

**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
<p>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</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2005-2006 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2005-2006	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Maine Department of Education	
Address: 23 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0023	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Jacqueline Soychak Telephone: 207-624-6734 Fax: 207-624-6731 e-mail: jacqueline.soychak@maine.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jacqueline Soychak	
Signature	Tuesday, February 27, 2007, 12:26:03 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

Maine's Science and Technology academic content standards were developed as an integral component of Maine's Learning Results (MLR), expectations for student learning in 8 content areas. In 1993, the Maine Legislature directed the State Board of Education to build on the Common Core of Learning and establish a task force on Learning Results to: "develop long-range educational goals and standards for school performance and student performance to improve learning results and recommend to the Commissioner, and to the Legislature a plan for achieving those goals and standards." On January 1996, after a series of teacher summits, and citizen hearings, the MLR Task Force recommended a set of grade span standards, a plan for implementation, and proposed legislation. The 1996 Legislature adopted much of the LR Task Force recommendations and directed the work to continue. A 1996 Critical Review sought comment from over 3000 educators. The revised standards were then exposed to public hearings before final adoption into Legislative rule in May of 1997. MLR's for Science and Technology set forth content standards, and performance indicators for grade spans: Pre-K-2, 3-4, 5-8, and 9-12. In February 2002, Maine's academic content standards and assessment system received full approval under IASA. The MLR is available in print or at the following address: <http://www.maine.gov.education/lres/lres.htm>. In 1997, when the Maine Legislature adopted the MLR's, it also provided for a review of the document to start in 2004 and be completed in 2007. This review will ensure that the MLR's adequately describe the skills and knowledge students need to be career, college and citizenship ready in the 21st century. Primary goals of the review process are to provide greater manageability, clarity and coherence in the MLR standards document. The Maine Department of Education (MDOE) has enlisted the assistance of national consultants in each of the 8 content areas of the MLR, including Science and Technology. The consultants considered our history, our current documents and our goals for Maine students and drafted a proposed set of revisions to move Maine toward those goals. Content area panels, which included educators and non-educators, collaborated with the national consultants to produce draft documents for public review. National standards documents, available cognitive and learning research, best practice strategies and other bodies of knowledge have been considered to support decisions regarding the proposed revised standards. The Department of Education sought and responded to broad-based feedback from diverse stakeholders including parent, educator and business groups, through regional forums and public hearing, regarding the proposed revised standards produced by the work of the content panels and national consultants. All proposed revised standards, including Science and Technology, will reflect a refinement of the current document not a departure from common rigorous standards for success. The document still includes standards and performance indicators for each content area and many of the same learning goals are carried forward from the current MLR document. With the exception of reading and mathematics, the document will still identify the end of grade span knowledge and skills that students must demonstrate. In January of 2007, the proposed revised Maine Learning Results will go to the Legislature. The final version of the MLR will be available in hard copy and in a web-based format with links, where available, to national standards documents and to instructional resources and supports.

