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## Report Objectives and Design

State Education Indicators With a Focus on Title I 2003-04 is the ninth in a series of reports designed to provide (1) consistent, reliable indicators to allow analysis of trends for each state over time, (2) high quality, comparable state data, and (3) indicator formats designed for use by a diverse audience. Since its inception, the report has provided two-page state profiles that report the same indicators for each state. This 2003-04 report reflects the second year of the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. A full explanation of the indicators and trends included can be found below.

## Title I, Part A

Title I, Part A, is the largest single grant program of the U.S. Department of Education, authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). For over 40 years, it has provided funds to states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying territories for additional educational support for the neediest children. In 2004, the $\$ 14$ billion program served over 15 million students in nearly all school districts and nearly half of all public schools.

## NCLB Accountability Requirements

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which reauthorized the ESEA, requires states to develop an accountability system for all students. As part of their accountability system, states must test students in grades 3-8 and once in grades 10-12 in reading (or language arts) and mathematics by 200506, although in 2003-04 states were only required to test students once in grades 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12.
$\vdots$ Beginning in 2007-08, states will be required to test students in science once in grades $3-5$, once in grades 6-9, and once in grades 10-12. States must also track student progress on an "other academic indicator." $N C L B$ requires states to use graduation rates as the additional indicator in high schools but allows states to select an other measure for elementary and middle schools. Results on assessments and other academic indicators are reported to parents and the public for all students in a school by student subgroups, race or ethnicity, poverty, gender, and migrant status.

States must set annual targets for school and district performance that lead all students to proficiency on state reading and mathematics assessments by the 2013-14 school year. Schools and districts that do not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) towards this goal for two consecutive years are identified as needing improvement and are subject to increasing levels of interventions designed to improve performance and increase options for students and parents.

After two consecutive years of missing AYP, schools are required to notify parents that in most cases they may choose to enroll their child in another public school in the district, thereby exercising their right to public school choice under NCLB. If an identified school misses AYP for a third year, the district is required to provide supplemental educational services to students from low-income families in the school, which may include tutoring or other after-school academic programming provided by public or private organizations or firms.

After a fourth year of missing AYP, a school is subject to corrective action, where the district implements at least one statutorily required strategy to improve
student learning, such as introducing new curricula or replacing staff. After a fifth year of missing AYP, schools begin planning for restructuring and after a sixth year they implement their restructuring plan, which may include replacing all or most of the staff, reopening the school as a charter school or other major reforms. If at any point a school under review makes AYP for two consecutive years, it exits improvement status and is no longer subject to these consequences. The school, however, must continue to demonstrate progress and consistently meet annual performance targets or it will reenter the first stage of improvement after missing AYP for two consecutive years.

It is important to note that the law allows states to establish the rules that determine if schools make AYP: the state designs its statewide assessment system, defines proficiency levels for students, and designates the other academic indicator for schools and districts. Assessments and accountability systems are not necessarily comparable state-to-state.

## Guide to State Indicator Profiles

The state profiles in this report contain key indicators for K -12 public education. They focus on the status of each indicator as of the 2003-04 school year, and many indicators also include data for a baseline year for the purpose of analyzing trends over time. The sources section at the end of the publication provides more detailed information and explanations for the indicators. The indicators in each state profile are organized into seven categories.

## Districts and Schools

The indicators in this category provide a statewide picture of characteristics of the public K-12 school system as of 2003-04, including the number of districts, public schools, and charter schools in the state. A comparison number from 1993-94 is provided to give a picture of how the state's school systems have changed over time, and to reflect change since the 1994 ESEA reauthorization. These data are from the Common Core of Data (CCD), collected from state departments of education by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

## Finances

Four financial data elements are included in this report: total current expenditures, including instructional, noninstructional, and support; per-pupil expenditures; sources of funding; and Title I, Part A, allocation. These figures provide a picture of school finances for each state, demonstrating how funding is distributed, as well as the relationship between federal funding allocations and state and local resources. Data are collected from CCD surveys through NCES and the Budget Office of the U. S. Department of Education. 1993-94 data have been adjusted to reflect inflation for 2003-04.

## Students

An important aspect of the accountability system requirements under NCLB is the disaggregation of student achievement results by student subgroup. This section of the profile reports student enrollment across grades, as well as trends in the student
populations in each state, particularly characteristics of students by race or ethnicity, poverty, disability status, English language proficiency, and migrant status. The bar graph showing counts of public schools by the percentage of students eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch program (i.e., students from low-income families) is useful for reviewing the disaggregated student achievement results reported on the second page of each profile. Data on students in each state are collected from several sources, including NCES, program offices within the U. S. Department of Education, and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

## Staff

This section provides information about educators, including the number of teachers and non-teaching staff in each state from data collected by NCES through the CCD. A third data element, the percentage of teachers with a major in the main subject taught, grades 7-12, is reported from results of the Schools and Staffing Survey, a periodic sample survey of teachers and schools conducted by NCES.

The final figure in this section, percentage of core courses taught by highly qualified teachers, 200304, was reported by states through the Consolidated State Performance Report. In 2003-04, NCLB required that all newly hired teachers in assignments supported with Title I, Part A, funds be "highly qualified," and by 2005-06 all teachers teaching in core academic subjects had to be "highly qualified." NCLB provides a framework by which states label teachers as "highly qualified." Since the law requires each state to create its own rubric for evaluating
experienced teachers, these indicators are not comparable across states.

## Outcomes

Three measures of student outcomes are reported in the national and state profiles: the high school "event" dropout rate; the averaged freshman graduation rate, a calculation of high school graduation rates; and the college-going rate.

The high school dropout rate is based on the CCD "event rate" that reports the annual percent of students in grades 9-12 that drop out of school. This measure may underestimate the actual number of students that drop out of high school, because it indicates only the percent of students that dropped out of high school within a single year and not the cumulative dropout rate for each student cohort over a lifetime.

An alternate estimate of student attrition, the averaged freshman graduation rate, is reported for comparison purposes. The indicator is a new calculation from NCES. It uses aggregate student enrollment data to estimate the size of an incoming freshman class and aggregate counts of the number of regular diplomas awarded four years later. While the averaged freshman graduation rate is the best measure of the graduation rate that is currently available, it has several flaws that affect its accuracy and reliability. The calculation for each state is based on local definitions of what constitutes a high school diploma, which vary considerably. For example, this definition may or may not include students graduating with a GED or other alternative credential. The graduation rate also does not take into account student mobil-
ity across districts or states, or into or out of private schools, nor does it include students who repeated a grade in high school or those who graduated early. Another outcome provided is the college-going rate, which measures the percent of high school graduates in a state enrolled in any postsecondary education institution in the fall of the following school year, as reported by NCES.

Finally, this section also includes test results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and mathematics, which are comparable across states. Prior to the passage of NCLB, state participation in NAEP was voluntary and reading and mathematics tests were given in four-year cycles. Under NCLB, each state is now required to participate in each two-year cycle of the NAEP, starting with 2002 for reading and 2003 for mathematics. The NAEP for these subjects is administered to a representative sample of students in each state (approximately 2,000 students), producing state-level scores for grades 4 and 8 reading and mathematics. Data for 1994 (reading) and 1996 (mathematics) NAEP are provided in order to show trends, as these years are closest to the 1993-94 baseline used for the remainder of the report.

## Statewide Accountability Information

The first column on the second page of each state profile provides a snapshot of state accountability systems for the 2003-04 school year, the second year of NCLB implementation. Accountability information is presented for each state, including the name of the state's accountability system, the assessments used, the subjects included for state-level accountability
determinations, and the performance levels used to report student achievement.

This section provides information on accountability goals for one grade in elementary, middle, and high school (the same as the assessment data reported in the second column of the second page of each profile) in reading or language arts (or the state's equivalent) and mathematics. The annual measurable objective (AMO) target provides an indication of how many students in each student group must perform at or above the state-defined proficient level for 2003-04 in order to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) on the state's trajectory toward 100 percent proficiency by 2013-14. The starting point of the trajectory for most states was 2001-02, and the target for 2003-04 is also displayed. The latter number is useful for reviewing the achievement information presented in the second column on the second page.

Accountability results are based on school and district performance against three criteria: disaggregated student assessment results, student participation on state assessments, and performance on the other indicator selected by the state. Any consequences are applied in the following school year. The middle part of this column provides information on school and district performance, including the number that made AYP, the number identified for improvement (due to missing AYP two or more years in a row), and the number that exited school improvement status (after making AYP two years in a row). It is important to note that since it takes two years for schools to exit their improvement status, a school could be counted in the "Made AYP" section and one of the levels of school improvement. Further, schools that "Exited
improvement status" are also counted in the "Made AYP" totals in this section.

Each state chooses its own assessment, sets its own learning standards, and determines the level of proficiency expected of its students. As a result, adequate yearly progress (AYP) results, as well as annual measurable objectives (AMOs) and targets are not comparable from state-to-state. Each state's accountability plan under NCLB is reviewed by the U.S. Department of Education. States can annually submit requests for amendments to their accountability plans. Complete information on each state's current accountability plan and decision letters regarding amendments can be viewed online at http://www.ed.gov/admins/ lead/account/stateplans03/index.html. Summary information on all the state accountability plans and state report cards can be viewed at http://www.ccsso. org/projects/Accountability_Systems.

## Student Achievement 2003-04

The second column on page 2 of the profile includes state student assessment information-the name of the state assessment, the subject assessed, and disaggregated results for one grade in elementary, middle, and high school are provided in this section. Due to limited space, the profile does not include all disaggregated scores and grades assessed, though this information is located on the Web site associated with this publication. (See page ii for the address.) However, NCLB does require the assessment of all students in grades 3-8 and once in grades 10-12 in reading or language arts and mathematics by 2005-06. For accountability purposes these assessment results are reported in state-defined performance levels by the following categories: all students
and students disaggregated by economic disadvantage, limited English proficiency, disability, migratory status, gender, and race or ethnicity. (While reporting by migrant status and gender is required by $N C L B$, these two indicators are not used in determining AYP.) In the 2003-04 school year, all states reported in all of these accountability reporting categories, according to the guidelines of $N C L B$.

To illustrate recent academic trends, two charts are provided, showing a three-year trend, where available, for the percentage of students achieving at the state's proficient level or above in reading and mathematics for one grade each in elementary, middle school, and high school. The online version of this report features all grades and subjects reported by the state to the U. S. Department of Education in the annual Consolidated State Performance Report.

## Nationwide Data

In addition to providing individual state profiles, this report also includes three tables that provide national summary information. Table 1 on page 2 provides a summary of state assessments, the number of levels for which student achievement is reported, and the number of years consistent data is available.
Table 2 on page 4 provides a summary of student performance in elementary and middle schools at the proficient level or higher by state. Table 3 on page 6 provides a summary of student achievement trends for elementary reading or language arts and middle grades mathematics from 1995-96 through 2003-04 for states that have used consistent tests, standards, and performance levels. Finally, Table 4 on page 8 provides a table of links to state reports where disaggregated state reporting data are located.

The Council of Chief State School Officers received valuable contributions from many organizations and individuals in preparing State Education Indicators With a Focus on Title I 2003-04. We consider the report a collaborative effort.

We received strong support from chief state school officers, state assessment directors, and state Title I directors for the idea of a 50 -state report profiling key statewide education indicators and indicators of progress of Title I programs. States provided excellent cooperation in reporting not only the state assessment data required under Title I but also further details about state assessment systems and student demographics that provide the context for analyzing assessment results. State education staff carefully reviewed the data in the state profiles and provided important suggestions for improving the report, and we thank them for their continued assistance which makes the profiles possible.

Funding support for the State Education Indicators report was provided under a task order from the U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service. We very much appreciate the guidance and assistance provided by staff in the Policy and Program Studies Service, especially Jessica Hausman and Adrienne Hosek, as well as staff from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, especially Mary Moran and Chuck Laster. The National Center for Education Statistics provided access to data files from the Common Core of Data, NAEP, and Schools and Staffing Survey, and we particularly thank John Sietsema and Lee Hoffman for their assistance. The database for the state profiles was developed in collaboration with Westat, Inc., and we appreciate the efforts of Beth Sinclair, Nina Blecher, and Babette Gutmann in data collection and project support.
: We appreciate the support and encouragement from : our Technical Working Group, who contributed signifi: cantly to the profile redesign: Dale Carlson, Kerstin Le: Floch, Peter Prowda, Pat Roschewski, Lani Seikaly, Beth : Sinclair, Robin Taylor, Lee Hoffman, Daphne Kaplan,
: Joseph McCrary, Mary Moran, and Stephanie Stullich.
: The data were proofed by Carla Toye, Nina de las Alas, : and Carlise Smith. The state assessment directors, Title : I coordinators, and CCD coordinators reviewed the : profiles and proofed the state assessment data. The : EIMAC subcommittee on assessment, co-chaired by : Sally Tiel (Idaho) and Louis Fabrizio (North Carolina), : reviewed the design and offered suggestions.
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Assessments

| Table 1: State Assessments, Number of Student Proficiency Levels, and Years of Consistent Assessment Data, 2003-04 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | State assessment* | Number of student proficiency levels | Years of consistent data |
| Alabama | Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test, Alabama High School Graduation Exam | 4 | - |
| Alaska | Alaska Benchmark Exams | 4 | 3 |
| Arizona | Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards | 4 | 2 |
| Arkansas | Arkansas Benchmark Exams | 4 | 2 |
| California | California Standards Tests, California High School Exit Exam | 5 | 4 |
| Colorado | Colorado Student Assessment Program | 4 | 2 |
| Connecticut | Connecticut Mastery Test | 5 | 5 |
| Delaware | Delaware Student Testing Program | 5 | 5 |
| District of Columbia | Stanford 9 | 4 | 2 |
| Florida | Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test | 5 | 4 |
| Georgia | Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests, Georgia High School Graduation Tests | 3 | 5 |
| Hawaii | Hawaii Content and Performance Standards II | 4 | 3 |
| Idaho | Idaho State Achievement Tests | 3 | 2 |
| Illinois | Illinois Standards Achievement Test | 4 | 6 |
| Indiana | Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus | 3 | 4 |
| Iowa | Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Iowa Tests of Ed. Dev. | 3 | 4 |
| Kansas | Kansas Assessment Program | 5 | 5 |
| Kentucky | Kentucky Core Content Test | 4 | 6 |
| Louisiana | Louisiana Educational Assessment Program | 5 | 4 |
| Maine | Maine Educational Assessment | 4 | 6 |
| Maryland | Maryland School Assessments | 3 | 2 |
| Massachusetts | Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System | 4 | 5 |
| Michigan | Michigan Educational Assessment Program | 4 | 8 |
| Minnesota | Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments | 5 | 7 |
| Mississippi | Mississippi Curriculum Test | 4 | 3 |
| Missouri | Missouri Assessment Program | 5 | 7 |
| Montana | Montana Comprehensive Assessment System | 4 | 4 |
| Nebraska | School-based Teacher-led Assessment and Reporting System (STARS) | 4 | 3 |
| Nevada | Nevada Criterion-Referenced Tests | 4 | 3 |


| State | State assessment* | Number of student proficiency levels | Years of consistent data |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Hampshire | New Hampshire Educational Improvement and Assessment Program | 4 | 2 |
| New Jersey | New Jersey Skills and Knowledge Assessment | 3 | 6 |
| New Mexico | New Mexico Standards Based Assessment | 4 | 2 |
| New York | New York State Tests | 4 | 2 |
| North Carolina | North Carolina End of Grade Mathematics/Reading | 4 | 9 |
| North Dakota | North Dakota State Assessment | 4 | 3 |
| Ohio | Ohio Proficiency Test | 4 | 4 |
| Oklahoma | Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests | 4 | 5 |
| Oregon | Oregon State Assessments | 5 | 4 |
| Pennsylvania | Pennsylvania System of School Assessment | 4 | 4 |
| Puerto Rico | Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento Académico | 3 | 2 |
| Rhode Island | New Standards Reference Exam | 5 | 2 |
| South Carolina | Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test | 4 | 6 |
| South Dakota | Dakota State Test of Educational Progress | 4 | 2 |
| Tennessee | Tennessee Achievement Test | 3 | 2 |
| Texas | Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills | 3 | 2 |
| Utah | Utah Performance Assessment System for Students | 4 | 2 |
| Vermont | New Standards Reference Examinations | 5 | 2 |
| Virginia | Standards of Learning Assessments | 3 | 7 |
| Washington | Washington Assessment of Student Learning | 4 | 4 |
| West Virginia | WESTEST | 5 | - |
| Wisconsin | Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations | 4 | 6 |
| Wyoming | Wyoming Comprehensive Assessment System | 4 | 3 |
| Nation (50 states plus the |  | 3 levels: 9 states | 2-3 years: 23 states |
| District of Columbia and |  | 4 levels: 30 states | 4-6 years: 22 states |
| Puerto Rico) |  | $5+$ levels: 12 states | More than 6 years: 5 states |

*More information on assessments can be found in state profiles beginning on page 14.
State Assessment; Student Achievement Levels; Years of Consistent Data Source: State assessment results submitted in the Consolidated State Performance Report, Section B, 2003-04, and follow-up by CCSSO, State Education Accountability Reports and Indicator Reports: Status of Reports Across the States, 2003.

Note: The column showing "Years of Consistent Data" indicates the number of years that the state had a consistent test in the same grades and a consistent definition of proficient in at least one subject and grade included in this report. See state profiles beginning on page 14 for more details. In states with separate years of consistent data by subject, the highest number of years of consistent data was used for the national total.

