
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	8.20
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	48.20
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

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	84.50	52.10
Poverty Metric Used	Free/Reduced Lunch	
Secondary Schools	71.10	39.60
Poverty Metric Used	Free/Reduced Lunch	

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	83.60

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

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

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

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

A task force of LA teachers, administrators, parents, and department staff developed Bulletin 112, Louisiana English Language Development Standards (LAELDS). The State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Adopted Bulletin 112 in March 2004. The LAELDS are aligned to the State's content standards by describing the linguistic academic language skills for each of the five levels of English language proficiency in the four language domains. The LAELDS have been disseminated to all districts via the department's website, conferences, workshops, and state organizations.

The Title III Program Consultant provides technical assistance in the use of the LAELDS to design of curriculum and instruction appropriate for an English language learner. The LA are also aligned to the English Language Development Assessment.

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

The LA ELDA were developed in direct alignment to the State's ELA standards and are linked by academic language skills and functions to the State's Math, Science, and Social Studies standards. The State LA ELDS task force is in the process of completing a curriculum model based on the LA ELDS and the State's Grade Level Expectations. This curriculum model will provide both general education and ESL teachers with grade level academic language skills and functions in the content areas that the English language learner must master to successfully access the curriculum and achieve academically.

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

1. The LA ELDS are based on and are in direct alignment to the State's English Language Development Assessment (ELDA). The ELDA standards were developed after a review of participating states' ELP and content standards by national experts in English language acquisition, state Title III and assessment personnel, and linguistic and assessment personnel from the American Institute of Research.

2. 1. The state administered the ELDA in kindergarten through grade 12 in April 2006; individual student and district/state summary reports of results have been disseminated to districts and are also available electronically at the LDE.

2. ELDA is administered in the four domains of language with a derived score in comprehension from the receptive language domains of listening and reading.

3. The ELDA standards were used to develop the LA ELDS and are in direct alignment.

3. Validity and reliability studies on grades 3-12 ELDA were conducted by the Center for the Study of Assessment and Validity and Evaluation²

University of Maryland. Grades K-2 validity and reliability studies were conducted by Measurement Incorporated. These studies are included in

Technical reports. An ELDA Interpretive Guide is available to aid in

Appropriate interpretation of ELDA scores.

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	4772	63.00
2. Vietnamese	1349	18.00
3. Arabic	394	0.10
4. Chinese/Cantonese/	256	0.00
5. French	118	0.00
6. Korean Choson-0	95	0.00
7. Urdu	86	0.00
8. Tagalog	38	0.00
9. Farsi (Persian)	37	0.00
10. Laothian Pha XA Lao	36	0.00

Comments: Number 4 is Chinese, Cantonese, Mandarin, and Zhongwen languages.

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities
- **# of immigrant 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
4923	4876	21

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.)

Due to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, immigrant students were displaced throughout the state and nation. Immigrant students new to Louisiana arrived throughout the 2005 - 2006 school year.

There has been a 10% increase from the 2004-2005 school year to the 2005-2006 school year in the number of LEP students whose first language is Spanish. The numbers above do not include accurate numbers from Orleans, Recovery School District, St. Bernard, Cameron, and Plaquemines as these school districts were devastated by the storms and struggled to open the few useable schools and resources.

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

Louisiana has made no changes.

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

Louisiana has made no changes.

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

Louisiana has made no changes.

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

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

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

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 79.70	# 2201	% 41.00	# 1133	% 40.40	# 1116	% 14.40	# 397

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

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

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

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

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

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

Definitions:

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

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	79.70	1125	41.20
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		1606	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	40.40	390	14.30
TOTAL		2731	

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	38
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
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 Response</u>

Comments: Louisiana has not calculated the District and State AYP results yet (these will be calculated after the first of the year). Therefore, we cannot determine the number of districts meeting or not meeting the AMAO targets at this time. We will provide updates to this information after the AYP results are calculated.

* 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	46	76.70	
4	54	84.40	
5	45	72.60	
6	43	78.20	
7	40	61.50	
8	24	55.80	
H.S.	19	76.00	

Comments:

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced		
	#	%	
3	47	78.30	
4	52	80.00	
5	50	80.70	
6	42	76.40	
7	40	62.50	
8	27	62.80	
H.S.	18	72.00	

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

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

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

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

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	
Comments: As recorded in our approved Accountability Workbook, Louisiana uses a non-dropout rate for the Additional Academic Indicator for schools with a 12th grade. We will switch to a 4-year graduation rate in 2007. 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	6.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.70
Black, non-Hispanic	9.40
Hispanic	6.80
White, non-Hispanic	4.90
Students with Disabilities	10.50
Limited English Proficient	6.10
Economically Disadvantaged	6.50
Migrant	5.70
Male	8.00
Female	5.90

Comments: Due to the hurricanes we extended the collection period, so the school districts had a much longer period to correct their student data.
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

Louisiana Bulletin 741, Handbook for School Administrators states, "The academic school year shall be 180 days."

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	65	65
LEAs with Subgrants	13	13

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	3277	6623
1	3376	6873
2	3131	6413
3	3219	6372
4	3316	6923
5	3091	6377
6	3027	6438
7	3158	6324
8	3261	6702
9	2982	6769
10	2652	5797
11	2425	5322
12	2051	4984

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	9908	8594
Doubled-up	21820	13924
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	2207	6466
Hotels/Motels	1626	4524
Unknown	3405	48409

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 served by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	6223
1	6519
2	6060
3	5998
4	6607
5	5973
6	6083
7	5883
8	6423
9	6433
10	5356
11	4881
12	4529
Comments: homeless children and youth served by subgrants. Some other levels of homeless children and youth served by McKinney-Vento subgrants include Pre-K at 3687; and Special Education, GED/Options, NIS, and Alternative Programs and Adult Education at 237.	

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
3596
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

578

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)

133

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)	7150
English Language Learners (ELL)	3109
Gifted and Talented	3739
Vocational Education	1228

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	13
Expedited evaluations	11
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	13
Transportation	12
Early childhood programs	10
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	13
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	13
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	13
Coordination between schools and agencies	13
Counseling	10
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	10
Clothing to meet a school requirement	13
School supplies	13
Referral to other programs and services	13
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	11
Other (optional)	5

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	2
School selection	5
Transportation	5
School records	3
Immunizations or other medical records	1
Other enrollment issues	1

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
Available Resources	1
No shelters to refer students to	1

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

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

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	292	83
Grade 4	Yes	4300	3306
Grade 5	Yes	208	98
Grade 6	Yes	219	97
Grade 7	Yes	216	78
Grade 8	Yes	4316	3157
Grade 9	Yes	105	52
Grade 10	Yes	2906	1872
Grade 11	N/A	229	50
Grade 12	N/A	95	< n

Comments: State assessment is required for grades 3 through 11; however, high school students who fail any portion of the test in the previous year(s) must take it during the 12th grade.

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	226	87
Grade 4	Yes	4677	3086
Grade 5	Yes	208	90
Grade 6	Yes	219	97
Grade 7	Yes	216	95
Grade 8	Yes	4455	2635
Grade 9	Yes	105	62
Grade 10	Yes	2997	1794
Grade 11	N/A	314	64
Grade 12	N/A	117	< n

Comments: State assessment is required for grades 3 through 11; however, high school students who fail any portion of the test in the previous year(s) must take it during the 12th grade.

* 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.