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

The Maine Legislative 1996 statute (Title 20A) adopting Maine's Learning Results (MLR) contained language related to the development of state and local student assessments in reading, mathematics and science: Student achievement of the Learning Result...must be measured by a combination of state and local assessment to measure progress and ensure accountability. The 4th grade, 8th grade, and 11th grade results of the Maine Educational Assessment "MEA" are the state assessments used to measure the achievement of learning results beginning in the 1998-99 school year. In February 2002, Maine's assessment system received full approval under IASA. As the MLRs and MEA were based on grade spans, the Department created a system of grade level expectations (GLE's) derived from the MLR content standards to meet the requirements of NCLB. Using direct input from Maine educators and surveys, Department content specialists developed and subjected the proposed GLEs to reviews by both the Technical and Policy Advisory Committees. Based on their recommendations, the Commissioner of Education adopted the new GLEs. The Department completed development of the assessments based on the GLEs at grades 3,5, 6, and 7 for field-testing in March of 2005. The initial set of GLEs were then reviewed and modified based on an evaluation of the MEA and needs of Maine educators communicated to the Department. Beginning in 2005-2006, Maine implemented a new MEA design for grades 3 through 8 to measure the MLRs and meet NCLB accountability requirements. The grade 3-8 MEA design provides for continuity, clarity, and balanced student engagement time across the grades through a mix of selected response and student constructed response items. Test content was based on MLR content standards and performance indicators at grades 4 and 8, and on the original grade level expectations in reading and mathematics at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. In this test, items based on revised GLEs were field tested on the MEA in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 but were not to be used for student scores or for school level purposes, such as AYP. These new tests, together with the MEA in science and technology at grades 4 and 8, provided the information for NCLB for the 2005-06 school year. The MEA reading and mathematics assessments are being used to determine school and district achievement of AYP in response to the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). (Maine continues to also administer a writing assessment in grades 5 and 8.) Beginning in school year 2006-07, the revised GLEs will be assessed for all grades 3 - 8 in reading and mathematics and grades 4 and 8 in science and technology. The GLEs are derived from focused Learning Results performance indicators, and do not represent new content. They can be viewed at <http://www.maine.gov.education/lsalt/glereview.htm>. In school year 2005-06, the College Board SAT tests in critical reading, writing, and mathematics replaced the grade 11 MEA for secondary students. The shift to the SAT represents a strategic step towards a more integrated high school testing program and an effort to build a more effective set of policy initiatives designed to increase post-secondary aspirations and degree attainment. In 2006-07, the Maine High School Assessment will consist of the SAT, augmented with additional mathematics items. The grade 11 MEA science assessment will be discontinued for 2006-07 and replaced by a new integrated science assessment. In the spring of 2008, this test will be administered to all 3rd year high school students in conjunction with the administration of the augmented (math-A) portion of the SAT. In the 2001-2002 school year, the Department piloted (statewide) an alternate assessment process to the MEA, which is known as the Personalized Alternate Assessment Portfolio (PAAP). The PAAP is designed to provide access to Learning Results content standards for students with the most significant disabilities or needs. The PAAP uses rubrics based on the standards for all students, but provides lower access points to the content standards. The PAAP process is guided by a group of diverse stakeholders, known as the Work Collaborative. In addition, Maine teachers are annually trained to use and score the portfolios under the guidance of the MEA and PAAP contractor. As experience in the PAAP process has been gained, the program has been revised incrementally for greater effectiveness and efficiency as an assessment tool, and to reflect changes made in the general assessment.

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 Maine Educational Assessment (MEA) performance standards for grades 4, 8, and 11 that were set in 1998-99 remained unchanged until 2006. The Maine Department of Education (MDOE), in the original 18 month process, with extensive input from educators and policy makers throughout the state, created four performance levels to describe student achievement: Does Not Meet the Standards; Partially Meets the Standards; Meets the Standards; and Exceeds the Standards. In establishing the performance standards for the MEA, MDOE utilized two processes: 1) The Contrasting Groups Method asked 5000 teachers to rate student work against the adopted performance levels and descriptors; and 2) The Body of Work Method required 300 educators, parents, business people, and citizens comprising 21 panels to look systematically at student responses on the MEA and rate them against the performance levels and descriptors. This information was presented to the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) for review and recommendations to the Commissioner of Education on appropriate performance standards. Chapter 12 of the MEA Technical Manual (1998-99) provides a more complete description of the standard setting processes. The Commissioner followed the recommendations of the PAC, adopting performance standards that equal or exceed those of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. The implemented performance standards had been held constant since that time. In May 2006 MDOE set new achievement standards for grades 3 - 8, applying two performance standard strategies and using the MEA results for 2005-2006. The Technical and Policy Advisory Committees approved a standard setting proposal presented by Measured Progress, the MEA contractor. The Contrasting Groups method queried teachers at the time of testing about the performance of students in relation to descriptions of quality, and over 2/3s of all teachers in the state responded. A second method, the Modified Bookmark approach, engaged panels of educators and the public in linking student performance to quality descriptors at the item level. The new standards reflect an approach that moderates the achievement standards vertically across all grades tested, enabling us to see more clearly the progress of all students and subgroups of students. The new standards, except for writing, were applied to the MEA results in 2005-06. MDOE also set achievement standards for the SAT similar to those established for the MEA. The Department utilized a standard setting process that involved panels of Maine teachers to establish achievement standards. For grade 11 reading, writing and mathematics standard setting, the Modified Bookmark procedure was used. To comply with the requirements of standards-based reporting on achievement of Maine's Learning Results and the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) accountability requirements of NCLB, a standards based reporting format was developed, similar to the MEA School Summary Reports. Students received a State proficiency score based on Maine's achievement standards; in addition students who participated in the SAT according to College Board protocols received traditional SAT college-reportable scores. Likewise, schools received summary reports detailing student proficiency. This standards reporting format will serve as the basis for AYP determinations. Standard setting for the PAAP alternate assessment poses a different challenge, since the performance standards are actually described in the rubrics. In 2002-03, the Department brought together 40 special education teachers (3 panels) to engage in a validation process under the guidance of Measured Process. The process was based on "expert teacher judgment". While the process did identify patterns of performance categorization based on adjacent scores, it did not produce the level of exact agreement desired. Based on this experience, some revisions were made in the scoring processes, and the Rubric standards were monitored. Results since then appear to demonstrate a higher level of consistency. Following the completion of the MEA standard setting initiative described above, a new standard setting process for the PAAP will be undertaken and completed during the 2006-2007 school year. Alignment of PAAP standards and MEA standards will be built into the process for appropriate levels, since both the PAAP and the MEA are based on the same content standards.