## Summary of student performance 2003-04

Table 2: Percentage of Students Achieving At or Above Each State's Proficient Level, by Grade Level, in Reading and Mathematics, 2003-04

| State | Grade 3 |  | Grade 4 |  | Grade 5 |  | Grade 6 |  | Grade 7 |  | Grade 8 |  | High school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math |
| Alabama | - | - | 77\% | 72\% | - | - | 82\% | 56\% | - | - | 58\% | - | 87\% ${ }^{\text { }}$ | $78 \%{ }^{\text { }}$ |
| Alaska | 74\% | 72\% | 71\% | 65\% | 71\% | 65\% | 70\% | 65\% | 70\% | 65\% | 68\% | 64\% | 70\% | 67\% |
| Arizona | 64\% | 57\% | - | - | 47\% | 43\% | - | - | - | - | 46\% | 25\% | 60\% | 40\% |
| Arkansas | - | - | 68\% | 64\% | - | - | 41\% | 40\% | - | - | 51\% | 31\% | 45\% | 53\% |
| California | 31\% | 49\% | 40\% | 45\% | 41\% | 38\% | 36\% | 35\% | 37\% | 33\% | 33\% | 29\% | 49\% | 45\% |
| Colorado | 93\% | - | 89\% | - | 89\% | 89\% | 89\% | 83\% | 86\% | 78\% | 87\% | 71\% | 88\% ${ }^{*}$ | 63\%* |
| Connecticut | - | - | 69\% | 80\% | - | - | 74\% | 82\% | - | - | 77\% | 77\% | 79\% | 76\% |
| Delaware | 82\% | 78\% | - | - | 85\% | 75\% | - | - | - | - | 71\% | 50\% | 71\%* | 53\%* |
| District of Columbia | 47\% | 59\% | 43\% | 52\% | 43\% | 50\% | 46\% | 55\% | 36\% | 39\% | 40\% | 38\% | 23\% | 35\% |
| Florida | 66\% | 64\% | 70\% | 64\% | 59\% | 53\% | 55\% | 46\% | 53\% | 50\% | 45\% | 57\% | 34\%* | 62\%* |
| Georgia | 89\% | 89\% | 81\% | 76\% | 85\% | 83\% | 76\% | 73\% | 84\% | 77\% | 83\% | 73\% | 93\% | 92\% |
| Hawaii | 47\% | 27\% | - | - | 50\% | 23\% | - | - | - | - | 39\% | 20\% | 43\% | 21\% |
| Idaho | 87\% | 86\% | 82\% | 84\% | - | - | - | - | 74\% | 69\% | 82\% | 66\% | 78\% ${ }^{*}$ | 71\%* |
| Illinois | 65\% | 79\% | - | - | 59\% | 69\% | - | - | - | - | 67\% | 54\% | $57 \%{ }^{\text { }}$ | $52 \%{ }^{\text {t }}$ |
| Indiana | 74\% | 71\% | - | - | - | - | 69\% | 72\% | - | - | 65\% | 71\% | 69\% | 67\% |
| lowa | - | - | 77\% | 77\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 69\% | 72\% | 77\% | 79\% |
| Kansas | - | - | - | 80\% | 71\% | - | - | - | - | 64\% | 74\% | - | $61 \%{ }^{\text {+ }}$ | 49\% ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ |
| Kentucky | - | - | 67\% | - | - | 48\% | - | - | 60\% | - | - | 33\% | 34\% | 37\% |
| Louisiana | - | - | 63\% | 63\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50\% | 60\% | 61\% | 62\% |
| Maine | - | - | 50\% | 32\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 37\% | 22\% | 48\% | 25\% |
| Maryland | 71\% | 72\% | 75\% | 70\% | 68\% | 63\% | 68\% | 50\% | 61\% | 50\% | 64\% | 46\% | 66\% | 48\% |
| Massachusetts | 64\% | - | 56\% | 43\% | - | - | - | 43\% | 69\% | - | - | 39\% | 63\% | 58\% |
| Michigan | - | - | 62\% | 71\% | - | - | - | - | 55\% | - | - | 61\% | 62\% | 51\% |
| Minnesota | 73\% | 70\% | - | - | 76\% | 74\% | - | - | 70\% | 67\% | - | - | 78\% | 70\% |
| Mississippi | 84\% | 93\% | 88\% | 80\% | 86\% | 68\% | 77\% | 71\% | 63\% | 54\% | 62\% | 60\% | 39\% | 55\% |
| Missouri | 35\% | - | - | 40\% | - | - | - | - | 32\% | - | - | 14\% | 23\% | 15\% |


| State | Grade 3 |  | Grade 4 |  | Grade 5 |  | Grade 6 |  | Grade 7 |  | Grade 8 |  | High school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math |
| Montana | - | - | 66\% | 45\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 58\% | 64\% | 63\% ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ | 60\% ${ }^{+}$ |
| Nebraska | - | - | 85\% | 87\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 83\% | 81\% | 81\% | 76\% |
| Nevada | 45\% | 45\% | 40\% | - | 44\% | 50\% | - | - | - | - | 50\% | 48\% | 77\% | 58\% |
| New Hampshire | 73\% | 84\% | - | - | - | - | 74\% | 72\% | - | - | - | - | 78\% | 65\% |
| New Jersey | 79\% | 77\% | 82\% | 72\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 72\% | 62\% | 82\% | 70\% |
| New Mexico | - | - | 49\% | 55\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 56\% | 49\% | 55\%* | 46\%* |
| New York** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Carolina | 82\% | 88\% | 83\% | 93\% | 88\% | 92\% | 80\% | 89\% | 85\% | 84\% | 88\% | 84\% | 66\% | 71\% |
| North Dakota | - | - | 81\% | 65\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 72\% | 46\% | 54\% | 37\% |
| Ohio | - | - | 71\% | 66\% | - | - | 65\% | 66\% | - | - | - | - | 79\% | 68\% |
| Oklahoma | 56\% | 55\% | - | - | 66\% | 71\% | - | - | - | - | 73\% | 69\% | 54\% | 23\% |
| Oregon | 82\% | 81\% | - | - | 76\% | 78\% | - | - | - | - | 59\% | 59\% | 50\% | 42\% |
| Pennsylvania | - | - | - | - | 63\% | 62\% | - | - | - | - | 69\% | 58\% | 61\% ${ }^{+}$ | 49\% ${ }^{+}$ |
| Puerto Rico | 50\% | 60\% | 53\% | 56\% | 54\% | 34\% | 45\% | 53\% | 31\% | 39\% | 30\% | 35\% | $43 \%{ }^{\text {+ }}$ | $33 \%{ }^{\dagger}$ |
| Rhode Island | - | - | 67\% | 51\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 52\% | 39\% | 53\% | 44\% |
| South Carolina | 36\% | 30\% | 38\% | 36\% | 27\% | 32\% | 29\% | 38\% | 25\% | 32\% | 26\% | 22\% | 58\% | 52\% |
| South Dakota | 78\% | 74\% | 87\% | 78\% | 77\% | 74\% | 77\% | 65\% | 72\% | 66\% | 78\% | 66\% | $73 \%{ }^{+}$ | $73 \%{ }^{+}$ |
| Tennessee | 84\% | 81\% | 81\% | 80\% | 83\% | 84\% | 81\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 81\% | 83\% | 87\% | 74\% |
| Texas | 90\% | 94\% | 85\% | 85\% | 79\% | 81\% | 86\% | 77\% | 83\% | 80\% | 89\% | 66\% | 82\%* | 67\% ${ }^{+}$ |
| Utah | 76\% | 74\% | 76\% | 77\% | 76\% | $72 \%$ | 76\% | 72\% | 79\% | 76\% | 77\% | 70\% | 75\%* | $64 \%^{\dagger}$ |
| Vermont | - | - | 82\% | 75\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 69\% | 73\% | 52\%* | $64 \%{ }^{\dagger}$ |
| Virginia | 71\% | 87\% | - | - | 85\% | 78\% | - | - | - | - | 72\% | 80\% | $89 \%{ }^{+}$ | $84 \%{ }^{\dagger}$ |
| Washington | - | - | 74\% | 60\% | - | - | - | - | 61\% | 46\% | - | - | 65\% | 44\% |
| West Virginia | 77\% | 72\% | 73\% | 69\% | 76\% | 71\% | 78\% | 63\% | 79\% | 65\% | 80\% | 69\% | 77\% | 64\% |
| Wisconsin | 85\% | - | 81\% | 73\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 79\% | 65\% | 69\%* | 69\%* |
| Wyoming | - | - | 44\% | 39\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 51\% | 41\% | 57\% ${ }^{+}$ | $45 \%{ }^{\text {+ }}$ |

*More information on assessments can be found in state profiles beginning on page 14.
**New York reports data in a proficiency index. See the state profile for more information.

## Student achievement trends

Table 3: Trends in the Percentage of Students Achieving At or Above Each State's Proficient Level, in Elementary Reading or Language Arts and in Middle Grades Mathematics, 1996 to 2004

| State | Test | State term for Proficient** | Subject | Grade | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alaska | Alaska Benchmark Exams | Proficient | Reading | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75\% | 74\% | 74\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 40\% | 64\% | 64\% |
| Arizona | Ariz. Inst. to Measure Standards | Meets the standard | Reading | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 64\% | 64\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 18\% | 25\% |
| Arkansas | Arkansas Benchmark Exams | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 61\% | 68\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 22\% | 31\% |
| California | California Standards Tests | Proficient | English or Language Arts | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 33\% | 36\% | 39\% | 40\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 29\% | 29\% |
| Colorado | Colo. Student Assessment Program | Proficient | Reading or Language Arts | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 87\% | 89\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 69\% | 71\% |
| Connecticut | Connecticut Mastery Test | Proficient | Reading or Language Arts | 4 | - | - | - | - | 71\% | 71\% | 69\% | 69\% | 69\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | 77\% | 76\% | 77\% | 77\% | 77\% |
| Delaware | Delaware Student Testing Program | Meets the Standard | Reading | 3 | - | - | - | - | 77\% | 75\% | 80\% | 79\% | 82\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | 36\% | 41\% | 43\% | 48\% | 47\% | 50\% |
| D. C. | Stanford 9 | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 46\% | 43\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 40\% | 38\% |
| Florida | Florida Comp. Assessment Test | Level 4 | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 55\% | 61\% | 70\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 53\% | 57\% | 57\% |
| Georgia | Criterion-Referenced Comp. Test | Meets Standard | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | 65\% | 74\% | 77\% | 81\% | 81\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | 54\% | 58\% | 65\% | 67\% | 73\% |
| Hawaii | Hawaii Content and Perf. Standards II | Meets Proficiency | Reading | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 61\% | 43\% | 47\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 52\% | 17\% | 20\% |
| Idaho | Idaho State Achievement Test | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75\% | 82\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 53\% | 66\% |
| Illinois | Illinois Standards Achiev. Test | Meets Standards | Reading | 3 | - | - | - | 61\% | 62\% | 62\% | 63\% | 60\% | 65\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | 43\% | 47\% | 50\% | 52\% | 52\% | 54\% |
| Indiana | Ind. Statewide Testing for Ed. Prog. Plus | Pass | English or Language Arts | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 66\% | 72\% | 74\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 66\% | 66\% | 71\% |


| State | Test | State term for Proficient** | Subject | Grade | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| lowa | Iowa Tests of Basic Skills | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 68\% | 69\% | 76\% | 77\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | 74\% | 73\% | 72\% | 72\% |
| Kansas | Kansas Assessment Program | Proficient | Reading | 5 | - | - | - | - | 62\% | 63\% | 63\% | 69\% | 71\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 7 | - | - | - | - | 53\% | 57\% | 56\% | 60\% | 64\% |
| Kentucky | Kentucky Core Content Test | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | 32\% | 57\% | 58\% | 60\% | 62\% | 67\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | 33\% | 25\% | 27\% | 26\% | 31\% | 33\% |
| Louisiana | Louisiana Ed. Assess. Program | Basic | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 57\% | 61\% | 63\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 41\% | 52\% | 60\% |
| Maine | Maine Educational Assessment | Meets the Standard | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | 47\% | 45\% | 51\% | 49\% | 49\% | 50\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | 19\% | 21\% | 20\% | 21\% | 18\% | 22\% |
| Maryland | Maryland School Assessments | Proficient | Reading | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 58\% | 71\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 40\% | 46\% |
| Massachusetts | Mass. Comprehensive Assmt. System | Proficient | English or Language Arts | 4 | - | - | - | - | 20\% | 51\% | 54\% | 56\% | 56\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | 34\% | 34\% | 34\% | 37\% | 39\% |
| Michigan | Mich. Educational Assmt. Program | Met Expectations | Reading or Language Arts | 4 | - | 49\% | 59\% | 59\% | 58\% | 60\% | 57\% | 66\% | 62\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 53\% | 54\% | 61\% |
| Minnesota | Minn. Comprehensive Assessments | Level 4 | Reading | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 49\% | 76\% | 73\% |
| Mississippi | Mississippi Curriculum Test | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 84\% | 87\% | 88\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 45\% | 48\% | 60\% |
| Missouri | Missouri Assessment Program | Proficient | Communication Arts | 3 | - | - | - | 29\% | $32 \%$ | 32\% | 36\% | 34\% | 35\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | 13\% | 11\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% |
| Montana | Mont. Comprehensive Assmt. System | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 79\% | 73\% | 77\% | 66\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | 69\% | 68\% | 70\% | 64\% |
| Nebraska | School-based Teacher-led Assessment | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 62\% | 83\% | 85\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 72\% | 75\% | 81\% |
| Nevada | Nevada Criterion Reference Tests | Meets Standard | Reading | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 51\% | 51\% | 45\% |
| New Hampshire | New Hampshire Ed. Impr. Assmt. Prog. | Proficient | Reading | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 77\% | 73\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 74\% | 72\% |
| New Jersey | N. J. Skills and Knowledge Assessment | Proficient | Language Arts Literacy | 4 | - | - | - | 57\% | 55\% | 79\% | 79\% | 78\% | 82\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | 62\% | 60\% | 62\% | 58\% | 57\% | 62\% |


| State | Test | State term for Proficient** | Subject | Grade | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Carolina | N. C. End of Grade/Course Test | Level III | Reading | 4 | 69\% | 68\% | 71\% | 71\% | 72\% | 74\% | 77\% | 81\% | 83\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | 68\% | 69\% | 76\% | 78\% | 80\% | 80\% | 83\% | 82\% | 84\% |
| North Dakota | North Dakota State Assessment | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 74\% | 74\% | 81\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 42\% | 44\% | 46\% |
| Ohio | Ohio Proficiency Test | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 56\% | 66\% | 66\% | 71\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | 61\% | 59\% | 53\% | 66\% |
| Oklahoma | Oklahoma Core Curriculum Test | Satisfactory | Reading | 5 | - | - | - | - | 68\% | 66\% | 63\% | 65\% | 66\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | 65\% | 63\% | 64\% | 65\% | 69\% |
| Oregon | Oregon State Assessments | Meets Standard | Reading | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 84\% | 85\% | 83\% | 82\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | 55\% | 58\% | 59\% | 59\% |
| Pennsylvania | Penn. System of School Assmts. | Proficient | Reading | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 56\% | 57\% | 58\% | 63\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | 51\% | 52\% | 51\% | 58\% |
| Puerto Rico | PPAA | Proficient | Reading | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 53\% | 50\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 35\% | 35\% |
| Rhode Island | New Standards Reference Exam | Achieved the standard | English Language Arts | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 62\% | 67\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 34\% | 39\% |
| South Carolina | Palmetto Achiev. Challenge Test | Proficient | English Language Arts | 4 | - | - | - | 29\% | 37\% | 37\% | 34\% | 32\% | 38\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | 15\% | 20\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 22\% |
| South Dakota | Dakota State Test of Ed. Progress | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 85\% | 87\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 55\% | 66\% |
| Tennessee | Tennessee Achievement Test | Proficient | Reading or Language arts | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 81\% | 84\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 79\% | 83\% |
| Texas | Texas Assmt. of Knowledge and Skills | Met the Standard | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 86\% | 85\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 73\% | 66\% |
| Utah | Utah Perform. Assmt. Sys. for Students | Sufficient | Language arts | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 80\% | 79\% | 76\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 73\% | 70\% |


| State | Test | State term for Proficient** | Subject | Grade | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vermont | New Standards Reference Exams | Achieve the Standard | English \& language arts | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 81\% | 82\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 67\% | 73\% |
| Virginia | Standards of Learning | Pass/Proficient | English | 3 | - | - | 54\% | 61\% | 61\% | 64\% | 71\% | 72\% | 71\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | 61\% | 68\% | 70\% | 75\% | 80\% |
| Washington | Wash. Assmt. of Student Learning | Level 3 | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 67\% | 66\% | 67\% | 74\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | 27\% | 30\% | 37\% | 46\% |
| Wisconsin | Wis. Knowl. and Concepts Exam. | Proficient | Reading | 4 | - | - | - | 81\% | 78\% | 78\% | 79\% | 81\% | 81\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | 43\% | 42\% | 39\% | 44\% | 73\% | 65\% |
| Wyoming | Wyo. Comprehensive Assmt. System | Proficient | English language arts | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 44\% | 41\% | 44\% |
|  |  |  | Mathematics | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 33\% | 35\% | 41\% |

*Note: "Trend" indicates at least one subject and grade in the state has had a consistent test, definitions of proficient, and grade tested across the years reported.
**More information on assessments can be found in state profiles beginning on page 14.

## State report cards

Table 4: Links to State Report Cards for More Information on Student Accountability and Assessment

| State | Web link |
| :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | ftp:///tp.alsde.edu/documents/ReportCards/2003-2004/000.pdf |
| Alaska | http://www.eed.state.ak.us/reportcard/2003-2004/2State\%20Report\%20Card/2003-2004\%20Report\%20Card.pdf |
| Arizona | http://www.ade.az.gov/srcs/statereportcards/reportcard03-04.pdf |
| Arkansas | http://www.as-is.org/reportcard/ |
| California | http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sc/documents/reportcard0304.pdf |
| Colorado | http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/Reports/download/NCLBRptCrd/NCLBRprtCrds0304.pdf |
| Connecticut | http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/nclb/dist_school_nclb_results/index.htm |
| Delaware | http://www.doe.k12.de.us/files/pdf/de edreportcard200304.pdf |
| District of Columbia | http://silicon.k12.dc.us/NCLB/reportcards.asp |
| Florida | http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org |
| Georgia | http:///reportcard.gaosa.org/yr2004/psc/ |
| Hawaii | http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/nclb/2004/AlSch37Cell_ 110104.pdf |
| Idaho | http://www.sde.idaho.gov/ipd/reportcard/SchoolReportCard.asp |
| Illinois | http://webprod1.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/getsearchcriteria.aspx |
| Indiana | http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/ayp2004state.ffm |
| lowa | http://www.state.ia.us/educate/stateboard/doc/pocketcard03.pdf |
| Kansas | http://www.ksde.org/accountability/accountability_report_2003_2004.pdf |
| Kentucky | http://www.education.ky.gov/KDE/Administrative+Resources/Testing+and+Reporting+/Reports/CTBS+5+Reports/default.htm |
| Louisiana | http://www.doe.state.la.us/lde/pair/1989.asp |
| Maine | http://www.state.me.us/education/nclb/reportcard/index.html |
| Maryland | http://mdreportcard.org/ |
| Massachusetts | http://profiles.doe.mass.edu//staterc/ |
| Michigan | http://www.michigan.gov/documents/State_Report_Card_2003-04_120358_7.doc |
| Minnesota | http://education.state.mn.us/ReportCard2005/ |
| Mississippi | http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/Account/RC4B/RC03-04.pdf |
| Missouri | http://dese.mo.gov/schooldata/AnRept04.pdf |
| Montana | http://www.opi.state.mt.us/ReportCard/Index.htm\| |


| State | Web link |
| :---: | :---: |
| Nebraska | http:///reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/20032004/Main/Home.asp |
| Nevada | http://www.nevadareportcard.com/ |
| New Hampshire | http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/curriculum/Assessment/materials04.htm |
| New Jersey | http://education.state.nj. us/r/2004/index.html |
| New Mexico | http://sde.state.nm.us/div/acc. assess/accountability/ayp2004.html |
| New York | http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/repcrd2004/home.shtml |
| North Carolina | http://www.ncreportcards.org/sr//stateDetails.jsp?Page=1\&pYear=2003-2004 |
| North Dakota | http://www.dpistate.nd.us/dpi/reports/profile/0304/ProfileDistrict/99999.pdf |
| Ohio | http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEPrimary.aspx?page=2\&TopicRelation/D=1266 |
| Oklahoma | http://apps.sde.state.ok.us/apireports/default.html |
| Oregon | http://www.ode.state.or.us/data/annreportcard/rptcard2004.pdf |
| Pennsylvania | http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/lib/pas/2004StateReportCard1_27_05.pdf |
| Puerto Rico | Not available |
| Rhode Island | http://www.infoworks.ride.uri.edu/2004/state/default.asp |
| South Carolina | http://ed.sc.gov/topics/researchandstats/schoolreportcard/2004/default.cfm |
| South Dakota | https://sis.ddncampus.net:8081/nclb/portal/portal.xsI?\&extract\|D=5 |
| Tennessee | http://www.k-12.state.tn.us/rptcrd04 |
| Texas | http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/src/2004/campus.srch.html |
| Utah | http://u-pass.schools.utah.gov/u-passweb/UpassServlet |
| Vermont | http://crs.uvm.edu/schlrpt |
| Virginia | https://p1pe.doe.virginia.gov/reportcard/ |
| Washington | http://reportcard.ospi.k 12.wa.us/summary.aspx |
| West Virginia | http://wveis.k12.wv.us/nclb/public04/nclbmenu.cfm |
| Wisconsin | http://www2.dpi.state.wi.us/wsas/default.asp |
| Wyoming | https://wdesecure.k12.wy.us/stats/wde.esc.show_menu |