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	104912	98.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	722	97.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1408	97.00
Black, non-Hispanic	2199	97.00
Hispanic	978	97.00
White, non-Hispanic	99538	98.00
Students with Disabilities	16479	96.00
Limited English Proficient	1863	97.00
Economically Disadvantaged	36183	98.00
Migrant	139	97.00
Male	53857	98.00
Female	50988	99.00

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.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	104870	98.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	722	97.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1392	96.00
Black, non-Hispanic	2161	96.00
Hispanic	969	96.00
White, non-Hispanic	99559	98.00
Students with Disabilities	16488	96.00
Limited English Proficient	1791	93.00
Economically Disadvantaged	36151	98.00
Migrant	139	97.00
Male	53837	98.00
Female	50966	99.00

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.

1.2.2 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	16479	96.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	528	

Comments: Maine does not provide alternate assessment aligned to grade level achievement standards. In 2005-06, alternate assessment was provided at grades 4, 8 and 11 only.

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	16488	96.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	567	

Comments: Maine does not provide alternate assessment aligned to grade level achievement standards. In 2005-06, alternate assessment was provided at grades 4, 8 and 11 only.

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	13866	59.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	109	46.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	198	64.00
Black, non-Hispanic	361	40.00
Hispanic	164	45.00
White, non-Hispanic	13022	59.00
Students with Disabilities	2241	35.00
Limited English Proficient	308	34.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5257	47.00
Migrant	18	33.00
Male	7173	61.00
Female	6681	57.00

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.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	13827	65.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	109	42.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	195	65.00
Black, non-Hispanic	349	49.00
Hispanic	161	49.00
White, non-Hispanic	13001	66.00
Students with Disabilities	2219	32.00
Limited English Proficient	290	30.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5232	52.00
Migrant	18	56.00
Male	7144	60.00
Female	6671	71.00

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.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	14016	59.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	97	41.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	254	67.00
Black, non-Hispanic	337	37.00
Hispanic	142	46.00
White, non-Hispanic	13174	60.00
Students with Disabilities	2303	34.00
Limited English Proficient	301	40.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5205	47.00
Migrant	18	33.00
Male	7069	61.00
Female	6935	58.00

Comments: The numbers in the "Total Numbers of Students Tested" Columns may differ from previous years since 2005-06 was the first year student data was supplied by the new Maine Educational Data Management System, in addition to natural fluctuations in populations. The discrepancies in the "Percent Proficient or Advanced" column are due to the fact that Maine reset achievement standards in 2005-06.

- 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	13946	61.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	96	46.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	245	62.00
Black, non-Hispanic	327	42.00
Hispanic	139	41.00
White, non-Hispanic	13127	62.00
Students with Disabilities	2259	31.00
Limited English Proficient	277	32.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5159	47.00
Migrant	18	33.00
Male	7015	57.00
Female	6919	66.00

Comments: The numbers in the "Total Numbers of Students Tested" Columns may differ from previous years since 2005-06 was the first year student data was supplied by the new Maine Educational Data Management System, in addition to natural fluctuations in populations. The discrepancies in the "Percent Proficient or Advanced" column are due to the fact that Maine reset achievement standards in 2005-06.