$\longrightarrow$

## STATE PROFILES

Alabama


## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Alabama's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and 11.
See http://www.alsde.edu/html/reports1.asp?systemcode=000\&schoolcode=0000 for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test and Alabama High School Graduation Exam
State student achievement levels: Not meeting standard, Partially meeting standard, Meeting standard, Exceeding standard

NCLB Accountability Goals
2003-04 Annual measurable objective starting point

> Target $(2003-04)$

| Grade 4 | Reading | objective starting point | (2003-04) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mathematics | $68 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 61 | 61 |
|  | Mathematics | 43 | 43 |
| Grade 11 | Reading | - | - |
|  | Mathematics | 81 | 81 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences* | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | 212 (25\%) | 319 (23\%) | 0 |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 35 (4\%) | 35 (*) | 0 |
| Year 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Corrective action | $7{ }^{(*)}$ | (*) | 0 |
| Restructuring | 37 (4\%) | 37 (3\%) | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice after being identified for improvement) | n/a | n/a | n/a |

## Student Achievement 2003-04

: Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test, Alabama High School Graduation
: Exam, used for NCLB accountability

## Reading

Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 Grade 11
: All students
$77 \%$
68
Economically disadvantaged student
Migrant students
57
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
47
65
65
85 $58 \%$
42
$87 \%$
White, non-Hispanic

Mathematics
Grade 8
Grade 11

| Proficient level or above for: | Grade 4 | Grade 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All students | Grade |  |
| n/a | $78 \%$ |  |


| All students | n/a | $78 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

62
students
63
31
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
58
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { White, non-Hispanic } & 61 & \text { n/a } \\ \text { n/a }\end{array}$

| Other indicator, 2003-04 | State target | State outcome |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance | At or progress toward 95\%. | Met |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | At or progress toward 95\%. | Met |
| High school indicator: Dropout rate | Less than 10\% or progress toward goal. Met |  |
| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |
| Title I school choice: | 740 | $3 \%$ |
| Supplemental educational services: | 1,616 | $26 \%$ |
| *Some AYP outcomes for this state are not available due to issues with data collection, measurement, |  |  |
| or other reasons. For more information please visit the state's Web site, above. |  |  |

Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above

n/a 2003
n/a 2002

Alaska


## Statewide Accountability Information

| See Appendix B for Alaska's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 3,8 , and HS See http://www.eed.state.ak.us//tats/ for more details on the statewide accountability system. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| State assessment for NCLB accountability: Alaska Benchmark Exams, High School Qualifying Exam <br> State student achievement levels: Far Below Proficient, Below Proficient, Proficient, Advanced |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| NCLB Accountability Goals |  |  |  |
| 2001-02 Annual measurable objective starting point |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Target } \\ (2003-04) \end{gathered}$ |
| Grade 3 | Reading | 64.03\% | 64.03\% |
|  | Mathematics | 54.86 | 54.86 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 64.03 | 64.03 |
|  | Mathematics | 54.86 | 54.86 |
| High schoo | Reading | 64.03 | 64.03 |
|  | Mathematics | 54.86 | 54.86 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | $172(57 \%)$ | $292(59 \%)$ | $21(40 \%)$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | $68(23 \%)$ | $122(25 \%)$ | $25(46 \%)$ |  |  |
| Year 2 | $40(13 \%)$ | 41 | $(8 \%)$ | 4 | $(7 \%)$ |
| Corrective action | 8 | $(3 \%)$ | 8 | $(2 \%)$ | 2 |
| Restructuring | 8 | $(3 \%)$ | 8 | $(2 \%)$ | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |

after being identified for improvement)

| Other indicator, 2003-04 | State target | State outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary indicator: Average daily attendance. Middle school indicator: Average daily attendance. High school indicator: Graduation rate. | endance. $85 \%$ <br> attendance. $85 \%$ <br>  $55.58 \%$ | Met <br> Met <br> Met |
| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students Perc | eligible students |
| Title I school choice: Supplemental educational services: | $\begin{array}{r} 26 \\ 475 \end{array}$ | 7\% |

Student Achievement 2003-04
Alaska Benchmark Exams, used for NCLB accountability

## Reading

| : Proficient level or above for: | Grade 3 | Grade 8 | High school |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All students | $74 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $70 \%$ |
| : Economically disadvantaged students | 60 | 48 | 47 |
| Migrant students | 53 | 44 | 69 |
| S Students with disabilities | 44 | 25 | 29 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 45 | 32 | 46 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 71 | 55 | 58 |
| : Hispanic students | 69 | 61 | 61 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 84 | 80 | 82 |

White, non-Hispanic 84
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above
$100 \%$


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 8 High school
All students $72 \%$ 64\%

| $:$ Economically disadvantaged students | 59 | 45 | 47 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $:$ Migrant students | 54 | 48 | 55 |
| Stitict | 54 | 20 | 23 |

Students with disabilities 51
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
: Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above .


Arizona



Arkansas




California

## Districts and schools

| Number of districts (CCD) | $\begin{array}{r} 1993-94 \\ 1,002 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2003-04 \\ 989 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of public schools (CCD) |  |  |
| Elementary | 4,943 | 5,580 |
| Middle | 1,101 | 1,341 |
| High | 1,382 | 1,839 |
| Combined | 167 | 446 |
| Other | 141 | 16 |
| Total | 7,734 | 9,222 |

Number of charter schools (CCD)

## Finances

Total current expenditures 1993-94 (CCD, in thousands of dollars, adjusted for inflation to 2002-03)

| Instructional | $\$ 19,149,210$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| Noninstructional | $1,339,019$ |
| Support | $11,545,974$ |
| Total | $32,034,203$ |

Per-pupil expenditures
\$6,013
(CCD, adjusted for inflation to 2002-03)


Title I allocation 2002-03
(ED; Incudes Tite I, Part A)
KEY: * = Less than 0.5 percent
$\begin{aligned} & *=\text { Less than } 0.5 \text { p } \\ &-\quad=\text { Not applicable }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} \bar{n} / \mathrm{a} & =\text { Not applicable } \\ & =\text { Not available }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} & =\text { Not available } \\ \# & =\text { Sample size too small to calculate }\end{aligned}$
FTE = Full Time Equivalent


## California



## Colorado

## Districts and schools

| Number of districts <br> (CCD) | $1993-94$ <br> 176 |
| ---: | ---: |
| Number of public schools (CCD) |  |
| Elementary | 817 |
| Middle | 246 |
| High | 278 |
| Combined | 14 |
| Other | 18 |
| Total | 1,373 |

Number of charter schools (CCD)
Finances
Total current expenditures 1993-94
(CCD, in thousands of dollars, adjusted for inflation to 2002-03)


Title I allocation 2002-03
(ED; Incudes Titel 1 , Part A)
\$104,115,332

KEY: * = Less than 0.5 percent
$\begin{aligned} * & =\text { Less than } 0.5 \text { p } \\ \overline{n / a} & =\text { Not applicable } \\ \text { n } & =\text { Not available }\end{aligned}$
n/a $=$ Not available
$\begin{aligned} \# & =\text { Sample size too sma } \\ \text { FTE } & =\text { Full Time Equivalent }\end{aligned}$


[^0]| $\vdots$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Staff |  |  |  |
| $\vdots$ |  |  |  |
| Number of FTE |  | $1993-94$ | $2003-04$ |
| $\vdots$ | teachers (CCD) | Elementary | 16,771 |
|  | Middle | 7,267 | 22,185 |
| $\vdots$ | High | 9,088 | 12,177 |
| $\vdots$ | Combined | 112 | 1,436 |
| $\vdots$ | Other | 195 | 25 |
| $\vdots$ | Total | 33,433 | 44,910 |
| Number of FTE non-teacher staff (ccD) |  |  |  |
| $\vdots$ | Instructional aides | 4,995 | 10,216 |
| $\vdots$ | Instructional coordinators | 670 | 963 |
| $\vdots$ | Administrators | 2,592 | 3,356 |
| $\vdots$ | Other | 21,102 | 30,091 |
|  | Total | 29,359 | 44,626 |

: Percentage of teachers with a major in the main subject

| $:$ taught, grades 7-12 (sASS) | 1994 | 2000 |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\vdots$ | English | $91 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| $\vdots$ | Mathematics | 65 | 68 |
| $\vdots$ | Science | 78 | 72 |
| $\vdots$ | Social studies | 61 | 88 |

: Percentage of core courses taught by highly qualified
: teachers, 2003-04 (As defined and reported by states, collected by ED)

| $:$ | All schools | $91 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| $\vdots$ | High-poverty schools | $90 \%$ |
| Low-poverty schools | $92 \%$ |  |


| : Outcomes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 93-94 | 2000-01 |
| : High school dropout rate (nces) |  | n/a |
| : Avg. freshman graduation rate (NCE | -5) $77 \%$ | 73\% |
| : College-going rate (IPEDS/NCES) | 52 | 53 |
| - NAEP state results (NCES) |  |  |
| - Reading, Grade 4 | 1994 | 2005 |
| : Proficient level or above | 28\% | 36\% |
| : Basic level or above | 59 | 69 |
| - Math, Grade 8 | 1996 | 2005 |
| : Proficient level or above | 25\% | 32\% |
| Basic level or above | 67 | 70 |

## Statewide Accountability Information

Student Achievement 2003-04
Colorado Student Assessment Program, used for NCLB accountability

| See Appendix B for Colorado's definitions of proficient for reading, grades 4,8 , and 10 and mathematics, grades 5, 8, and 10 . |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| See http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/Reports/nclbstaterpt.asp for more details on the statewide accountability system. |  |  |  |
| State assessment for NCLB accountability: Colorado StudentAssessment Program and Colorado Student Assessment Program Alternate State student achievement levels: Unsatisfactory, Partially Proficient, Proficient, Advanced (CSAP); Inconclusive, Exploring, Emerging, Developing, Novice (CSAPA) |  |  |  |
| NCLB Accountability Goals |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable objective starting point | $\begin{gathered} \text { Target } \\ (2003-04) \end{gathered}$ |
| Grade 4 | Reading | 76.92\% | 76.92\% |
|  | Mathematics | 75.86 | 75.86 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 73.61 | 73.61 |
|  | Mathematics | 59.51 | 59.51 |
| Grade 10 | Reading | 79.65 | 79.65 |
|  | Mathematics | 47 | 47 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | $493(79 \%)$ | $1,440(79 \%)$ | $115(63 \%)$ |  |  |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Year 1 | 40 | $(6 \%)$ | 40 | $(2 \%)$ | $57(31 \%)$ |
| Year 2 | 19 | $(3 \%)$ | 19 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |
| Corrective action | 27 | $(4 \%)$ | 27 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |
| $\quad$ Restructuring | 3 | $(*)$ | 3 | $(*)$ | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice | 28 | $(4 \%)$ | 28 | $(2 \%)$ | 0 | after being identified for improvement)


| Other indicator, 2003-04 |  | State target | State outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary and Middle school indicator: Percentage of students in the advanced category on the CSAP. |  | 1\% or greater | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate. |  | 55.3\% or greater | Met |
| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students |  |  |
| Title I school choice: | 368 |  | 1\% |
| Supplemental educational services: | 2,149 |  | 13\% |

## Reading or language arts

| $:$ Proficient level or above for: | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade 10 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $:$ All students | $89 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| $:$ Economically disadvantaged students | 79 | 74 | 77 |
| : Migrant students | 69 | 54 | 67 |
| Students with disabilities | 59 | 47 | 54 |
| : Students with limited English proficiency | 73 | 66 | 74 |
| : Black, non-Hispanic | 81 | 77 | 78 |
| : : Whanic students | 78 | 73 | 78 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 94 | 93 | 92 |

White non-Hispanic


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 5 Grade 8 Grade 10
for: Grade $\quad$ Grade

| Economically disadvantaged students $\quad 79$ |
| :--- | :--- |

- Migrant students

Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
hite, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


## Connecticut



Connecticut

## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Connecticut's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high school.
See http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/der/edfacts/performance.htm for more details on the statewide accountability system.

State assessment for NCLB accountability: Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT)
State student achievement levels: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Advanced, Goal

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4 | Reading | $57 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 65 | 64 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 57 | 55 |
|  | Mathematics | 65 | 64 |
| High school Reading | 62 | 62 |  |
|  | Mathematics | 59 | 59 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | $345(72 \%)$ | $789(81 \%)$ | $128(77 \%)$ |


| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 81 (17\%) | 122 | (12\%) | 3 | (23\%) |
| Year 2 | 4 (*) | 4 | (*) | 0 |  |
| Corrective action | 8 (2\%) | 8 | (*) | 0 |  |
| Restructuring | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |

after being identified for improvement)
Other indicator, 2003-04 State target State outcome

| Elementary and Middle school indicator: <br> Writing assessment | $70 \%$ or more students at basic or <br> above, or increase from previous year. | Met |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate |  |  |$\quad$| - |
| :--- |

Student Achievement 2003-04
: Connecticut Mastery Test, used for NCLB accountability
: Reading or language arts


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 High school

| : All students | $80 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $:$ Economically disadvantaged students | 61 | 50 | 48 |
| : Migrant students | 49 | 31 | $*$ |
| : Students with disabilities | 49 | 36 | 39 |
| : Students with limited English proficiency | 47 | 29 | 35 |
| : Black, non-Hispanic | 58 | 48 | 42 |
| : Hispanic students | 61 | 48 | 46 |
| : White, non-Hispanic | 88 | 88 | 86 |

Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


## Delaware



## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Delaware's definitions of proficient for Reading and mathematics for grades 3, 8, and 10.

See http://www.doe.state.de.us/files/pdf/de_edreportcard200304.pdf for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Delaware Student Testing Program
State student achievement levels: Well Below the Standard, Below the Standard, Meets the
Standard, Distinguished, Exceeds the Standard
NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $(\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 3 | Reading | $57 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 33 | 33 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 57 | 57 |
|  | Mathematics | 33 | 33 |
| Grade 10 | Reading | 57 | 57 |
|  | Mathematics | 33 | 33 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | $81(82 \%)$ | $131(76 \%)$ | $19(100 \%)$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 6 | $(6 \%)$ | $34(20 \%)$ | 0 |
| Year 2 | 4 | $(4 \%)$ | 6 | $(3 \%)$ |
| Corrective action | 3 | $(3 \%)$ | 3 | $(2 \%)$ |
| Restructuring | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

Other indicator, 2003-04 State target State outcome

| Elementary/middle school indicator: Decrease in the |
| :--- |
| number of students performing below the standard |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate |


| Progress toward 0 students |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| below the standard. |

Progress toward or above $90 \%$ Met | Met |
| :--- |

Student Achievement 2003-04
: Delaware Student Testing Program, used for NCLB accountability

## Reading

## Proficient level or above for: Grade 3

All students
Economically disadvantaged students

- Migrant students
$82 \%$
73

Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above
$100 \%$


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 8 Grade 10

| $:$ : All students | $78 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $:$ Economically disadvantaged students | 67 | 30 | 31 |
| : Migrant students | 82 | 60 | n/a |
| : Students with disabilities | 47 | 16 | 11 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 70 | 23 | 30 |
| : Black, non-Hispanic | 61 | 28 | 27 |
| : Hispanic students | 74 | 33 | 34 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 87 | 64 | 63 |

Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


## District of Columbia




## District of Columbia





Georgia
http://www.doe.k12.ga.us


KEY: * $=$ Less than 0.5 percent
$\begin{aligned} \bar{n} / \mathrm{a} & =\text { Not applicable } \\ & =\text { Not available }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} & =\text { Not available } \\ \# & =\text { Sample size too small to calculate }\end{aligned}$
FTE = Full Time Equivalent

## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Georgia's definitions of proficient for Reading and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and High School.
See http://reportcard.gaosa.org/yr2004/psc/ for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Criterion- Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT)
State student achievement levels: CRCT: Does Not Meet Standard, Meets Standard, Exceeds
Standard; GHSGT: Failure, Pass, Pass Plus
NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4 | Reading | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 50 | 50 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 60 | 60 |
|  | Mathematics | 50 | 50 |
| High school Reading | 88 | 88 |  |
|  | Mathematics | 81 | 81 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences* | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | $910(81 \%)$ | $1,614(79 \%)$ | $62(34 \%)$ |

Identified for improvement:

| Year 1 | 83 | $(7 \%)$ | 209 | $(10 \%)$ | 12 | $(7 \%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year 2 | 52 | $(5 \%)$ | 52 | $(3 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Corrective action | 52 | $(5 \%)$ | 53 | $(3 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Restructuring | 98 | $(9 \%)$ | 99 | $(5 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice <br> after being identified for improvement) | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  |
| Other indicator, 2003-04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Elementary indicator: LEA choice | - | - |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Middle school indicator: LEA choice | - | - |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate | Meeting 60\% or progress toward goal. | Met |
| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |
| Title I school choice: | 2,547 | $1 \%$ |
| Supplemental educational services: | 24,451 | $13 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| *Some AYP outcomes for this state are not available due to issues with data collection, measurement, |  |  |
| or other reasons. For more information please visit the state's Web site, above. |  |  |

Student Achievement 2003-04
Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests, used for NCLB accountability Reading

## Proficient level or above for: <br> Grade 4

 81\%Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


## Mathematics

Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 High school

| : All students | $76 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| : Economically disadvantaged students | 66 | 61 | 85 |
| : Migrant students | 59 | 49 | 78 |
| Students with disabilities | 46 | 29 | 55 |
| : Students with limited English proficiency | 53 | 48 | 78 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 65 | 61 | 85 |
| : Hispanic students | 67 | 62 | 85 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 85 | 82 | 96 |

Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


2004 2003 2002

Hawaii


## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Hawaii's definitions of proficient for Reading and mathematics for grades 3, 8, and high school.
See http://arch.k12.hi.us/pdf/nclb/2004/NCLB999.pdf for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: HCPS II State Assessment
State student achievement levels: Well Below Proficiency Assessment, Approaches Proficiency Assessment, Meets Proficiency, Exceeds Proficiency

|  |  | NCLB Accountability Goals <br> 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $(\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 3 | Reading | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 10 | 10 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 30 | 30 |
|  | Mathematics | 10 | 10 |
| High school | Reading | 30 | 30 |
|  | Mathematics | 10 | 10 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | s All schools | All districts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | 98 (48\%) | 147 (53\%) | 0 |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 49 (24\%) | 75 (27\%) | 0 |
| Year 2 | 3 (1\%) | 3 (1\%) | 0 |
| Corrective action | 6 (3\%) | 6 (2\%) | 0 |
| Restructuring | 54 (26\%) | 54 (19\%) | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice after being identified for improvement) | 20 (10\%) | 20 (7\%) | 0 |
| Other indicator, 2003-04 S |  | State target | State outcome |
| Elementary indicator: Grade-level retention rate Middle school indicator: Grade-level retention rate High school indicator: Graduation rate |  | $3 \%$ or less | Met |
|  |  | 6\% or less | Met |
|  |  | 70\% | Met |

NCLB choice participation Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students
Title I school choice:
Supplemental educational services:

157
2,447

Student Achievement 2003-04
Hawaii Content and Performance Standards II State Assessment, used for NCLB accountability

## Reading

## Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 8 High school

All students 47\%

Economically disadvantaged students

- Migrant students

Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


## Mathematics

Proficient level or above for: Grade $3 \quad$ Grade 8
All students
: Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
Students with disabilities
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
: White, non-Hispanic
: Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above

Idaho



## Illinois



| : Staff |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Number of FTE | 1993-94 | 2003-04 |
| : teachers (CCD) Elementary | 56,285 | 63,013 |
| Middle | 17,322 | 22,336 |
| High | 29,551 | 35,687 |
| Combined | 956 | 1,789 |
| Other | 1,868 | 296 |
| Total | 105,982 | 123,121 |
| : Number of FTE non-teacher staff (CCD) |  |  |
| Instructional aides | 17,609 | 33,295 |
| Instructional coordinators | 1,507 | 833 |
| Administrators | 6,031 | 10,483 |
| Other | 63,201 | 81,839 |
| Total | 88,348 | 126,450 |
| : Percentage of teachers with a major in the main subject |  |  |
| : taught, grades 7-12 (sass) | 1994 | 2000 |
| English | 89\% | 70\% |
| Mathematics | 82 | 65 |
| Science | 77 | 93 |
| Social studies | 80 | 90 |
| : Percentage of core courses taught by highly qualified <br> : teachers, 2003-04 (As defined and reported by states, collected by ED) |  |  |
| $\vdots \quad$ All schools | 98\% |  |
| High-poverty schools |  | 93\% |
| Low-poverty schools |  | 99.7\% |
| : Outcomes |  |  |
| 1993-94 |  | 2000-01 |
| : High school dropout rate (NCES) 7\% |  | 6\% |
| : Avg. freshman graduation rate (NCES) 76 |  | 76 |
| : College-going rate (IPEDSINCES) | 64 | 60 |
| : NAEP state results (nces) |  |  |
| - Reading, Grade 4 | 1994 | 2005 |
| Proficient level or above | - | 30\% |
| Basic level or above | - | 63 |
| - Math, Grade 8 | 1996 | 2005 |
| Proficient level or above | - | 28\% |
| Basic level or above | - | 68 |

```
    - = Not applicable
    n/a = Not available
    FTE = Full Time Equivalent
```


## Statewide Accountability Information

Student Achievement 2003-04
: Illinois Standards Achievement Test, used for NCLB accountability
See Appendix B for Illinois's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 3, 8, and 11.
See http://webprod1.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/getsearchcriteria.aspx for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT)
State student achievement levels: Academic Warning, Below Standards, Meets Standards, Exceeds Standards

## NCLB Accountability Goals

| 2001-02 Annual measurable | Target |
| :---: | :---: |
| objective starting point |  |$\quad(2003-04)$


| Grade 3 | Reading | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Mathematics | 40 | 40 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 40 | 40 |
|  | Mathematics | 40 | 40 |
| Grade 11 | Reading | 40 | 40 |
|  | Mathematics | 40 | 40 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | $1,536(66 \%)$ | $2,717(70 \%)$ | $551(62 \%)$ |
| Id |  |  |  |


| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Year 1 | 201 | $(9 \%)$ | 201 | $(5 \%)$ | 0 |
| Year 2 | 197 | $(9 \%)$ | 197 | $(5 \%)$ | 0 |
| Corrective action | 240 | $(11 \%)$ | 240 | $(6 \%)$ | 0 |
| $\quad$ Restructuring | 22 | $(1 \%)$ | 22 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

after being identified for improvement)
State target
State outcome

| Elementary indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward $88 \%$ | Met |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward $88 \%$ | Met |  |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate | Meet or progress toward 65\%. | Met |  |
| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |  |
| Title I school choice: | 1,313 | $*$ |  |
| Supplemental educational services: | 18,000 | $6 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Reading
Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 All students

65\%
Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic 56
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


## Mathematics

Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 8 Grade 11

| $:$ : All students | $79 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $:$ Economically disadvantaged students | 63 | 32 | 25 |
| : Migrant students | 62 | 33 | 36 |
| : Students with disabilities | 60 | 14 | 12 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 79 | 25 | 26 |
| : Black, non-Hispanic | 54 | 25 | 21 |
| : Hispanic students | 76 | 39 | 31 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 90 | 67 | 62 |

nite, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


Indiana


## Indiana

## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Indiana's definitions of proficient for English language arts and mathematics for grades 3, 6, and high school.
See http://www.doe.state.in.us/istep/2003/summary.html for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus
State student achievement levels: Did Not Pass, Pass, Pass Plus
NCLB Accountability Goals
2001-02 Annual measurable
Target
objective starting point (2003-04)

| Grade 3 | English language arts | $58.8 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Mathematics | 57.1 | 57.1 |
| Grade 8 | English language arts | 58.8 | 58.8 |
|  | Mathematics | 57.1 | 57.1 |
| High school English language arts | 58.8 | 58.8 |  |
|  | Mathematics | 57.1 | 57.1 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | $628(80 \%)$ | $1,405(76 \%)$ | $136(46 \%)$ |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Identified for improvement: | 26 | $(3 \%)$ | 26 | $(1 \%)$ | 23 | $(8 \%)$ |
| Year 1 | 23 | $(3 \%)$ | 23 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Year 2 | 18 | $(2 \%)$ | 18 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Corrective action | 10 | $(1 \%)$ | 10 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Restructuring | 27 | $(3 \%)$ | 27 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice |  |  |  |  |  |  |

after being identified for improvement)

## State target

State outcome

| Elementary indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward 95\% | Met |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward 95\% | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate | Meet or progress toward 95\% | Met |
| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |
| Title I school choice: | 1,199 | $3 \%$ |
| Supplemental educational services: | 3,064 | $19 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Student Achievement 2003-04
: Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus, used for NCLB : accountability
English or language arts
Proficient level or above for: Grade $3 \quad$ Grade $8 \quad$ High school
All students
All students
74\%
Migrant students
Students with disabilities

- Students with limited English proficiency

Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: English or language arts percent proficient level or above 100\%

Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 8 High school
: All students

- Migrant students
- Students with disabilities
: Students with limited English proficiency
- Black, non-Hispanic
: Hispanic students
- White, non-Hispanic
: Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above - 100\%


Iowa


## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for lowa's definitions of proficient for Reading and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high
school.

See http://www.state.ia.us/educate/stateboard/doc/pocketcard03.pdf for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: lowa Tests of Basic Skills and the lowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED)
State student achievement levels: Low, Intermediate, High
NCLB Accountability Goals

| Grade 4 | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mathematics | $65 \%$ | $65 \%$ |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | 700 | $(96 \%)$ | 1,359 | $(92 \%)$ | 350 | $(95 \%)$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Identified for improvement: | 8 | $(1 \%)$ | 59 | $(4 \%)$ | 9 | $(2 \%)$ |
| Year 1 | 2 | $\left({ }^{*}\right)$ | 7 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Year 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Corrective action | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Restructuring | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| after being identified for improvement) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## after being identified for improvement)

Other indicator, 2003-04 State target State outcome

| Elementary indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward 95\% | Met |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward 95\% | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate | Meet or progress toward 90\% | Met |

NCLB choice participation Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students

| Title I school choice: | 60 | $2 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Supplemental educational services: | 75 | $7 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Student Achievement 2003-04
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and the Iowa Tests of Educational Development, used for NCLB accountability

## Reading

Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 High school
All students
Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students

| White, non-Hispanic | 52 | 42 | 51 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 80 | 72 | 79 |

Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


Kansas
http://www.ksbe.state.ks.us



Kentucky

## Districts and schools

| Number of districts | $1993-94$ <br> (CCD) | $2003-04$ <br> 176 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Number of public schools (CCD) |  |  |
| Elementary | 814 |  |
| Middle | 224 | 768 |
| High | 258 | 234 |
| Combined | 19 | 78 |
| Other | 32 | 2 |
| Total | 1,347 | 1,370 |

Number of charter schools (CCD)

## Finances

Total current expenditures 1993-94 (CCCD, in thousands of dollars, adiusted for inflation to 2002-03)

| Instructional | $\$ 2,253,130$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| Noninstructional | 196,448 |
| Support | $1,312,012$ |
| Total | $3,761,590$ |

2002-03

| Per-pupil expenditures <br> (CCD, adjusted for inflation to 2002-03) | \$5,740 | \$6,661 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |



Title I allocation 2002-03
(ED: Incudes Tite I, PartA)
\$162,957,050

KEY: * $=$ Less than 0.5 percent

- = Not applicable
n/a = Not available
\# = Sample size too small to calculate
TE = Full Time Equivalent



## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Kentucky's definitions of proficient for reading for grades 4, 7, and high school and mathematics for grades 5, 8, and high school.
See http://www.education.ky.gov/KDE/Administrative+Resources/Testing+and+Reporting+/Reports/
CTBS+5+Reports/default.htm for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Kentucky Core Content Test
State student achievement levels: Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, Distinguished

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grade 4,5 Reading | $47.27 \%$ | $47.27 \%$ |  |
|  | Mathematics | 22.45 | 22.45 |
| Grade 7,8 Reading | 45.6 | 45.6 |  |
|  | Mathematics | 16.49 | 16.49 |
| Grade HS | Reading | 19.26 | 19.26 |
|  | Mathematics | 19.76 | 19.76 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | $634(74 \%)$ | $890(76 \%)$ | $111(63 \%)$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Identified for improvement: |  | $113(13 \%)$ | $113(10 \%)$ | $55(31 \%)$ |  |
| Year 1 | 13 | $(2 \%)$ | 13 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |
| Year 2 | 6 | $(1 \%)$ | 6 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |
| Corrective action | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Restructuring | 5 | $(1 \%)$ | 5 | $(*)$ | 0 |

Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice
after being identified for improvement)
Other indicator, 2003-04 State target State outcome


## Student Achievement 2003-04

Kentucky Core Content Test, used for NCLB accountability Reading

## Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 7 High school

 All students67\%
60\%
47
Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
57
51
49

- Students with disabilities 49

Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic

## 47 48 58

Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


Louisiana



Maine


```
KEY: * = Less than 0.5 percent
    - = Not applicable
    n/a = Not vavilable 
    ETE = Full Time Equivalent
```

[^1]
## : Staff

| - Number of FTE |  | 1993-94 | 2003-04 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : teachers (CCD) | Elementary | 6,660 | 6,863 |
|  | Middle | 2,835 | 3,364 |
|  | High | 3,822 | 4,483 |
|  | Combined | 329 | 316 |
|  | Other | 30 | 4 |
|  | Total | 13,676 | 15,030 |
| : Number of FTE non-teacher staff (CCD) |  |  |  |
| Instru | ctional aides | 3,452 | 5,952 |
| Instructional | coordinators | 118 | 297 |
|  | ministrators | 1,287 | 1,592 |
|  | Other | 8,664 | 10,404 |
|  | Total | 13,521 | 18,245 |

: Percentage of teachers with a major in the main subject

| $:$ taught, grades $7-12$ (sass) | 1994 | 2000 |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\vdots$ | English | $81 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| $\vdots$ | Mathematics | 68 | 64 |
| $\vdots$ | Science | 67 | 63 |
|  | Social studies | 72 | 56 |

: Percentage of core courses taught by highly qualified
: teachers, 2003-04 (As defined and reported by states, collected by ED)

| $\vdots$ | All schools | $90 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $\vdots$ | High-poverty schools | $91 \%$ |
| $\vdots$ | Low-poverty schools | $91 \%$ |


| : Outcomes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 93-94 | 2000-01 |
| : High school dropout rate (NCES) |  | 3\% |
| : Avg. freshman graduation rate (NCES | -s) 75 | 76 |
| : College-going rate (IPEDS/NCES) | 50 | 54 |
| - NAEP state results (NCES) |  |  |
| - Reading, Grade 4 | 1994 | 2005 |
| : Proficient level or above | 41\% | 36\% |
| : Basic level or above | 75 | 72 |
| - Math, Grade 8 | 1996 | 2005 |
| : Proficient level or above | 31\% | 30\% |
| Basic level or above | 77 | 74 |

## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Maine's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high school.
See http://www.state.me.us/education/profiles/getprofiles.htm for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Maine Educational Assessment
State student achievement levels: Does Not Meet the Standard, Partially Meets the Standard, Meets the Standard, Exceeds the Standard
NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $(2003-04)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4 | Reading | $34 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 12 | 12 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 35 | 35 |
|  | Mathematics | 13 | 13 |
| High school | Reading | 44 | 44 |
|  | Mathematics | 11 | 11 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Made AYP | 398 | $(86 \%)$ | 516 | $(78 \%)$ | 277 (97\%) |
| Identified for improvement: | 18 | $(4 \%)$ | 48 | $(7 \%)$ | 0 |
| Year 1 | 1 | $(*)$ | 2 | $\left({ }^{*}\right)$ | 0 |
| Year 2 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Corrective action | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| $\quad$ Restructuring | 4 | $(1 \%)$ | 7 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice |  |  |  |  |  |

Other indicator, 2003-04
Elementary indicator: Average daily attendance Middle school indicator: Average daily attendance Meet or progress toward 96\%. Met High school indicator: Graduation rate

## NCLB choice participation

Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students
Title I school choice:
Supplemental educational services:

## Student Achievement 2003-04

Maine Educational Assessment, used for NCLB accountability

## Reading

## Proficient level or above for: <br> Grade 4 <br> 50\%

Economically disadvantaged students

- Migrant students
: Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade $4 \quad$ Grade 8
: All students
: Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
Students with disabilities
: Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
Shite, non-Hispanic 33
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above

Maryland


## Statewide Accountability Information

 high school.See http://mdreportcard.org/ for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Maryland School Assessments (MSA)
State student achievement levels: TBD
NCLB Accountability Goals
2001-02 Annual measurable
objective starting point
Target

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $(\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 3 | Reading | $40 \%$ | $42.7 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 47.4 | 49.8 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 43 | 45.6 |
|  | Mathematics | 19 | 22.7 |
| Grade HS | Reading | 42.9 | 45.5 |
|  | Mathematics | 20.9 | 27.5 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | 292 (77\%) | 1,069 (79\%) | 15 (63\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 31 (8\%) | 140 (10\%) | 8 (34\%) |
| Year 2 | 18 (5\%) | 19 (1\%) | 0 |
| Corrective action | 7 (2\%) | 13 (1\%) | 1 (4\%) |
| Restructuring | 59 (16\%) | 83 (6\%) | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice after being identified for improvement) | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Other indicator, 2003-04 | State target | State outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance Middle school indicator: Attendance High school indicator: Graduation rate | Meet or progress toward 94\% <br> Meet or progress toward 94\% <br> Meet or progress toward 90\% | Met <br> Met <br> Met |
| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students |  |
| Title I school choice: Supplemental educational services: | $\begin{array}{r} 914 \\ 5,077 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \% \\ 17 \% \end{array}$ |

Student Achievement 2003-04
Maryland School Assessments, used for NCLB accountability Reading

## Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 8 High school

All students
71\%
64\%
Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
54
75

- Students with disabilities

Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic 59
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 8 High school
All students $\quad 72 \% \quad 46 \%$ 48\%

| $:$ Economically disadvantaged students | 56 | 23 | 23 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

- Migrant students

Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


Massachusetts
http://www.doe.mass.edu


## Massachusetts

## Statewide Accountability Information

Student Achievement 2003-04

See Appendix B for Massachusetts's definitions of proficient for English language arts in grades 4, 7, and
high school, and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high school.
See http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/staterc/ for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System
State student achievement levels: Failing (HS)/Warning (Elementary), Needs Improvement, Proficient, Advanced

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $(2003-04)$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grade 4 | English language arts | 70.7 CPI | 75.6 CPI |
|  | Mathematics | 53 | 60.8 |
| Grade 7 | English language arts | 70.7 | 75.6 |
| Grade 8 | Mathematics | 53 | 60.8 |
| High school English language arts | 70.7 | 75.6 |  |
|  | Mathematics | 53 | 60.8 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | 667 | $(61 \%)$ | 1,150 | $(80 \%)$ | 71 (61\%) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Identified for improvement: | 201 | $(21 \%)$ | 286 | $(16 \%)$ | 129 |
| Year 1 | $34 \%)$ | $(3 \%)$ | 38 | $(2 \%)$ | 0 |
| Year 2 | 23 | $(2 \%)$ | 28 | $(2 \%)$ | 0 |
| Corrective action | 24 | $(2 \%)$ | 24 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |
| $\quad$ Restructuring | 45 | $(4 \%)$ | 48 | $(3 \%)$ | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice |  |  |  |  |  |


| Other indicator, 2003-04 | State target | State outcome |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance | $92 \%$ | Met |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | $92 \%$ | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation | $70 \%$ | Met |
| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |
| Title I school choice: | 554 | * |
| Supplemental educational services: | 6,589 | $17 \%$ |

Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System, used for NCLB accountability

## English or language arts

| : Proficient level or above for: | Grade 4 | Grade 7 | High school |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : All students | $56 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $63 \%$ |
| : Economically disadvantaged students | 32 | 45 | 36 |
| : Migrant students | 22 | 46 | 29 |
| : Students with disabilities | 26 | 31 | 26 |
| : Students with limited English proficiency | 27 | 30 | 21 |
| : Black, non-Hispanic | 34 | 46 | 37 |
| : Hispanic students | 28 | 38 | 30 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 63 | 76 | 70 |

Student achievement trend: English or language arts percent proficient level or above

: Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


## Michigan




## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Michigan's definitions of proficient for Reading/language arts for grades 4, 7, and high school and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high school.
See http://www.michigan.gov/documents/State_Report_Card_2003-04_120358_7.doc for more details on the statewide accountability system.

State assessment for NCLB accountability: Michigan Educational Assessment Program State student achievement levels: Basic, Below Basic, Met Expectations, Exceeds Expectations

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $(\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grade 4 | Reading/language arts | $38 \%$ | $38 \%$ |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences* | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Made AYP | $1,847(80 \%)$ | $2,775(77 \%)$ | $431(80 \%)$ |
| Identified for |  |  |  |


| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year 1 | n/a | 218 | $(6 \%)$ | 0 |
| Year 2 | n/a | 72 | $(2 \%)$ | 0 |
| Corrective action | n/a | 74 | $(2 \%)$ | 0 |
| Restructuring | n/a | 147 | $(4 \%)$ | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice | n/a | n/a |  | n/a |

after being identified for improvement)

## Other indicator, 2003-04

| Elementary indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward 80\% | Met |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward 80\% | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate | $80 \%$ | Met |

## State target

State outcome

## Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students

| Title I school choice: | 340 | * |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Supplemental educational services: | 11,444 | $11 \%$ |

*Some AYP outcomes for this state are not available due to issues with data collection, measurement, or other reasons. For more information please visit the state's Web site, above.