- 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	14297	55.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	99	32.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	211	60.00
Black, non-Hispanic	329	33.00
Hispanic	145	53.00
White, non-Hispanic	13507	56.00
Students with Disabilities	2372	27.00
Limited English Proficient	289	30.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5330	42.00
Migrant	16	56.00
Male	7311	56.00
Female	6980	55.00

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.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	14263	58.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	98	43.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	208	60.00
Black, non-Hispanic	323	41.00
Hispanic	141	52.00
White, non-Hispanic	13487	59.00
Students with Disabilities	2350	22.00
Limited English Proficient	275	27.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5308	44.00
Migrant	16	44.00
Male	7284	55.00
Female	6973	62.00

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	14880	50.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	115	28.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	177	64.00
Black, non-Hispanic	320	27.00
Hispanic	112	34.00
White, non-Hispanic	14144	50.00
Students with Disabilities	2270	17.00
Limited English Proficient	276	26.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5401	37.00
Migrant	29	48.00
Male	7657	49.00
Female	7211	50.00

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.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	14873	59.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	115	33.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	176	63.00
Black, non-Hispanic	310	36.00
Hispanic	112	46.00
White, non-Hispanic	14149	60.00
Students with Disabilities	2271	20.00
Limited English Proficient	264	26.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5400	45.00
Migrant	29	55.00
Male	7658	54.00
Female	7204	64.00

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.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	15455	46.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	109	24.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	177	55.00
Black, non-Hispanic	302	27.00
Hispanic	148	37.00
White, non-Hispanic	14706	47.00
Students with Disabilities	2326	13.00
Limited English Proficient	258	23.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5429	32.00
Migrant	24	25.00
Male	7912	47.00
Female	7530	45.00

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.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	15463	60.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	108	32.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	175	59.00
Black, non-Hispanic	302	43.00
Hispanic	143	57.00
White, non-Hispanic	14722	61.00
Students with Disabilities	2337	19.00
Limited English Proficient	249	25.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5433	45.00
Migrant	24	46.00
Male	7910	55.00
Female	7540	65.00

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.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	16247	45.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	100	30.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	209	60.00
Black, non-Hispanic	284	24.00
Hispanic	134	38.00
White, non-Hispanic	15508	45.00
Students with Disabilities	2437	12.00
Limited English Proficient	228	20.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5423	30.00
Migrant	23	26.00
Male	8422	44.00
Female	7813	45.00

Comments: The numbers in the "Total Numbers of Students Tested" Columns may differ from previous years since 2005-06 was the first year student data was supplied by the new Maine Educational Data Management System, in addition to natural fluctuations in populations. The discrepancies in the "Percent Proficient or Advanced" column are due to the fact that Maine reset achievement standards in 2005-06.

- 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	16254	59.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	101	39.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	208	65.00
Black, non-Hispanic	284	43.00
Hispanic	133	47.00
White, non-Hispanic	15515	59.00
Students with Disabilities	2447	16.00
Limited English Proficient	221	26.00
Economically Disadvantaged	5428	44.00
Migrant	23	48.00
Male	8426	52.00
Female	7815	66.00

Comments: The numbers in the "Total Numbers of Students Tested" Columns may differ from previous years since 2005-06 was the first year student data was supplied by the new Maine Educational Data Management System, in addition to natural fluctuations in populations. The discrepancies in the "Percent Proficient or Advanced" column are due to the fact that Maine reset achievement standards in 2005-06.

- 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	15142	47.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	89	31.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	178	54.00
Black, non-Hispanic	232	22.00
Hispanic	111	37.00
White, non-Hispanic	14532	47.00
Students with Disabilities	1597	11.00
Limited English Proficient	157	16.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3568	33.00
Migrant	< n	< n
Male	7675	50.00
Female	7467	44.00

Comments: The numbers on the "Total Number of Students Tested" column may differ from previous years since 2005-06 was the first year Maine used its new Maine Educational Data Management System for this data, in addition to natural fluctuation in populations. The discrepancies in the "Percent Proficient or Advanced" column is due to the fact that we used a different assessment, the SAT, at grade 11 and reset achievement standards in 2005-06.

- 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	15143	45.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	89	36.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	178	37.00
Black, non-Hispanic	232	28.00
Hispanic	111	37.00
White, non-Hispanic	14533	45.00
Students with Disabilities	1598	11.00
Limited English Proficient	157	6.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3569	30.00
Migrant	< n	< n
Male	7675	43.00
Female	7468	47.00

Comments: The numbers on the "Total Number of Students Tested" column may differ from previous years since 2005-06 was the first year Maine used its new Maine Educational Data Management System for this data, in addition to natural fluctuation in populations. The discrepancies in the "Percent Proficient or Advanced" column is due to the fact that we used a different assessment, the SAT, at grade 11 and reset achievement standards in 2005-06.