Student Achievement 2003-04
Michigan Educational Assessment Program, used for NCLB accountability Reading or language arts
Proficient
All students
Grade 4
Grade 7
High school

62\%
55\%
Economically disadvantaged students

- Migrant students

47
40
30
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
61
43
Hispanic students 48
66
Student achievement trend: Reading or language arts percent proficient level or above


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 High school

| : All students | $71 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $:$ Economically disadvantaged students | 57 | 41 | 31 |
| $:$ Migrant students | 52 | 33 | 19 |
| Students with disabilities | 42 | 25 | 18 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 59 | 42 | 26 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 51 | 33 | 22 |
| Hispanic students | 58 | 46 | 33 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 77 | 69 | 56 |

White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


- 2004

2003
2002

## Minnesota

http://www.educ.state.mn.us

## Districts and schools

| Number of districts (CCD) | $\begin{array}{r} 1993-94 \\ 405 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2003-04 \\ 349 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of public schools (CCD) |  |  |
| Elementary | 989 | 1,046 |
| Middle | 239 | 291 |
| High | 503 | 699 |
| Combined | 73 | 97 |
| Other | 30 | 54 |
| Total | 1,834 | 2,187 |

Number of charter schools (CCD)

## Finances

Total current expenditures 1993-94 (CCD, in thousands of dollars, adjusted for inflation to 2002-03)


Title I allocation 2002-03
(ED: Includes Tite I, PartA)
KEY: * = Less than 0.5 percent

- = Not applicable
n/a $=$ Not available
\# = Sample size too small to calculate
FTE = Full Time Equivalent

+41 schools did not report.

| $\vdots$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Staff |  |  |  |
| $\vdots$ |  |  |  |
| Number of FTE |  | $1993-94$ | $2003-04$ |
| teachers (CCD) | Elementary | 22,331 | 24,127 |
| $\vdots$ | Middle | 8,024 | 9,344 |
| $\vdots$ | High | 13,125 | 16,438 |
| $\vdots$ | Combined | 673 | 1,045 |
| $\vdots$ | Other | 132 | 358 |
| $\vdots$ | Total | 44,285 | 51,312 |
| Number of FTE non-teacher staff (ccD) |  |  |  |
| $\vdots$ | Instructional aides | 6,089 | 14,636 |
| $\vdots$ | Instructional coordinators | 487 | 467 |
| $\vdots$ | Administrators | 2,872 | 3,220 |
| $\vdots$ | Other | 18,455 | 33,810 |
|  | Total | 27,903 | 52,133 |

: Percentage of teachers with a major in the main subject : taught, grades 7-12 (SASs) 19942000

| English | $84 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Mathematics | 94 | 90 |
| Science | 97 | 93 |
| Social studies | 89 | 94 |

: Percentage of core courses taught by highly qualified
: teachers, 2003-04 (As defined and reported by states, collected by ED)

| All schools |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\square$ | $99 \%$ |
| $\vdots$ |  |
| High-poverty schools | $98 \%$ |
|  |  |

## : Outcomes

| : High school dropout rate (NCES) | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $:$ Avg. freshman graduation rate (NCES) 89 | 84 |  |

: College-going rate (IPEDSINCES) 5364

NAEP state results (NCES)

19

| $:$ | Proficient level or above | $33 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\vdots$ | Basic level or above | 65 | 71 |
| $:$ | Math, Grade 8 | 1996 | 2005 |
| $:$ | Proficient level or above | $34 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| $:$ | Basic level or above | 75 | 79 |2005

## Minnesota

## Statewide Accountability Information

Student Achievement 2003-04
: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments, used for NCLB accountability
See Appendix B for Minnesota's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 3, 7, and high school.
See http://education.state.mn.us/html/intro_sch_dist_data.htm for more details on the statewide accountability system.

State assessment for NCLB accountability: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments State student achievement levels: Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, Level 4, Level 5

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> (2003-04) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Grade 3 | Reading | $62.9 \%$ | $66.9 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 65.4 | 66.2 |
| Grade 7 | Reading | 62.9 | 75.4 |
|  | Mathematics | 65.4 | 73.4 |
| High school | Reading | 62.9 | 80.3 |
| Mathematics |  | 65.4 | 74.1 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | 696 | $(68 \%)$ | 1,393 | $(65 \%)$ | 212 | $(57 \%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Identified for improvement: | 22 | $(2 \%)$ | 22 | $(1 \%)$ | 19 | $(5 \%)$ |
| Year 1 | 18 | $(2 \%)$ | 18 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Year 2 | 8 | $(1 \%)$ | 8 | $(*)$ | 0 |  |
| Corrective action | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Restructuring | 0 | 0 | 20 | $(1 \%)$ |  |  |

after being identified for improvement)

State target
Meet or progress toward $90 \%$ Meet or progress toward $90 \%$ Meet or growth towards $80 \%$ Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students


## Reading

Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 7 High school All students
$73 \%$
70\%
47
17
28
21
Migrant students
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 7 High school

| : All students | $70 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $70 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $:$ Economically disadvantaged students | 52 | 43 | 47 |
| : Migrant students | 32 | 22 | 29 |
| : Sudents with disabilities | 45 | 25 | 24 |
| : Students with limited English proficiency | 38 | 26 | 29 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 39 | 28 | 28 |
| : Hispanic students | 45 | 37 | 40 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 77 | 74 | 78 |

Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


2004
2003
2002

Mississippi


Mississippi



```
KEY: * = Less than 0.5 percent
    \overline{n}=}=\mathrm{ Not applicable
    #/a = Not available 
    FTE = Full Time Equivalent
```


## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Missouri's definitions of proficient for Communication arts for grades 3, 7, and high school and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high school.
See http://dese.mo.gov/commissioner/statereportcard/ for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Missouri Assessment Program
State student achievement levels: Level not determinted, Step 1, Progressing, Nearing Proficient, Proficient, Advanced

NCLB Accountability Goals

| 2001-02 Annual measurable objective starting point |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Target } \\ (2003-04) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4 | Communication arts | 18.4\% | 20.4\% |
|  | Mathematics | 8.3 | 10.3 |
| Grade 7 | Communication arts | 18.4 | 20.4 |
|  | Mathematics | 8.3 | 10.3 |
| High schoo | Communication arts | 18.4 | 20.4 |
|  | Mathematics | 8.3 | 10.3 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Made AYP | $950(86 \%)$ | 1,569 | $(77 \%)$ | $398(75 \%)$ |  |
| Identified for improvement: | 111 | $(10 \%)$ | 111 | $(5 \%)$ | 0 |
| Year 1 | 13 | $(1 \%)$ | 13 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |
| Year 2 | 8 | $(1 \%)$ | 8 | $(*)$ | 0 |
| Corrective action | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Restructuring | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |


| Other indicator, 2003-04 | State target | State outcome |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance | $93 \%$ | Met |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | $93 \%$ | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate | $85 \%$ | Met |


| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Title I school choice: | 28 | $*$ |
| Supplemental educational services: | 992 | $13 \%$ |
|  |  |  |

Student Achievement 2003-04
Missouri Assessment Program, used for NCLB accountability Communication arts

## Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 7 High school

 All studentsEconomically disadvantaged students

- Migrant students
$35 \%$
22
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Communication arts percent proficient level or above


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade $4 \quad$ Grade $8 \quad$ High school

- All students
: Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
- Students with disabilities
: Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
- White, non-Hispanic

Student achieve


Montana


## Statewide Accountability Information

Student Achievement 2003-04
Montana Comprehensive Assessment System, used for NCLB accountability
See Appendix B for Montana's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high school.
See http://www.opi.state.mt.us/ReportCard/Index.html for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Montana Comprehensive Assessment System
State student achievement levels: Nearing Proficient, Novice, Proficient, Advanced

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2003-04 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4 | Reading | $55 \%$ | $55 \%$ |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences* Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | 568 (84\%) | 731 (85\%) | 362 (83\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 31 (5\%) | 31 (4\%) | 0 |
| Year 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Corrective action | 4 (1\%) | 4 (*) | 0 |
| Restructuring | 33 (2\%) | 33 (4\%) | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice after being identified for improvement) | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Other indicator, 2003-04

| Elementary indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward 80\% | Met |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward $80 \%$ | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate | Meet or progress toward $80 \%$ | Met |

State target
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Meet or progress toward 80\% } & \text { Met } \\ \text { Meet or progress toward 80\% } & \text { Met }\end{array}$ Meet or progress toward 80\% Met

| Title I school choice: | 14 | $4 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Supplemental educational services: | 10 | $*$ |
|  |  |  |
| *Some AYP outcomes for this state are not available due to issues with data collection, measurement, |  |  |
| or other reasons. For more information please visit the state's Web site, above. |  |  |

or other reasons. For more information please visit the state's Web site, above.

## Nebraska



## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Nebraska's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and

## high school.

See http://reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/Main/PDFDownload.asp for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: STARS (School-based Teacher-led Assessment and
Reporting System)
State student achievement levels: Basic, Progressing, Proficient, Advanced
NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable objective starting point | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Target } \\ & (2003-04) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4 | Reading | 62\% | 62\% |
|  | Mathematics | 65 | 65 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 61 | 61 |
|  | Mathematics | 58 | 58 |
| High schoo | Reading | 66 | 66 |
|  | Mathematics | 62 | 62 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts


## Other indicator, 2003-04

Elementary indicator: Writing assessment Middle school indicator: Writing assessment High school indicator: Graduation rate

State target
Meet or progress toward 62\% Meet or progress toward 62\% _ Meet or progress toward 83.97\% Met

## NCLB choice participation

Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students

Title I school choice:
Supplemental educational services:

Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 High school

## All students

- Economically disadvantaged students

Migrant students

- Students with disabilities

Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students

## on-Hispanic

: Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


## Nevada



## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Nevada's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 3, 8, and high school.
See http://www.nevadareportcard.com/ for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Nevada Criterion Reference Tests
State student achievement levels: Approaches Standard, Developing/Emergent, Meets Standard, Exceeds Standard

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | NCLB Accountability Goals |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable objective starting point | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Target } \\ & (2003-04) \end{aligned}$ |
| Grade 3 | Reading | 32.4\% | 27.5\% |
|  | Mathematics | 37.3 | 34.5 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 37 | 37 |
|  | Mathematics | 38 | 32 |
| High school Reading |  | 91 | 73.5 |
|  | Mathematics | 58 | 42.8 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | $70(59 \%)$ | $357(63 \%)$ | $8(47 \%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Identified for improvement: | $31(26 \%)$ | $57(10 \%)$ | $6(35 \%)$ |
| Year 1 | $16(13 \%)$ | $81(14 \%)$ | $3(18 \%)$ |
| Year 2 | $2(2 \%)$ | $2(*)$ | 0 |
| Corrective action | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Restructuring | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice
after being identified for improvement)
Other indicator, 2003-04 State target State outcome

| Elementary indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward $90 \%$ | Met |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward $90 \%$ | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate | Meet or progress toward $50 \%$ | Met |
| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |
| Title I school choice: | 252 | $1 \%$ |
| Supplemental educational services: | 259 | $10 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Student Achievement 2003-04

Nevada Criterion Reference Tests, used for NCLB accountability Reading

## Proficient level or above for: <br> Grade 3

45\%
Economically disadvantaged students

- Migrant students

Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


## Mathematics

Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 8 High school
All students $45 \% \quad 48 \%$

| - Economically disadvantaged students | 32 | 32 | 41 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - Migrant students | 26 | 29 | 19 |

- Migrant students

Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
: Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
$100 \%$


New Hampshire


## New Hampshire

## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for New Hampshire's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 3, 6 , and high school.

See http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/curriculum/Assessment/materials04.htm for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: New Hampshire Educational Improvement Assessment Program
State student achievement levels: Novice, Basic, Proficient, Advanced
NCLB Accountability Goals

| Grade 3 | Reading | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mathematics | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| Grade 6 | Reading | 64 | 64 |
|  | Mathematics | 60 | 60 |
| High school Reading | 64 | 64 |  |
|  | 70 | 70 |  |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | $194(78 \%)$ | $336(73 \%)$ | $102(76 \%)$ |


Other indicator, 2003-04 State target State outcome

| Elementary indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward 90\% | Met |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward 90\% | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate | Meet or progress toward 75\% | Met |
| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |
| Title I school choice: | 1 | $*$ |
| Supplemental educational services: | 15 | $13 \%$ |

## Student Achievement 2003-04

New Hampshire Educational Improvement Assessment Program, used for NCLB accountability

## Reading

| $:$ Proficient level or above for: | Grade 3 | Grade 6 | High school |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All students | $73 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 53 | 54 | 60 |
| Migrant sludents | 62 | 25 | $<10$ |
| Students with disabilities | 32 | 31 | 37 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 31 | 27 | 23 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 53 | 63 | 60 |
| : Hispanic students | 45 | 45 | 55 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 74 | 75 | 79 |

$\vdots$ Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


## Districts and schools

| Number of districts | $1993-94$ | $2003-04$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| (CCD) | 608 | 598 |
| Number of public schools (CCD) |  |  |
| Elementary | 1,457 | 1,526 |
| Middle | 393 | 435 |
| High | 310 | 368 |
| Combined | 3 | 12 |
| Other | 124 | 87 |
| Total | 2,287 | 2,428 |

Number of charter schools (CCD)

## Finances

Total current expenditures 1993-94 (CCD, in thousands of dollars, adjusted for inflation to 2002-03)

| Instructional | $\$ 7,977,705$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| Noninstructional | 426,374 |
| Support | $4,908,885$ |
| Total | $13,312,964$ |

Per-pupil expenditures
(CCD, adjusted for inflation to 2002-03)


Title I allocation 2002-03
(ED; Includes Tite l , Part A)
KEY: * $=$ Less than 0.5 percent
\$272,032,782
$\bar{n} \overline{\mathrm{n}}=$ Not applicable
$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a} & =\text { Not available } \\ \# & =\text { Sample size too small to calculate }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} \# & =\text { Sample size too smal } \\ \text { FTE } & \text { Full Time Equivalent }\end{aligned}$

| : Students |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Public school |  | 1993-94 | 2003-04 |
| - enrollment (CCD) | Pre-K | 9,225 | 22,746 |
| : | K-8 | 775,959 | 904,670 |
| : | 9-12 | 288,263 | 382,910 |
| : | Total (K-12) | 1,064,222 | 1,287,580 |
|  |  |  |  |
| - Race/ethnicity (CCD) |  |  |  |
| - American Indian/Alaskan Native |  | * | * |
| Asian/Pacific Islander |  | 5\% | 7\% |
| Black, non-Hispanic |  | 19 | 18 |
| : | Hispanic | 13 | 17 |
| White, non-Hispanic |  | 63 | 58 |
| : Students with disabilities (0sEP) |  | 14\% | 15\% |
| : Students with li | ited | 4\% | 5\% |


| $\vdots$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Staff |  |  |  |
| $\vdots$ |  |  |  |
| Number of FTE |  | $1993-94$ | $2003-04$ |
| teachers (CCD) | Elementary | 37,465 | 50,173 |
| $\vdots$ | Middle | 15,473 | 21,710 |
| $\vdots$ | High | 23,434 | 30,743 |
| $\vdots$ | Combined | 141 | 373 |
| $\vdots$ | Other | 3,430 | 1,969 |
| $\vdots$ | Total | 79,943 | 104,968 |
| Number of FTE non-teacher staff (ccD) |  |  |  |
| $\vdots$ | Instructional aides | 12,806 | 24,010 |
| $\vdots$ | Instructional coordinators | 1,378 | 1,466 |
| $\vdots$ | Administrators | 6,236 | 6,749 |
| $\vdots$ | Other | 5,218 | 62,736 |
|  | Total | 75,638 | 94,961 |

: Percentage of teachers with a major in the main subject - taught, grades 7-12 (sass) 19942000

| English | $87 \%$ | $74 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Mathematics | 69 | 90 |
| Science | 82 | 93 |
| Social studies | 93 | 93 |

Percentage of core courses taught by highly qualified
: teachers, 2003-04 (As defined and reported by states, collected by ED)


## Statewide Accountability Information

Student Achievement 2003-04

See Appendix B for New Jersey's definitions of proficient for Language arts literacy and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high school.
See http://education.state.nj.us/rc/ for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge, Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment, High school Proficiency Assessment
State student achievement levels: Partially Proficient, Proficient, Advanced Proficient

## NCLB Accountability Goals

| 2001-02 Annual measurable objective starting point |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Target } \\ (2003-04) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4 | Language arts literacy | 68\% | 68\% |
|  | Mathematics | 53 | 53 |
| Grade 8 | Language arts literacy | 58 | 58 |
|  | Mathematics | 39 | 39 |
| High schoo | Language arts literacy | 73 | 73 |
|  | Mathematics | 55 | 55 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | $932(68 \%)$ | 1,481 | $(76 \%)$ | 588 | $(95 \%)$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 207 | $(15 \%)$ | 331 | $(16 \%)$ | 28 | $(5 \%)$ |
| Year 2 | 66 | $(5 \%)$ | 67 | $(3 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Corrective action | 95 | $(7 \%)$ | 98 | $(5 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Restructuring | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice | 53 | $(4 \%)$ | 57 | $(3 \%)$ | 0 |  |

Other indicator, 2003-04 State target State outcome


New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge, Grade Eight Proficiency : Assessment, High school Proficiency Assessment, used for NCLB account: ability

- Language arts literacy

| : Proficient level or above for: | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | High school |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All students | $82 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $82 \%$ |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 66 | 47 | 61 |
| Migrant students | 49 | 40 | 53 |
| : Students with disabilities | 49 | 28 | 62 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 49 | 18 | 24 |
| : Black, non-Hispanic | 67 | 46 | 65 |
| : Hispanic students | 69 | 52 | 66 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 90 | 83 | 90 |

White, non-Hispanic 69
Student achievement trend: Language arts literacy percent proficient level or above


## Mathematics

## Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 High school

All students

| $72 \%$ | $62 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 54 | 36 |


| Economically disadvantaged students | 54 | 36 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Migrant students | 38 | 27 |
| Students | 46 | 21 |

Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
50
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic 8
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


| Districts and schools |  |  | : Students |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of districts (CCD) | $\begin{array}{r} 1993-94 \\ 88 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 2003-04 } \\ 89 \end{array}$ |  |  | 1993-94 | 2003-04 |
|  |  |  | : enrollment (CCD) | Pre-K | 1,895 | 3,976 |
|  |  |  | : | K-8 | 224,316 | 222,056 |
|  |  |  | : | 9-12 | 87,768 | 97,034 |
| Number of public schools (CCD) |  |  | Total (K-12) |  | 312,084 | 319,090 |
| Elementary 420445 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middle 139164 |  |  | - Race/ethnicity (CCD) |  |  |  |
| High | 125 | 164 162 | : American Indian/Alaskan Native |  | 10\% | 11\% |
| Combined | 9 | 34 | Asian/Pacific Islander |  | 1 | 1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Other } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | 15 | 9814 | Black, non-Hispanic |  | 2 | 2 |
|  | 708 |  | Black, | spanic | 46 | 52 |
| Number of charter schools (CCD) 34 |  |  | White, non-Hispanic |  | 40 | 33 |
|  |  |  | : Students with disabilities (0sEP) |  |  |  |
| Finances |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total current expenditures 1993-94 (CCD, in thousands of dollars, adiusted for inflation to 2002-03) |  | 2002-03 | : Students with limited <br> : English proficiency (ncela) |  | 25\% | 17\% |
| Instructional | \$987,569 | \$1,266,008 | : English proficiency (NCELA) |  |  |  |
| Noninstructional | 97,444 | 105,462 |  |  |  |  |
| Support <br> Total | 601,337 | 910,138 | : Migrant students |  | 1\% | 1\% |
|  | 1,686,350 | 2,281,608 | : (OME) |  |  |  |
| Per-pupil expenditures <br> (CCD, adjusted for inflation to 2002-03)$\$ \$ 5,232 \quad \$ 7,125$ |  |  | - Eighth-grade students enrolled in 1996 <br> : Algebra I for high school credit 22\% <br> - (NaEP) |  |  | $2003$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sources of funding <br> (CCD, 2002-03) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Local } \\ & 13 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | : Students eligible to participate in the Free or Reduced- <br> : Price Lunch Program, 2003-04 (cco) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | : Number of schools, by percent of students eligible to : participate in the Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Program, -2003-04 (CCD) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0-34\% |  | 153 |  |
|  |  |  | 35-49\% | 78 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 50-74\% |  |  | 65 |
| Title I allocation 2002-03 (ED; Includes Title I, Part A) |  | 103,273,759 | 75-100\% |  |  | 318 |


| : Staff |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : Number of FTE 1 | 1993-94 | 2003-04 |
| : teachers (CCD) Elementary | 9,082 | 10,465 |
| Middle | 4,073 | 4,681 |
| High | 4,431 | 5,670 |
| Combined | 192 | 344 |
| Other | 276 | 409 |
| Total | 18,054 | 21,569 |
| : Number of FTE non-teacher staff (CCD) |  |  |
| Instructional aides | 4,066 | 5,243 |
| Instructional coordinators | 468 | 724 |
| Administrators | 1,278 | 1,853 |
| Other | 12,478 | 15,452 |
| Total | 18,290 | 23,272 |
| $\therefore$ Percentage of teachers with a major in the main subject |  |  |
| - taught, grades 7-12 (sass) | 1994 | 2000 |
| English | 76\% | 65\% |
| Mathematics | 69 | 52 |
| Science | 71 | 55 |
| Social studies | 60 | 39 |
| : Percentage of core courses taught by highly qualified <br> : teachers, 2003-04 (As defined and reported by states, collected by ED) |  |  |
| $\vdots \quad$ All schools |  |  |
| High-poverty schools | 63\% |  |
| Low-poverty schools | 72\% |  |
| : Outcomes |  |  |
|  | 1993-94 | 2000-01 |
| - High school dropout rate (NCES) | 5) 8\% | 5\% |
| : Avg. freshman graduation rate (NCES) 67 |  | 66 |
| - College-going rate (IPEDSINCES) | 54 | 59 |
| $\therefore$ NAEP state results (NcEs) |  |  |
| : Reading, Grade 4 | 1994 | 2005 |
| Proficient level or above | 21\% | 21\% |
| Basic level or above | 49 | 52 |
| Math, Grade 8 | 1996 | 2005 |
| Proficient level or above | 14\% | 14\% |
| Basic level or above | 51 | 53 |