- 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	646		

Comments: High school AYP data is not yet available.

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	261		

Comments: High school AYP data is not yet available.

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	440		

Comments: High school AYP data is not yet available.

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	169		

Comments: High school AYP data is not yet available.

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.

When schools are identified as CIPS (Continuous Improvement Priority Schools), a DOE School Improvement Consultant is assigned to assist the school with the improvement planning process. This includes support with data analysis, needs assessment, facilitation of improvement planning meetings, and facilitation of profession development planning. The consultant acts as a conduit to other DOE school improvement team members, including content area or subgroup specialists.

The school improvement consultant also acts as a liaison to the Title IA monitoring staff. Attention is given to collecting required documentation, such as parent notification letters, Supplemental Service selections, etc. and providing information related to application requirements, such as the 10% Set-aside for professional development.

Schools are supported throughout the 2 year improvement cycle.

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.

When Districts are identified as CIPD (Continuous Improvement Priority Districts), a DOE Improvement Consultant is assigned to assist the district with the improvement planning process. This includes support with data analysis, needs assessment, analysis of current improvement efforts across the district, facilitation of improvement planning meetings, and facilitation of profession development planning. The consultant acts as a conduit to other DOE improvement team members, including content area or subgroup specialists.

The DOE improvement consultant also acts as a liaison to the Title IA monitoring staff. Attention is given to collecting required documentation, such as parent notification letters, and providing information related to application requirements, such as the 20% district Set- Aside for professional development.

Districts are supported throughout the 2 year improvement cycle and efforts are coordinated with other state or local initiatives that may be in place.

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.		0
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.		0
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.		0
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.		2079
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.		0
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.		0
Comments: The majority of our CIPS schools are at the middle level, and there is only one middle school for the district. In those schools where choice is available, parents do not want to remove their child from a familiar environment or their peers.		

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.	3
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	50
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.	399
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.	50
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	53333	50328	94.40
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	5947	5650	95.00
Low-Poverty Schools	3521	3416	97.00
All Elementary Schools	17870	17104	95.70
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	4472	4156	92.90
Low-Poverty Schools	11414	10826	94.90
All Secondary Schools	35463	33225	93.70
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	31.30
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	18.40
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	36.30
d) Other (please explain)	14.00
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)	39.80
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	24.90
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	29.00
d) Other (please explain)	6.30
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	49.90	25.00
Poverty Metric Used	the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program	
Secondary Schools	49.90	25.00
Poverty Metric Used	the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	92.00

Comments: Data not yet available.

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

Since 2004 Maine has had English Language Proficiency Standards for English language learners in kindergarten through Grade 12 developed by the WIDA Assessment Consortium guidelines in alignment with Maine's Learning Results.

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

Maine began using the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs® statewide in December 2005.

Maine joined the WIDA consortium in 2003 and participated in the development and publication of WIDA's English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners in Kindergarten through Grade 12: Frameworks for Large-scale State and Classroom Assessment.

Independent Alignment Study:

The WIDA Consortium has contracted with Dr. Gary Cook from the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER) to conduct an independent alignment study of the alignment between the WIDA ELP Standards adopted by Maine and the ACCESS for ELLs® ELP assessment, Maine's measure of English proficiency growth. The alignment will be conducted by teachers from Maine and the 14 other WIDA Consortium states in Madison, Wisconsin, December 4-5, 2006. Dr. Norman Webb's alignment procedures will be used and the teachers will enter their findings in the Web Alignment Tool, a federally funded on-line 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 ELP tests. Dr. Cook is one of the leading authorities in this area. Dr. Cook will analyze and synthesize the teachers' finding 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 the US Department of Education.

Other Evidence:

Maine teachers were involved in the process of developing the WIDA ELP Standards and model performance indicators. A content match procedure was used at the time the ELP Standards were developed (see WIDA ELP Standards Overview, Gottlieb, 2004).

New NCLB Compliant ELP Assessment

1. Maine uses the ACCESS for ELLs® ELP assessment. The test provides annual, secure forms for Kindergarten through grades 12 (grade clustered tested are K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12.) 33% of the test items are changed annually based on the ELP standards and test blue print guidelines. Test item development is conducted at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL).
2. ACCESS for ELLs® tests four separate domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and provides score reports in those four plus comprehension (based on the listening and reading domains).
3. ACCESS for ELLs® is aligned to the WIDA ELP Standards adopted by Maine.
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. (see Development and Field Report, 2005; and the Annual Technical Report Series 100, 2006).

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:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent alignment study <u>Yes</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of alignment <u>Yes</u>
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:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notification sent to all Superintendents regarding requirement to administer the ACCESS for ELLs. State oversight of test orderign. Telephone follow up to districts that did not order assessments this year, but ordered in previous years. Presentation to annual conference of school administators on the requirement to administer ACCESS for ELLs. 2. Maine adminsters the ACCESS for ELLs, which assesses all five domains. 3. Maine participated in the development and publication of WIDA Consortium English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners in Kindergarten through Grade 12 and will be participating in an alignment study in December 2006 in which all participating Maine teachers have been provided a copy of the most current of Maine's Learning Results (academic standards). 4. As a member fo the WIDA consortium, Maine is provided with a Technical Report and the expertise of CAL

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		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency									
					Number and Percentage at Level 1		Number and Percentage at Level 2		Number and Percentage at Level 3		Number and Percentage at Level 4		Number and Percentage at Level 5	
	(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)		(7)		(8)	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
ACCESS for ELLs	3302	3146	100.00	652	21.00	670	21.00	956	30.00	593	19.00	275	9.00	

Comments: 3302 LEP students were tested during the testing window. Of those 3302, 94 achieved a level 6 on the ACCESS for ELLs, and 62 did not complete the test because of absence, truancy, illness or physical inability to complete all domains (15 from the Governor Baxter School for the Deaf).

- (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. Somali	830	26.60
2. Spanish	357	11.40
3. French	265	8.50
4. Chinese	218	7.00
5. Passamaquoddy	211	6.80
6. Khmer	179	5.70
7. Vietnamese	146	4.70
8. Arabic	142	4.60
9. Russian	86	2.80
10. Acholi	81	2.60
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	2726	100.00	571	21.00	574	21.00	805	30.00	487	18.00	222	8.00	67	2.00

Comments: 3406 LEP were identified for Title III subgrantees through Maine's Education Data Management System's (MEDMS) count April 2006. However, 2766 is the total number LEP students tested by Title III subgrantees during the testing window December 2005 to February 2006. 40 of those 2766 received no score for the ACCESS for ELLs due to incompleteness of all domains.

- (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 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
880	602	1

Comments: 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

2005-06

Immigrants enrolled in the State # Immigrants served by

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.)

Portland, Maine has the largest Sudanese refugee population in the United States.

Lewiston, Maine has experienced an increase of Somali refugees, with an increase in 2005-2006 from 247 to 389 or an increase of 57%. Lewiston for 2005-2006 had an immigrant population of 449 students, 389 of which were refugees. In October of 2005, Lewiston had 285 immigrants and in June 2006 Lewiston had 449 immigrants.

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

No changes have been made since the last Consolidated State Performance Report.

Proficient is defined as attaining a Level 6 on all domains of the ACCESS for ELLs, which is Maine's only English language proficiency assessment.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

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

Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

The State has not made any changes on its definition of making progress since the last Consolidated State Performance Report was submitted. However, Maine does intend to apply to amend its definition of making progress to a realistic and feasible target, and to base the definition on reliable data.

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

Maine has not made changes to its definition of cohort since its last Consolidated State Performance Report submission and therefore, the definition remains: A cohort is a group of ELL students who are within the same grade level and are assessed for English Language Proficiency within the same testing window. Maine has only one testing window per year. The cohort is used to measure progress for AMAOs by school districts that enroll ELLs in a Title III supported program.

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	% 85.00	# 2806	% 37.00	# 667	% 85.00	# 2806	% 3.00	# 57

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.

The % projected AMAO targets for K-8 and 9-12 are different and therefore, it was necessary to average the two in order to input data into the existing format. 90% for K-8, and 80% for 9-12 = 85%

The Projected Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students is based on all students tested (3302 LEP studnets). The Actual Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students is ONLY those students for which Maine has 2 years of data*(1796 LEP studnets)in which to compare and assess accurately "making progress" and "attaining proficiency." In addition, the Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students who made progress and attained proficiency are figures that are computed using the unrealistic projected AMAO targets previously established by Maine, which must be amended to reflect realistically obtainable targets based on reliable data.