New York
http://www.nysed.gov


```
KEY: * = Less than 0.5 percent
    - = Not applicable
    # = Not available 
    FTE = Full Time Equivalent
```



North Carolina
http://www.ncpublicschools.org

| Districts and schools |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Number of districts | $1993-94$ | $2003-04$ |
| (CCD) | 121 | 117 |
|  |  |  |
| Number of public schools (ccD) |  |  |
| Elementary | 1,167 |  |
| Middle | 407 | 1,329 |
| High | 321 | 465 |
| Combined | 29 | 361 |
| Other | 28 | 78 |
| Total | 1,952 | 27 |

Number of charter schools (CCD)

## Finances

Total current expenditures 1993-94 (CCD, in thousands of dollars, adjusted for inflation to 2002-03)

| Instructional | $\$ 4,027,758$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| Noninstructional | 499,539 |
| Support | $2,028,993$ |
| Total | $6,556,290$ |

Per-pupil expenditures
(CCD, adiusted for inflation to 2002-03)


Title I allocation 2002-03
(ED; Incudes Tite 1 , Part A)

```
KEY: * = Less than 0.5 percent
    - = Not applicable
    n/a = Not available
    # = Sample size too small to calculate
    FTE = Full Time Equivalent
```



[^2]
: Percentage of teachers with a major in the main subject

| $:$ taught, grades 7-12 (sASS) | 1994 | 2000 |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\vdots$ | English | $87 \%$ | $81 \%$ |
| $\vdots$ | Mathematics | 79 | 64 |
| $\vdots$ | Science | 73 | 75 |
| $\vdots$ | Social studies | 88 | 93 |

: Percentage of core courses taught by highly qualified
: teachers, 2003-04 (As defined and reported by states, collected by ED)

| $:$ | All schools | $85 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | High-poverty schools | $82 \%$ |
|  | Low-poverty schools | $87 \%$ |

## : Outcomes

| 1993-94 |  | 2000-01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : High school dropout rate (NCES) | - | 6\% |
| - Avg. freshman graduation rate (NCES) | (5) $70 \%$ | 67 |
| : College-going rate (IPEDS/NCES) | 51 | 65 |
| - NAEP state results (NCES) |  |  |
| - Reading, Grade 4 | 1994 | 2005 |
| Proficient level or above | 30\% | 30\% |
| Basic level or above | 59 | 64 |
| - Math, Grade 8 | 1996 | 2005 |
| Proficient level or above | 20\% | 32\% |
| Basic level or above | 56 | 72 |

## North Carolina



## North Dakota



## North Dakota

## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for North Dakota's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high school.
See http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/dpi/reports/profile/0304/ProfileDistrict/99999.pdf for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: North Dakota State Assessment
State student achievement levels: Novice, Partially Proficient, Proficient, Advanced

## NCLB Accountability Goals

| Grade 4 | Reading | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mathematics | $65.1 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 45.7 | 50.2 |
|  | Mathematics | 64.1 | 64.6 |
| Grade HS | Reading | 33.3 | 38.9 |
|  | Mathematics | 42.9 | 47.7 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | $338(94 \%)$ | $442(91 \%)$ | $174(84 \%)$ |


| Made AYP | 338 | $(94 \%)$ | 442 | $(91 \%)$ | 174 | $(84 \%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 13 | $(6 \%)$ |
| Year 2 | 1 | $(*)$ | 1 | $\left({ }^{*}\right)$ | 0 |  |
| Corrective action | 7 | $(2 \%)$ | 7 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Restructuring | 13 | $(4 \%)$ | 13 | $(3 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice | 4 | $(1 \%)$ | 4 | $\left({ }^{*}\right)$ | 0 |  |

Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice
after being identified for improvement)
Other indicator, 2003-04 State target State outcome

| Elementary indicator: Attendance | $93 \%$ | Met |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | $93 \%$ | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate | $89.90 \%$ | Met |

NCLB choice participation Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students
Title I school choice:
Supplemental educational services:

## Student Achievement 2003-04

: North Dakota State Assessment, used for NCLB accountability Reading

## Proficient level or above for: <br> Grade 4

81\%
Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students

- Students with disabilities

Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


Proficient level or above for: Grade 4

## All students

: Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
Students with disabilities

- Students with limited English proficiency

Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
68
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


Ohio



Oklahoma


## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Oklahoma's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 5, 8, and high school.

See http://sde.state.ok.us/home/defaultie.html for more details on the statewide accountability system

State assessment for NCLB accountability: Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests
State student achievement levels: Unsatisfactory, Limited Knowledge, Satisfactory, Advanced

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 5 | Reading | API:622 | API:768 |
|  | Mathematics | 648 | 790 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 622 | 768 |
|  | Mathematics | 648 | 790 |
| Grade HS | Reading | 622 | 768 |
|  | Mathematics | 648 | 790 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | 899 | 3\%) | 1,348 | 75\%) |  | 75\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 82 | (7\%) | 111 | (6\%) | 22 | (4\%) |
| Year 2 | 14 | (1\%) | 15 | (1\%) | 0 |  |
| Corrective action | 4 |  | 12 | (1\%) | 0 |  |
| Restructuring | 11 | (1\%) | 4 | (*) | 0 |  |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice | 3 | (*) | 3 | (*) | 0 |  |

after being identified for improvement)

Other indicator, 2003-04
Elementary indicator: Attendance Middle school indicator: Attendance High school indicator: Graduation rate

State target
Meet or progress toward 91.2\% \% Met Meet or progress toward 68.8\% Met Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students
Title I school choice:
Supplemental educational services:

| 714 | $10 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| 1,467 | $31 \%$ |

Student Achievement 2003-04
Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests, used for NCLB accountability Reading

## Proficient level or above for: Grade 5

All students
Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students


73\%
High school

57
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


Proficient level or above for: Grade 5
All students 71\%
Grade 8
High school
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Economically disadvantaged students } & 63 & 69 \% & 57\end{array}$
Migrant students
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


## Oregon



Oregon

## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Oregon's definitions of proficient for reading and mathematics for grades 3, 8, and high school.
See http://www.ode.state.or.us/data/annreportcard/rptcard2004.pdf for more details on the statewide accountability system.

State assessment for NCLB accountability: Oregon State Assessments
State student achievement levels: Very Low, Low, Nearly Meets, Meets Standards, Exceeds Standards

NCLB Accountability Goals

| Grade 3 2001-02 Annual measurable | Reading | Target <br> (2003-04) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mathematics | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 39 | 39 |
|  | Mathematics | 40 | 40 |
| Grade HS | Reading | 39 | 39 |
|  | Mathematics | 40 | 40 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools |  | All schools |  | All districts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | 496 | 87\%) | 847 | 71\%) |  | (39\%) |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 |  | (5\%) | 29 | (2\%) |  | (7\%) |
| Year 2 |  | (*) | 2 | (*) |  | (1\%) |
| Corrective action | 2 | (*) | 2 | (*) | 0 |  |
| Restructuring | 2 | (*) | 2 | (*) | 0 |  |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice after being identified for improvement) | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Other indicator, 2003-04 |  |  | te target |  | State | outcome |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance Middle school indicator: Attendance High school indicator: Graduation rate |  |  | 92\% |  |  | Met |
|  |  |  | 92\% |  |  | Met |
|  |  |  | 68.1\% |  |  | Met |


| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Title I school choice: | 873 | $13 \%$ |
| Supplemental educational services: | 537 | $24 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Student Achievement 2003-04
Oregon State Assessments, used for NCLB accountability Reading

| $:$ Proficient level or above for: | Grade 3 | Grade 8 | High school |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : Prll students | $82 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 73 | 42 | 31 |
| Migrant students | 54 | 23 | 11 |
| Students with disabilities | 52 | 19 | 12 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 59 | 21 | 10 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 74 | 43 | 26 |
| : Hispanic students | 63 | 32 | 21 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 87 | 64 | 54 |

percent proficient level or above


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 8 High school
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { : All students } & 81 \% & 59 \% & 42 \%\end{array}$

- Economically disadvantaged students 73

42
24
保rant sudents
Students with disabilities
: Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
: Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above
:
100\%


## Pennsylvania



## Pennsylvania



## Puerto Rico

http://www.de.gobierno.pr


## Puerto Rico



Rhode Island
http://www.ridoe.net


## Rhode Island

## Statewide Accountability Information

Student Achievement 2003-04
New Standards Reference Exam, used for NCLB accountability

See Appendix B for Rhode Island's definitions of proficient for English Language Arts and mathematics for grades 4,8 , and high school.
See http://www.infoworks.ride.uri.edu/2005/state/infoworks_statereport.pdf for more details on the statewide accountability system.

State assessment for NCLB accountability: New Standards Reference Exam
State student achievement levels: Little evidence of achievement, Below the standard, Nearly achieved the standard, Achieved the standard, Achieved the standard with honors

NCLB Accountability Goals
2001-02 Annual measurable objective starting point

Target (2003-04)

| Grade 4 | English Language Arts | $76.1 \%$ | $76.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Mathematics | 61.7 | 61.7 |
| Grade 8 | English Language Arts | 68 | 68 |
|  | Mathematics | 46.1 | 46.1 |
| High school English Language Arts | 62.6 | 62.6 |  |
|  | Mathematics | 44.8 | 44.8 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | s All schools | All districts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | 111 (76\%) | 258 (82\%) | 29 (89\%) |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 20 (14\%) | 35 (11\%) | 0 |
| Year 2 | 13 (9\%) | 13 (4\%) | 2 (6\%) |
| Corrective action | 5 (3\%) | 9 (3\%) | 3 (8\%) |
| Restructuring | 1 (1\%) | 1 (*) | 1 (3\%) |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice after being identified for improvement) | 2 (1\%) | 5 (2\%) | 1 (3\%) |
| Other indicator, 2003-04 |  | State target | State outcome |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance rate |  | 90\% | Met |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance rate |  | 90\% | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate |  | 71.4\% | Met |


| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Title I school choice: | 39 | * |
| Supplemental educational services: | 2,191 | 23\% |

## English or Language Arts

| Proficient level or above for: | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | High school |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All students | $67 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 52 | 35 | 33 |
| Migrant students | $\#$ | $\#$ | $\#$ |
| Students with disabilities | 40 | 23 | 22 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 33 | 17 | 9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 53 | 36 | 33 |
| Hispanic students | 47 | 30 | 31 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 74 | 59 | 60 |

## 7

Student achievement trend: English or Language Arts percent proficient level or above


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 High school
All students $\quad 51 \% \quad 39 \%$ 44\%

| Economically disadvantaged students | 36 | 19 | 22 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Migrant students
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


South Carolina


## South Carolina

## Statewide Accountability Information

## Student Achievement 2003-04

Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test, used for NCLB accountability
See Appendix B for South Carolina's definitions of proficient for English Language arts and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high school.
See http://www.myscschools.com/reportcard/2004/ for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test and the High School Assessment Program Test
State student achievement levels: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Advanced
NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $(\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Grade 4 | English Language arts | $17.6 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 15.5 | 15.5 |
| Grade 8 | English Language arts | 17.6 | 17.6 |
|  | Mathematics | 15.5 | 15.5 |
| Grade HS | English Language arts | 33.3 | 33.3 |
|  | Mathematics | 30 | 30 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year




## English or Language arts

## Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 All students <br> Grade

Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
$38 \%$
24
15
15
13
22
25
51

Student achievement trend: English or Language arts percent proficient level or above


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 High school
All students 36\% 22\% 52\%

| Economically disadvantaged students | 22 | 10 | 33 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Migrant students
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic 49
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


## South Dakota

http://www.state.sd.us/deca


## South Dakota

## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for South Dakota's definitions of proficient for Reading and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and 11.
See https://sis.ddncampus.net:8081/nclb/portal/portal.xsl for more details on the statewide accountability system.

State assessment for NCLB accountability: Dakota State Test of Educational Progress State student achievement levels: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Advanced

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $\mathbf{( 2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4 | Reading | $65 \%$ | $65 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 45 | 45 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 65 | 65 |
|  | Mathematics | 45 | 45 |
| Grade 11 | Reading | 50 | 50 |
|  | Mathematics | 60 | 60 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | $267(77 \%)$ | $562(78 \%)$ | $165(97 \%)$ |


| Made AYP | 267 (77\%) | 562 (78\%) | 165 (97\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 38 (14\%) | 47 (7\%) | 0 |
| Year 2 | 19 (6\%) | 19 (3\%) | 0 |
| Corrective action | 2 (1\%) | 2 (*) | 0 |
| Restructuring | 2 (1\%) | 2 (*) | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice after being identified for improvement) | 7 (2\%) | 7 (1\%) | 0 |
| Other indicator, 2003-04 |  | State target | State outcome |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance |  | 94\% | Met |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance |  | 94\% | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate |  | 90\% | Met |


| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Title I school choice: | 4 | * |
| Supplemental educational services: | 47 | 2\% |

Student Achievement 2003-04
Dakota State Test of Educational Progress, used for NCLB accountability Reading

| $:$ Proficient level or above for: | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade 11 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $:$ All students | $87 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| $:$ Economically disadvantaged students | 79 | 66 | 59 |
| $:$ Migrant students | 71 | 64 | 32 |
| $:$ Students with disabilities | 60 | 29 | 16 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 54 | 26 | 27 |
| $:$ Black, non-Hispanic | 73 | 61 | 37 |
| $:$ Hispanic students | 77 | 67 | 47 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 90 | 82 | 75 |
| Student achievement trend: | Reading | percent proficient level or above |  |

Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above


Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


Tennessee
http://www.state.tn.us/education


## Statewide Accountability Information

Student Achievement 2003-04

See Appendix B for Tennessee's definitions of proficient for reading/language arts and mathematics for grades 3, 8, and high school.
See http://evaas.sasinschool.com/tn_reportcard/welcome.jsp for more details on the statewide accountability system.

State assessment for NCLB accountability: Tennessee Achievement Test
State student achievement levels: Below Proficient, Proficient, Advanced

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $(2003-04)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grade 3 | Reading/language arts | $77.1 \%$ | $77.1 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 72.4 | 72.4 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences* | Title I schools | $s$ All schools | All districts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | 732 (82\%) | 1,442 (79\%) | 93 (68\%) |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 84 (9\%) | 118 (7\%) | 25 (18\%) |
| Year 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Corrective action | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Restructuring | 44 (5\%) | 47 (3\%) | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice after being identified for improvement) | n/a | 8 (*) | n/a |
| Other indicator, 2003-04 |  | State target | State outcome |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance |  | 92.5\% | Met |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance |  | 92.5\% | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate |  | 76\% | Met |

NCLB choice participation Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students

| Title I school choice: | 839 | $2 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Supplemental educational services: | 4,870 | $33 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| *Some AYP outcomes for this state are not available due to issues with data collection, measurement, |  |  |

Tennessee Achievement Test, used for NCLB accountability
Reading or language arts

| : Proficient level or above for: | Grade 3 | Grade 8 | High school |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : All students | 84\% | 81\% | 87\% |
| : Economically disadvantaged students | 77 | 69 | 78 |
| - Migrant students | 49 | 27 | 62 |
| : Students with disabilities | 56 | 38 | 51 |
| - Students with limited English proficiency | 58 | 36 | 57 |
| : Black, non-Hispanic | 74 | 66 | 78 |
| : Hispanic students | 73 | 66 | 81 |
| - White, non-Hispanic | 88 | 86 | 91 |

Student achievement trend: Reading or language arts percent proficient level or above


## Mathematics

Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 8 High school
: All students $\quad 81 \% \quad 83 \%$ High sch

| $:$ Economically disadvantaged students | 72 | 73 | 61 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Migrant students
Students with disabilities
: Students with limited English proficiency

- Black, non-Hispanic

Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
: Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above - 100\%


Texas


## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Texas's definitions of proficient for Reading and mathematics for grades 4,8 , and high school.
See http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills
State student achievement levels: Did Not Meet the Standard, Met the Standard, Commended
Performance
NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $(2003-04)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4 | Reading | $47 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 33 | 33 |
| Grade 8 | Reading | 47 | 47 |
|  | Mathematics | 33 | 33 |
| Grade 10 | Reading | 47 | 47 |
|  | Mathematics | 33 | 33 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | $4,494(89 \%)$ | $6,516(89 \%)$ | $955(88 \%)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |


| Year 1 | 88 | (*) | 88 | (*) | 2 | (*) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year 2 | 2 | (*) | 2 | (*) | 0 |  |
| Corrective action | 1 | (*) | 1 | (*) | 0 |  |
| Restructuring | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice after being identified for improvement) | 2 | (*) | 2 | (*) | 0 |  |
| Other indicator, 2003-04 |  | State target |  |  | State out | tcome |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance |  | Meet or exceed 90\% |  |  | M |  |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance |  | Meet or exceed 90\% |  |  | M |  |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate |  | Meet or exceed 70\% |  |  | M |  |

NCLB choice participation Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students

[^3]Student Achievement 2003-04
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills, used for NCLB accountability Reading

| : Proficient level or above for: | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | High school |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pll students | $85 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $82 \%$ |
| : Economically disadvantaged students | 79 | 83 | 73 |
| : Migrant students | 74 | 76 | 65 |
| : Sudents with disabilities | 76 | 73 | 53 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 71 | 48 | 34 |
| : Black, non-Hispanic | 77 | 85 | 75 |
| : Hispanic students | 80 | 84 | 74 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 93 | 95 | 90 |

Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above

Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 High school

| : All students | $85 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 80 | 54 | 53 |
| : Migrant stydents | 77 | 47 | 47 |
| Students with disabilities | 76 | 40 | 35 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 75 | 28 | 32 |
| : Black, non-Hispanic | 75 | 49 | 51 |
| Hispanic students | 81 | 57 | 56 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 93 | 80 | 80 |

Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


Utah


## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Utah's definitions of proficient for Language arts and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high school.
See http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/default/annual_report_03_04.pdf for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Utah Performance Assessment System for Students
State student achievement levels: Minimal, Partial, Sufficient, Substantial
NCLB Accountability Goals
2001-02 Annual measurable objective starting point

Target (2003-04)
Grade 4
Language arts
Mathematics

57
65\%

Grade 8
Language arts
Mathematics

High school Language arts 64
Mathematics
35
2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | $172(81 \%)$ | $794(88 \%)$ | $34(58 \%)$ |  |  |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Year 1 | 11 | $(5 \%)$ | 11 | $(1 \%)$ | $21(35 \%)$ |
| Year 2 | 1 | $(1 \%)$ | 1 | $\left(^{*}\right)$ | 0 |
| Corrective action | 2 | $(1 \%)$ | 2 | $\left(^{*}\right)$ | 0 |
| Restructuring | 1 | $(1 \%)$ | 1 | $\left(^{*}\right)$ | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice | 2 | $(1 \%)$ | 2 | $\left(^{*}\right)$ | 0 |

after being identified for improvement)

| Other indicator, 2003-04 | State target | State outcome |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward 93\% | Met |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward 93\% | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation or | Meet or progress toward $85.7 \%$ (graduation) |  |
| attendance | or 93\% (attendance) | Met |

NCLB choice participation Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students

| Title I school choice: | 62 | 3\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Supplemental educational services: | 635 | 49\% |

Student Achievement 2003-04
Utah Performance Assessment System for Students, used for NCLB accountability

## Language arts

Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 High school
: All students
Economically disadvantaged students

- Migrant students

Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students

| White, non-Hispanic | 81 | 82 | 79 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Student achievement trend: Language arts percent proficient level or above


Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


## Vermont




Virginia

Districts and schools
Number of districts

(CCD) | $1993-94$ |
| ---: |
| Number of public schools (CCD) |
| Elementary |
| Middle |
| High |
| Combined |
| Other |
| Total |
| Number of charter schools (CCD) |

## Finances Total current expenditures 1993-94

(CCD, in thousands of dollars, adjusted for inflation to 2002-03)

| Instructional | \$4,173,044 | \$5,661,332 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Noninstructional | 360,291 | 362,643 |
| Support | 2,400,076 | 3,184,354 |
| Total | 6,933,411 | 9,208,329 |
| Per-pupil expenditures <br> (CCD, adjusted for inflation to 2002-03) | \$6,632 | \$7,822 |
| Sources of funding <br> (CCD, 2002-03) <br> Federal $\qquad$ <br> 7\% |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Local } \\ & 54 \% \end{aligned}$ |

Title I allocation 2002-03
(ED; Incudes Titel I, Part A)
\$182,110,558

KEY: * = Less than 0.5 percent
$\begin{aligned} * & =\text { Less than } 0.5 \text { p } \\ \bar{n} & =\text { Not applicable } \\ \text { n } & =\text { Not available } \\ \# & =\text { Sample size }\end{aligned}$
\# = Sample size too small to calculate
FTE = Full Time Equivalent

## : Students

| - Public school - enrollment (CCD) |  | 1993-94 | 2003-04 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pre-K | 3,186 | 16,524 |
|  | K-8 | 734,673 | 819,972 |
| : | 9-12 | 278,009 | 354,836 |
|  | Total (K-12) | 1,012,682 | 1,174,808 |
| - Race/ethnicity (CCD) |  |  |  |
| - American Indian/Alaskan Native |  | * | * |
| Asian/Pacific Islander |  | 3\% | 5\% |
| Black, non-Hispanic |  | 26 | 27 |
|  | Hispanic | 3 | 7 |
| White, non-Hispanic |  | 68 | 61 |
| - Students with disabilities (0sEP) |  | 11\% | 12\% |

$\vdots$ Students with limited $\quad$ -

| $:$ Students with limited | - | $5 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| English proficiency (nceLA) |  |  |

$:$ Migrant students * *
$\vdots$ (OME)

| : Eighth-grade students enrolled in 1996 | 2003 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| : Algebra I for high school credit $29 \%$ | $28 \%$ |

: Students eligible to participate in the Free or Reduced-

: Number of schools, by percent of students eligible to
: participate in the Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Program, 2003-04 ${ }^{\dagger}$ (CDD)


| : Staff |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\vdots$ |  |  |  |
| Number of FTE |  | $1993-94$ | $2003-04$ |
| teachers (CCD) | Elementary | 28,540 | 42,203 |
| $\vdots$ | Middle | 12,141 | 19,019 |
| $\vdots$ | High | 27,727 | 24,633 |
| $\vdots$ | Combined | 576 | 820 |
| $\vdots$ | Other | 642 | 284 |
| $\vdots$ | Total | 69,626 | 86,959 |
| Number of FTE non-teacher staff (ccD) |  |  |  |
| $\vdots$ | Instructional aides | 11,209 | 15,287 |
| $\vdots$ | Instructional coordinators | 1,077 | 1,525 |
| $\vdots$ | Administrators | 5,183 | 5,480 |
| $\vdots$ | Other | 41,705 | 53,713 |
|  | Total | 59,174 | 76,005 |

: Percentage of teachers with a major in the main subject : taught, grades 7-12 (SASS) 19942000

| $:$ | English | $93 \%$ | $63 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\vdots$ | Mathematics | 69 | 59 |
| $\vdots$ | Science | 67 | 74 |
| $\vdots$ | Social studies | 84 | 77 |

: Percentage of core courses taught by highly qualified
: teachers, 2003-04 (As defined and reported by states, collected by ED)

| All schools | $95 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\square$ | tigh-poverty schools |
| Low-poverty schools | $92 \%$ |

## : Outcomes

| 1993-94 |  | 2000-01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : High school dropout rate (NCES) | 5\% | 4\% |
| - Avg. freshman graduation rate (N | Es) 76 | 78 |
| - College-going rate (IPEDS/NCES) | 53 | 53 |
| : NAEP state results (NCES) |  |  |
| : Reading, Grade 4 | 1994 | 2005 |
| : Proficient level or above | 26\% | 37\% |
| : Basic level or above | 57 | 72 |
| : Math, Grade 8 | 1996 | 2005 |
| : Proficient level or above | 21\% | 33\% |
| Basic level or above | 58 | 74 |

## Virginia

## Statewide Accountability Information

Student Achievement 2003-04
Standards of Learning Assessments, used for NCLB accountability

See Appendix B for Virginia's definitions of proficient for English and mathematics for grades 3, 8, and high school.
See http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/src/vasrc-reportcard-intropage.shtml for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Standards of Learning Assessments State student achievement levels: Fails/Does not meet the standard, Pass/Proficient, Pass/Advanced

NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> $(\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Grade 3 | English | $60.7 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 58.4 | 59 |
| Grade 8 | English | 60.7 | 61 |
|  | Mathematics | 58.4 | 59 |
| Grade 11 | English | 60.7 | 61 |
|  | Mathematics | 58.4 | 59 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | 586 (76\%) | 1,345 (74\%) | 30 (23\%) |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 82 (11\%) | 82 (5\%) | 0 |
| Year 2 | 21 (3\%) | 21 (1\%) | 0 |
| Corrective action | 8 (1\%) | $8{ }^{(*)}$ | 0 |
| Restructuring | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice after being identified for improvement) | 9 (1\%) | (*) | 0 |
| Other indicator, 2003-04 |  | State target | State outcome |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance rate |  | 94\% | Met |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance rate |  | 94\% | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate |  | 51.7\% | Met |


| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Title I school choice: | 432 | $2 \%$ |
| Supplemental educational services: | 1,301 | $11 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

English
: Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 All students
$71 \%$
Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
: Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic 62
Student achievement trend: English percent proficient level or above


Mathematics
Proficient level or above for: Grade 3 Grade 8 High school

- All students 87\% 80\% 84\%
$\begin{array}{llll}: \text { Economically disadvantaged students } & 79 & 67 & 75\end{array}$
Migrant students
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
Unite, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above


Washington


## Washington

## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Washington's definitions of proficient for Reading and mathematics for grades 4, 7, and high school.
See http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/Reports/WASLTrend.aspx?\&schoolld=1\&reportLevel=State for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: Washington Assessment of Student Learning State student achievement levels: Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, Level 4

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable objective starting point | $\begin{gathered} \text { Target } \\ (2003-04) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 4 | Reading | 52.2\% | 52.2\% |
|  | Mathematics | 29.7 | 29.7 |
| Grade 7 | Reading | 30.1 | 30.1 |
|  | Mathematics | 17.3 | 17.3 |
| High schoo | Reading | 48.6 | 48.6 |
|  | Mathematics | 24.8 | 24.8 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Made AYP | $866(89 \%)$ | $2,042(86 \%)$ | $267(90 \%)$ |



| NCLB choice participation | Number of Titte I students | Percent of eligible students |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Tite I school choice: | 377 | $1 \%$ |
| Supplemental educational services: | 250 | $2 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | $\vdots$ |
|  |  | $\vdots$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Student Achievement 2003-04

Washington Assessment of Student Learning, used for NCLB accountability Reading
Proficient level or above for:
Grade 4 All students

74\%
Economically disadvantaged students

- Migrant students
: Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Reading percent proficient level or above

| ${ }^{100 \%}{ }^{\text {\% }}$ |  |  | 2004 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2003 |
| 75 | 61 596065 |  | 2002 |
| 50\% |  |  |  |
| 25\% |  |  |  |
| 0\% Grade 4 Grade 7 High School |  |  |  |
| Mathematics |  |  |  |
| Proficient level or above for: | Grade 4 | Grade 7 | High school |
| All students | 60\% | 46\% | 44\% |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 45 | 27 | 25 |
| Migrant students | 32 | 13 | 11 |
| Students with disabilities | 29 | 8 | 6 |
| Students with limited English proficiency | 27 | 8 | 10 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 38 | 21 | 16 |
| Hispanic students | 39 | 22 | 20 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 66 | 52 | 49 |

White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above : 100\%


West Virginia


West Virginia

## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for West Virginia's definitions of proficient for reading/language arts and mathematics for grades 3, 8, and high school.
See http://wveis.k12.wv.us/nclb/public04/nclbmenu.cfm for more details on the statewide accountability system.
State assessment for NCLB accountability: West Virginia Educational Standards Tests State student achievement levels: Novice, Partial Mastery, Mastery, Distinguished, Above mastery

## NCLB Accountability Goals

2003-04 Annual measurable objective starting point
Target
$(2003-04)$

| Grade 3 | Reading/language arts | $69 \%$ | (2003-04) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Mathematics | 63 | $69 \%$ |
| Grade 8 | Reading/language arts | 74 | 63 |
|  | Mathematics | 61 | 74 |
| High school Reading/language arts | 72 | 61 |  |
|  | Mathematics | 57 | 72 |
|  |  | 57 |  |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year AYP outcomes and consequences Title I schools All schools All districts

| Made AYP | 299 | $(75 \%)$ | 519 | $(73 \%)$ | 2 | $(4 \%)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Year 1 | 31 | $(8 \%)$ | 200 | $(28 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Year 2 | 5 | $(1 \%)$ | 54 | $(8 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Corrective action | 1 | $(*)$ | 4 | $(1 \%)$ | 2 | $(4 \%)$ |
| Restructuring | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice | 4 | $(1 \%)$ | 4 | $(1 \%)$ | 0 |  |

## after being identified for improvement)

| Other indicator, 2003-04 | State target | State outcome |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Elementary indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward $90 \%$ | Met |
| Middle school indicator: Attendance | Meet or progress toward $90 \%$ | Met |
| High school indicator: Graduation rate | Meet or progress toward $80 \%$ | Met |
| NCLB choice participation | Number of Title I students | Percent of eligible students |

## Student Achievement 2003-04

West Virginia Educational Standards Tests, used for NCLB accountability Reading or language arts

## Proficient level or above fo <br> Grade 3

 All students77\%
Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
: Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
69
69
45
75
68
75
78

Student achievement trend: Reading or language arts percent proficient level or above


## Mathematics

Proficient level or above for: Grade 3
Grade 8
High school
: All students
Migrant students
Students with disabilities
: Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
: Hispanic students

## 72\%

69\%
64\%

White, non-Hispanic


Wisconsin
http://www.dpi.state.wi.us



## Wyoming



## Statewide Accountability Information

See Appendix B for Wyoming's definitions of proficient for English language arts and mathematics for grades 4, 8, and high school.
See https://www.k12.wy.us/SA/Paws/doca/Accountability_Workbook.pdf for more details on the statewide accountability system

State assessment for NCLB accountability: Wyoming Comprehensive Assessment System State student achievement levels: Novice, Partially proficient, Proficient, Advanced

## NCLB Accountability Goals

|  |  | 2001-02 Annual measurable <br> objective starting point | Target <br> (2003-04) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Grade 4 | English language arts | $30.4 \%$ | $30.4 \%$ |
|  | Mathematics | 23.8 | 23.8 |

2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

| AYP outcomes and consequences | Title I schools | All schools | All districts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Made AYP | 205 (91\%) | 331 (92\%) | 47 (98\%) |
| Identified for improvement: |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | 18 (9\%) | 31 (9\%) | 1 (2\%) |
| Year 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Corrective action | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Restructuring | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exited Improvement status (made AYP twice after being identified for improvement) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other indicator, 2003-04 |  | target | State outcome |
| Elementary/middle school indicator: Reading performance Re scoring |  | percentage <br> est (novice) lev | Met <br> Met |

NCLB choice participation Number of Title I students Percent of eligible students

| Titte School choice: | n/a | n/a |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Supplemental educational services: | - | - |

## Student Achievement 2003-04

Wyoming Comprehensive Assessment System, used for NCLB accountabil-
English or language arts
Proficient level or above for: Grade 4 Grade 8 High school
All students
Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
44\%

Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: English or language arts percent proficient level or above


Proficient level or above for: Grade 4
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { All students } & 39 \% \\ \text { Economically disadvantaged students } & 29\end{array}$
Economically disadvantaged students
Migrant students
Students with disabilities
Students with limited English proficiency
Black, non-Hispanic
Hispanic students
White, non-Hispanic
Student achievement trend: Mathematics percent proficient level or above

$\xrightarrow{2}$

## Appendix A: Sources

## Districts and schools

## Number of districts

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, 1993-94 and 2003-04.
Notes: Common Core of Data is referred to as CCD throughout report. This total reflects all regular local school districts that are not a component of a supervisory union, with a student membership (enrollment) greater than zero. Not included are supervisory union administrative centers, regional education service agencies, state or federal agencies providing elementary and/or secondary level instruction, or other education agencies, such as charter schools. Data downloaded August 2007 from the Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey: School Year 2003-04, version 1a.

## Number of public schools

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, 1993-94 and 2003-04.
Notes: All regular and special education schools offering free, public elementary or secondary education with student membership (enrollment) greater than zero are included. A school is classified as combined if it provides instruction at both the elementary (grade 6 or below) and the secondary (grade 9 or above) levels. Data downloaded August 2007 from the Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey: School Year 2003-04 version 1a.

## Number of charter schools

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, 2003-04.
Notes: This reflects all charter schools with a student membership (enrollment) greater than zero. These numbers may not match the number of charter schools listed on state Web
sites due to differences in data collection. Data downloaded August 2007 from the Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey: School Year 2003-04, version 1a

## Finances

## Total current expenditures

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics: Revenues and expenditures for public elementary and secondary education: school year 1993-94. Available http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/96303.pdf.
Hill, J.G., and Johnson, F. (2005). Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education: School Year 2002-03 (NCES 2005-353R). U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. Available http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2005/2005353.pdf.

- Note: This reflects data reported to the U. S. Department of Education, National Center
: for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), National Public Education Financia : Survey. 1993-94 data adjusted to reflect inflation for 2002-03.


## : Per pupil expenditures

: Hill, J.G., and Johnson, F. (2005). Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education: School Year 2002-03 (NCES 2005-353R). U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. Available http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2005/2005353.pdf.
Note: National Center for Education Statistics is referred to as NCES throughout report.
: Expenditures include current expenditures, based on membership, covering day-to-day operations of public elementary and secondary schools, except those associated with repaying : debts, capital outlays (e.g., purchases of land, school construction and repair, and equip: ment), and programs outside the scope of preschool to grade 12, such as adult education, : community colleges, and community services. Expenditures for items lasting more than one - year (e.g., school buses and computers) are not included in current expenditures. 1993-94 : Data adjusted to reflect inflation for 2002-03.

## : Sources of funding

: Hill, J.G., and Johnson, F. (2005). Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary : and Secondary Education: School Year 2002-03 (NCES 2005-353R). U.S. Depart: ment of Education, Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. Available
: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2005/2005353.pdf.
: Title I allocation 2002-03
: Source: U. S. Department of Education, Budget Office, Funds for State Formula-Allocat: ed and Selected Student Aid Programs, 2003. Available http://www.ed.gov/about/ : overview/budget/statetables/06stbystate.pdf.

- Note: This total includes only Title I, Part A, ESEA Title I Grants to Local Education Agencies.


## Public school enrollment

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, 1993-94 and 2003-04.

Notes: These numbers do not include ungraded students. Data downloaded August 2007 : from the Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey: School Year 2003-04, version 1a.
: Race and ethnicity
: Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common : Core of Data, 1993-94 and 2003-04.

Note: Data downloaded August 2007 from the Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey: School Year 2003-04, version 1a.

## Students with disabilities

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, 2003-04 school year. Available: http://www.ideadata.org/tables28th/ar_1-10.htm.
U.S. Department of Education. To Assure the Free Appropriate Public Education of All Children with Disabilities. Seventeenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 1995.
Notes: Office of Special Education Programs is referred to as OSEP throughout report. The figures shown represent children ages 6 to 17 served under IDEA, Part B.

## Students with limited English proficiency

Source: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs, State-specific numbers and statistics. Washington, D.C. Available: http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/stats.
U.S. Department of Education, National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. 1993-94. Notes: Data reflects the number of LEP students enrolled in public schools.

## Migratory students

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Migrant Education, 1993-94, 2003-04.
Notes: Office of Migrant Education is referred to as OME throughout report. The figures shown represent the " 12 -month" count of students identified for the Migrant program. The 12-month count is the unduplicated number of eligible children ages 3-21 who participate in either a regular year (Category 1) or summer (Category 2) program.

## Eighth-grade student enrolled in Algebra I for high school credit

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1996 and 2003. Available: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard.

## Students eligible to participate in the Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Program, 2003-04

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, 2003-04.

Note: Data downloaded August 2007 from the Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey: School Year 2003-04, version 1a.

## : Number of schools, by percent of students eligible for the Free or Re: duced-Price Lunch Program

: Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common : Core of Data, 2003-04.
: Notes: The figures shown represent the percentage of students in all schools, including all : regular local school districts and schools with a specific vocational and alternative education : purpose, eligible to participate in the Free and Reduced-Price Lunch Program under the
: National School Lunch Act. The National School Lunch Program is run by the Depart-
ment of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service. Data downloaded August 2007 from the
Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey: School Year 2003-04,
version 1 a.

## Number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) teachers

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, 1993-94 and 2003-04.

- Notes: FTE teacher counts are based on NCES definitions in the Digest of Education Sta-- tistics. A school is classified as combined if it provides instruction at both the elementary
: (grade 6 or below) and the secondary (grade 9 or above) levels. Data downloaded August
2007 from the Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey: School Year 2003-04, version 1a.


## Number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) non-teacher staff

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common : Core of Data, 1993-94 and 2003-04.
: Notes: FTE teacher counts are based on NCES definitions in the Digest of Education Sta: tistics. Administrators includes both LEA and school administrators. Other includes library : support staff, LEA administrative support staff, school administrative support staff, and all : other support staff, guidance counselors, librarians, and student support services staff. Data downloaded August 2007 from the State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Sec: ondary Education, 1993-94, v.1b and 2003-04, v.1b.

Percentage of teachers with a major in the main subject taught, grades 7-12

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey, 1994 and 2000.
Notes: Schools and Staffing Survey is referred to as SASS throughout report.

## Percentage of core courses taught by highly qualified teachers, 2003-04

Source: U.S. Department of Education, 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, OMB Number: 1810-0614, Section IV, Highly Qualified Teachers. Washington, D.C., 2004. Please note that the data also incorporates edits from state departments of education, which may or may not be reflected in the state's Consolidated State Performance Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Education.
U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Application, for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110), Section 3(a). Washington, D.C., 2003.
Notes: Within the guidelines put forth within the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Section 9101(23) of ESEA, each state defines how teachers are classified as highly qualified.