*students who were both administered ACCESS for ELLs in 2004-2005 and administered ACCESS for ELLs again in 2005-2006

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	667	37.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		1072	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	85.00	57	3.00
TOTAL		1796	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

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

* 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	12
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	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	12
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	12
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)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments: Maine's 1AMAO and 2AMAO are not feasible, realistic targets, are not based on data that can realistically support an 80 or 90 per cent attainment, and must be amended to reflect realistic targets. Data for 2004-2005 was not available to measure achievement of 1 AMAO and 2AMAO, which means the answer to Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years should read NOT ABLE TO DETERMINE

* 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	< n	< n
4	< n	< n
5	< n	< n
6	< n	< n
7	< n	< n
8	18	78.00
H.S.	< n	< n

Comments: High School data is not available at this time, but the data will be provided at a later date.

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	< n	< n
4	< n	< n
5	< n	< n
6	< n	< n
7	< n	< n
8	18	100.00
H.S.	< n	< n

Comments: High School data is not available at this time, but the data will be provided at a later date.

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: Sources of Data:

- Maine School Incidence of Prohibited Behavior Data (reported expulsions) collected during 2003-04; 2004-05 and 2005-06.

- Maine Gun Free Schools Reports collected during 2003-04; 2004-05 and 2005-06.

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	87.22
American Indian or Alaska Native	78.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	88.20
Black, non-Hispanic	85.60
Hispanic	78.00
White, non-Hispanic	86.20
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	83.50
Female	88.80

Comments: Data for SWD, LEP, Econ.Disadvantaged and Migrant subgroups not available for 2004-2005. We are working to develop a system to capture this data for ensuing years. Only students with regular diplomas count as graduates.

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	2.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.60
Black, non-Hispanic	4.00
Hispanic	4.60
White, non-Hispanic	2.70
Students with Disabilities	3.30
Limited English Proficient	1.40
Economically Disadvantaged	3.20
Migrant	0.00
Male	3.20
Female	2.40

Comments: This data was researched by our contractor and is correct to the best of our knowledge. 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

School year is the "fiscal year commencing on July 1st and ending on June 30th."

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	290	166
LEAs with Subgrants	3	3

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	62	10
1	67	14
2	56	16
3	61	16
4	53	15
5	54	10
6	44	0
7	81	20
8	92	16
9	119	12
10	122	12
11	131	< n
12	116	13

Comments: adult educaton 83

subgrants are students of high shcool age grades 9-12 who may attend adult ed, sorted by age not grade placement

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	415	132
Doubled-up	415	73
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	31	13
Hotels/Motels	111	< n
Unknown	33	21

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	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	< n
10	< n
11	< n
12	10

Comments: 2 of the 3 subgrants report numbers as high school age not grade level, those equal 39 youth, 47 in adult education. Numbers above reflect 1 subgrant only.

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

0

Comments: subgrants are high school age youth

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

115

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)

Comments: Information not available

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)	42
English Language Learners (ELL)	< n
Gifted and Talented	< n
Vocational Education	< n

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	3
Expedited evaluations	0
Staff professional development and awareness	3
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	3
Transportation	2
Early childhood programs	0
Assistance with participation in school programs	3
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	1
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	3
Coordination between schools and agencies	3
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	2
Clothing to meet a school requirement	1
School supplies	3
Referral to other programs and services	3
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional)	3
Comments: assistance with employment, legal aid 1, transition planning for life	

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	1
School selection	1
Transportation	3
School records	3
Immunizations or other medical records	2
Other enrollment issues	1
Comments: Transportation where no public bus nor taxi service is available, transportation for parenting teens limited	

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
Incarcerated parents	1
Unaccompanied youth without any significant adult	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			
Grade 4			
Grade 5			
Grade 6			
Grade 7			
Grade 8			
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	< n	
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments: Subgrants provide services for high school age youth not grades K-8. Maine's grade 11 test is the SAT, results are not yet processed.

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			
Grade 4			
Grade 5			
Grade 6			
Grade 7			
Grade 8			
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	< n	
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments: SAT is given to Maine's 11th graders, results have not been processed.

* 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.