## High school dropout rate

Source: Kaufman, P., Alt, M.N., and Chapman, C. (2004). Dropout Rates in the United States: 2001 (NCES 2005-046). U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Notes: Only states whose definitions complied with NCES's definition were included. Annua or "event" rate is the percentage of 9-12 students dropping out during one school year.

## Averaged freshman graduation rate

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, 1993-94, 1994-95, 2000-01, and 2001-02, based on calculations published in Seastrom, M., Hoffman, L., Chapman, C., and Stillwell, R. (2005). The Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate for Public High Schools From the Common Core of Data: School Years 2001-02 and 2002-03 (NCES 2006-601). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

## Postsecondary enrollment

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, Private School Universe Survey, 1993; and Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Fall Enrollment, 1994, Survey.
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data survey (Digest of Education Statistics, 2003, table 104); Private School Universe Survey, 1999 (Digest of Education Statistics, 2002, table 63); and Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Fall Enrollment, 2000, Survey (Digest of Education Statistics, 2002, table 204).

## : NAEP State Results

: Source: The Nation's Report Card: Mathematics Highlights 2005. U.S. Department : of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational
: Progress, 2005. Available: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2005/2006453.pdf.
: The Nation's Report Card: Reading 2005. U.S. Department of Education, National : Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2005. Avail: able: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2005/2006451.pdf.
: Notes: The National Assessment of Educational Progress is referred to as NAEP through: out report. Data reported for public schools only. Some states did not satisfy one of the : guidelines for school sample participation rates. Puerto Rico did not participate in these : assessments. See Appendix C for further information and definitions of proficient and basic.

- Prior to 1996, accommodations were not permitted for students with disabilities so caution : should be used when comparing results. Data for 1994 (reading) and 1996 (mathematics)
$:$ NAEP are given for the purpose of trend analyses, as these years are closest to the 1993-94 : baseline used for the remainder of the report.


## Statewide Accountability Information

Source: Results from an unpublished 50-state survey conducted by CCSSO in July 2005. Rolf Blank et al. For more information, visit the states' Web page or contact the author at: rolfb@ ccsso.org

## NCLB Accountability Goals

Source: Council of Chief State School Officers, Accountability Profiles. 2005. Available: http://accountability.ccsso.org, with edits by states.
: 2003-04 NCLB accountability results, applied to 2004-05 school year

- Source: U.S. Department of Education, 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, OMB Number: 1810-0614, Section : II, Schools in Need of Improvement. Washington, D.C., 2004. Please note that the data also : incorporates edits from state departments of education, which may or may not be reflected in the state's Consolidated State Performance Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Education.


## Other indicator, 2003-04

Source: Council of Chief State School Officers, Accountability Profiles. 2005. Available: http:// accountability.ccsso.org, with edits by states.

## NCLB choice participation

Source: U.S. Department of Education, 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, OMB Number: 1810-0614, Section
III, School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services. Washington, D.C., 2004. Please
note that the data also incorporates edits from state departments of education, which may or may not be reflected in the state's Consolidated State Performance Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Education.
Source: U.S. Department of Education, 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, OMB Number: 1810-0614, Section I, Student Academic Achievement. Washington, D.C., 2004. Please note that the data also incorporates edits from state departments of education, which may or may not be reflected in the state's Consolidated State Performance Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Education.
Notes: Trend results for 2000-01 through 2003-04 reported in bar graphs for states with consistent tests and proficiency levels over two or more years and in Table 3 on page 6.

## Appendix B: State definitions of proficient*

## Alabama <br> Not available

## Alaska

Reading: A student who scores at the proficient level based on the scale scores, established in state regulation, in reading combined with writing or language arts.

Mathematics: A student who scores at the proficient level based on the scale scores established in state regulation.

## Arizona

Meets Standard: This level denotes demonstration of solid academic performance on challenging subject matter reflected by the content standards. This includes knowledge of subject matter, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and content relevant analytical skills. Attainment of at least this level is the expectation for all Arizona students

## Arkansas

Proficient: Proficient students demonstrate solid academic performance for the grade tested and are well-prepared for the next level of schooling. They can use Arkansas's established reading and writing or mathematics skills and knowledge to solve problems and complete tasks on their own. Students can tie ideas together and explain the way their ideas are connected.

## California

Proficient: In reading-language arts and mathematics in grades 2-8 would be based on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced level on the California Standards Tests (CSTs). These tests assess how well students are mastering the state's rigorous academic content standards, which lay out what students should know and be able to do at each grade level.

At the high school level, the definition of "proficient" in reading and math would be tied to scores on the California High School Exit Exam, which is a pass/fail test. "Cut scores" for achieving proficiency at the high school level would be equivalent to achieving proficiency on the California standards-based tests in reading-language arts and math.

## Colorado

Proficient: Students understand directions, recognize authors' point of view, explain reactions, define problems or solutions, make predictions and draw conclusions, differentiate among printed materials, discriminate among various media, extract information from complex stimulus, identify character's reactions or motives, identify sequences, support opinions, classify familiar vocabulary, and interpret poetry in a concrete manner.

## - Connecticut

: Reading: Proficient: Students who score at this level can comprehend most grade-level or : below-grade-level textbooks and other materials. They can generally determine the main : idea, have an adequate understanding of the author's purpose and are able to make some : judgments about a test's quality and themes.
: Mathematics: Proficient: Students who score at this level demonstrate adequately developed : conceptual understanding and computational skills, and adequately developed problem: solving skills.

## Delaware

Meets Standard: The performance levels for reading, writing and math at grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 and science and social studies grades $4,6,8$ and 11 were set through a standard : setting process detailed in the Report and Recommendations to the Delaware State Board of Education for Establishing Proficiency Levels for the Delaware Student Testing Program in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics, August 1999. The DSTP scale scores for reading and math are reported on a developmental scale ranging from 150 : to 800. The determination of the DSTP scale scores for grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 has been done : using a procedure that involves linking to the Stanford Achievement Test, version 9, (Stan-- ford 9) scores for reading and math. The DSTP in reading and math contains a portion of
: the Stanford 9. The scaling for grades 4,6 , and 7 is parallel to that at grades $3,5,8$, and 10 .
: Determination of five levels of performance for reading and math at grades 4,6 , and 7 will
: be done using a statistical model. For writing, raw scores are used to determine performance levels at grades $3,5,8$, and 10 and the performance levels at grades 4,6 , and 7 can easily replicate those at grades $3,5,8$, and 10 .

## District of Columbia

: Proficient: Percentage that scored at or above the state proficiency standard. Students who : are not tested are included in this computation as being not proficient.

## Florida

Level 4: Performance at this level indicates that the student has success with the challenging content of the Sunshine State Standards. A Level 4 student answers most of the questions correctly but may have only some success with questions that reflect the most challenging content.
: Georgia
Meets Standard: CRCT: Scores from 300-349 indicate "Meets Standard," which represents : the "Proficient" student achievement level
: Hawaii
Meets Proficiency: Assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated the knowl$\vdots$

[^4]edge and skills required to meet the content standards for this grade. The student is ready to $:$ variety of novel, quantitative reasoning problems.
work on higher levels of this content area.

## Idaho

Proficient: Student demonstrates thorough knowledge and mastery of skills that allows him or her to function independently on all major concepts related to his or her current educational level.

## Illinois

Meets Standards: Student work demonstrates proficient knowledge and skills in the subject. Students effectively apply knowledge and skills to solve problems.

## Indiana

Pass: Solid academic performance for each grade assessed. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter.

## Iowa

Grade 4 Reading: Intermediate: Understands some factual information; sometimes can draw conclusions and make inferences about the motives and feelings of the characters; and is beginning to be able to identify the main idea, evaluate the style and structure of the text, and interpret nonliteral language.

Grade 4 Mathematics: Intermediate: Is beginning to develop an understanding of most math concepts and to develop the ability to solve complex word problems, use a variety of estimation methods, and interpret data from graphs and tables.

Grade 8 Reading: Intermediate: Understands some factual information; sometimes can draw conclusions; makes inferences about the motives and feelings of characters; and applies
what has been read to new situations; and sometimes can identify the main idea, evaluate the style and structure of the text, and interpret nonliteral language.

Grade 8 Mathematics: Intermediate: Is beginning to develop an understanding of most math concepts and to develop the ability to solve complex word problems, use a variety of estimation methods, and interpret data from graphs and tables.

Grade 11 Reading: Intermediate: Understands some factual information; sometimes can make inferences about the characters; identify the main idea, and identifies author viewpoint and style; occasionally can interpret nonliteral language and judge the validity of conclusion.

Grade 11 Mathematics: Intermediate: Is beginning to develop the ability to apply a variety of math concepts and procedures, make inferences about qualitative information, and solve a

## Kansas

: Proficient: Mastery of core skills is apparent. Knowledge and skills can be applied in most : contexts. Ability to apply learned rules to most situations is evident. Adequate command : of difficult or challenging content and applications is competently demonstrated. There is : evidence of solid performance.

## Kentucky

: Proficient: Proficient as defined in Kentucky has been demonstrated to be a very high standard for student achievement, especially in comparison to standards typically set by other : states. In Kentucky, Proficiency requires students to know content beyond basic knowledge : and to apply their knowledge to solve problems. Students performing at the Proficient level : are able to: * demonstrate broad content knowledge and apply it; * communicate in an accurate, clear, and organized way with relevant details and evidence; * use appropriate strategies to solve problems and make decisions; * demonstrate effective use of critical thinking skills.
: Louisiana
Basic: These standards have been shown to be high; for example, equipercentile equating of
: the standards has shown that Louisiana's "Basic" is somewhat more rigorous than NAEP's
: "Basic." In addition, representatives from Louisiana's business community and higher educa: tion have validated the use of "Basic" as the state's proficiency goal

## Maine

Meets the standard: The student's work demonstrates consistent accomplishment of content
knowledge, analysis, problem-solving, and communication skills..

## Maryland

Proficient: Achieved the cut score on the assessment, as determined by the state.
: Massachusetts
Proficient: Students at this level demonstrate a solid understanding of challenging subject matter and solve a wide variety of problems

## Michigan

Proficient: A realistic and rigorous level of achievement indicating proficiency in meeting the needs of students..

## Minnesota

Level 3: A score at or above Level 3 (scale score 1,420-1,499) represents state expectations for achievement of all students. Students who score at Level 3 are working successfully on
grade-level material. This level corresponds to a "proficient" level of achievement for NCLB.

## Mississippi

Mississippi Curriculum Test, Proficient: Students at the proficient level demonstrate solid academic performance and mastery of the content area knowledge and skills required for success at the next grade. Students who perform at this level are well prepared to begin work on even more challenging material that is required at the next grade.
Algebra I and English II Test, Proficient: Students at the proficient level demonstrate solid academic performance and mastery of the knowledge and skills required for success in a more advanced course in the content area.

## Missouri

Communication Arts: Proficient: In reading, students compare and contrast; interpret and use textual elements; predict; draw inferences and conclusions; determine word meaning; identify synonyms and antonyms; identify main idea and details. In writing, they use some details and organization; write complete sentences; generally follow rules of standard English.

Grade 4 Mathematics: Proficient: Students communicate math processes; add and subtract common fractions and decimals (money only); use standard units of measurement; identify attributes of planes and solid figures; create and interpret data from graphs; recognize, extend, and describe pictorial or numeric patterns; apply strategies to solve multi-step and logic problems.

Grade 8 Mathematics: Proficient: Students communicate math processes; recognize transformations; solve problems using units of measurement; interpret data from multiple representations; extend and describe patterns and relationships using algebraic expressions; develop and apply number theory concepts; use inductive and deductive reasoning to solve problems.

Grade 10 Mathematics: Proficient: Students communicate math processes; usually analyze and evaluate information; estimate; recognize reasonableness; identify needed information; make predictions; find probability; identify various representations of data; represent situations algebraically; apply properties of real numbers; use multiple strategies to solve problems.

## Montana

Proficient: A student demonstrates competency including subject matter knowledge, the application of subject knowledge to real world situations, and the analytical skills appropriate to this subject.

## Nebraska

Proficient: In the STARS (School-based Teacher-led Assessment and Reporting System) assessment system, student performance achievement levels are determined for each classroom assessment according to criteria established under the quality indicators. This process
: must be conducted in a technically appropriate manner and is reviewed by the external - assessment reviewers.

## Nevada

## Not available.

## New Hampshire

: Grade 3 Reading or Language Arts: Proficient: Students at this level demonstrate an overall understanding of the materials they read, hear, and view. They are able to identify main
ideas and draw conclusions. Their responses show thought and are supported with some detail. When writing, they communicate competently and are able to adequately develop and support their ideas. Although they demonstrate a firm grounding in the mechanics of written expression, they may make errors in spelling and grammar. However, these do not interfere with a reader's ability to understand the text.

Grade 3 Mathematics: Proficient: Students at this level are able to estimate and compute solutions to problems and communicate their understanding of mathematics. They can, with : reasonable accuracy, add three-digit whole numbers; subtract any two-digit numbers; and multiply whole numbers up to five. They are able to: Demonstrate and understanding of : place value as well as the relationship between simple fractions and decimals; read charts and graphs; make measurements; and recognize and extend patterns.

Grade 6 Reading or Language Arts: Proficient: Students at this level demonstrate an overall understanding of literacy, narrative, factual, informational, and practical works. They extract main ideas, analyze text, evaluate and organize information, draw conclusions, and make inferences and interpretations. They critically evaluate materials they read, hear, and view. They effectively organize, develop, and support ideas so that a reader can easily understand the intent of their writing. They demonstrate a firm grounding in the mechanics of written expression; however, they may still make some errors.

Grade 6 Mathematics: Proficient: Students at this level demonstrate an overall understanding of mathematical concepts and skills. They make few, if any, errors in computation. They use tables and graphs to organize, present, and interpret data. They employ appropriate strategies to solve a wide range of problems. They clearly communicate their solutions and problem-solving strategies.

Grade 10 Reading or Language Arts: Proficient: Students at this level demonstrate a solid : understanding of a wide range of literary, narrative, factual, informational, and practical works. They make meaningful connections between and among ideas and concepts in
materials they read, hear, and view. They evaluate and organize information, make and com: municate informed judgments, and provide evidence for inferences and interpretations. Their writing is clear, logical, and shows evidence of fluency and style. They effectively control the

## mechanics of language including spelling, capitalization, grammar, and punctuation.

Grade 10 Mathematics: Proficient: Students at this level demonstrate a solid understanding of mathematical concepts and skills. Their work displays a high degree of accuracy. They make meaningful connections among important concepts in algebra, geometry, measurement, and probability and statistics. They identify and use appropriate information to solve problems. They provide supporting evidence for inferences and solutions. They communicate mathematical ideas effectively, with sufficient substance and detail to convey understanding

## New Jersey

Proficient: Proficient means a score achieved by a student at or above the cut score which demarks a solid understanding of the math content measured by an individual section on any state assessment.

## New Mexico

Not available.

## New York

Proficiency: The state has defined proficiency as the performance of a student who scores Level 3 on the grade 4 or 8 English language arts assessment, shows Level 3 growth on the NYSESLAT, scores between 65 and 84 on a Regents examination, or passes an approved alternative to a Regents examination

## North Carolina

Level III: Students performing at this level consistently demonstrate mastery of grade level subject matter and course subject matter and skills and are well prepared for the next grade or course level work

## North Dakota

Proficient: The definition of proficiency was established in narrative form by the state content and achievement standards drafting committees in 1999. These narratives guided the state standards-setting committees who established the state's achievement cut-scores for the North Dakota State Assessment in 2001-02. The standards-setting committees drafted supporting narrative that aligned to the final cut-scores and became the operative definition for all reports.

## Ohio

Ohio Achievement Test: Reading: Grade 4, cut score of 218 or higher; Grade 6, cut score of 222; High school, cut score of 200 or higher.

Ohio Achievement Test: Mathematics: Grade 4, cut score of 218 or higher; Grade 6, cut score of 200 or higher; High school, cut score of 200 or higher.
: Oklahoma
Not available.
: Oregon
Meets Standard: Specific cut score on state multiple-choice math test plus specific cut score
(composite of five trait scores) on math problem solving assessment.

## Pennsylvania

Proficient: Satisfactory academic performance. Proficient work indicates a solid understand-
ing and adequate display of the skills included in the Pennsylvania Academic Content
Standards.
Puerto Rico
Not available.
Rhode Island
Achieved Standard: Students demonstrate the ability to apply concepts and processes ef-

- fectively and accurately. Students communicate ideas in clear and effective ways.
: South Carolina
: Proficient: Proficient: A student who performs at the proficient level on the PACT has met
: expectations for student performance based on the curriculum standards approved by the
: state board of education. The student is well prepared for work at the next grade. The profi-
: cient level represents the long-term goal for student performance in South Carolina.


## South Dakota

Not available.
: Tennessee
: Proficient: Student performs at or above the cut scores set by the state.
: Texas
Met the Standard: Student performed at a level that was at or somewhat above the state passing standard. Performance showed a sufficient understanding of the knowledge and skills tested at grade level.

## Utah

Sufficient: A student scoring at this level is proficient on the measured standards and objec-
tives of the Core Curriculum in this subject. The student's performance indicates sufficient
understanding and application of key curriculum concepts

## Vermont

Meets Standard: English or Language Arts:
(1) Reading: Basic Understanding: Students must demonstrate the ability to comprehend a : variety of materials of varying length and complexity.
(2) Reading: Analysis and Interpretation: Students must demonstrate the ability to analyze and interpret what they read in the process of becoming critical readers.
(3) Writing Effectiveness: Students must demonstrate the ability to write effectively in a variety of formats for a variety of purposes, audiences, and contexts.
(4) Writing Conventions: Students must demonstrate control of the conventions (usage, spelling and punctuation) of the English language according to current standards of correctness.
Meets Standards: Mathematics:
(1) Concepts: Showing that the student understands mathematical processes and ideas.
(2) Skills: Showing that the student can perform the mathematical routine or technique correctly.
(3) Problem Solving: Showing that the student can choose and apply appropriate skills and concepts, and reason mathematically. Students solve increasingly complex situations by formulating, implementing and drawing conclusions from the problem solution.

## Virginia

Pass/Proficient: Students who attain a scaled score of 399 or below on any of the Standards of Learning tests receive a rating of "fails/does not meet the standards." Those with a scaled score of 400 to 499 receive a rating of "pass/proficient", and those with a scaled sc ore of 500 to 600 receive a rating of "pass/advanced."

## Washington

Meet the Standard: Students performing at this level demonstrate mastery of the Essential Academic Learning Requirements for the subject and grade level.

## West Virginia

Mastery: Student demonstrates knowledge, comprehension, and application of skills, which meet the standard.

## Wisconsin

Proficient: Demonstrates competency in the academic knowledge and skills tested

## Wyoming

Students at the proficient level use concepts and skills to acquire, analyze, and communicate information and ideas.
$\xrightarrow{2}$

## Appendix C

## National Assessment for Educational Progress—Definitions and Further Information*

## Mathematics Achievement Levels-Grade 4

Basic Fourth-grade students performing at the Basic level should show some evidence of understanding the mathematical concepts and procedures in the five NAEP content strands. Fourth-graders performing at the Basic level should be able to estimate and use basic facts to perform simple computations with whole numbers; show some understanding of fractions and decimals; and solve some simple real-world problems in all NAEP content areas. Students at this level should be able to use-though not always accurately-four-function calculators, rulers, and geometric shapes. Their written responses are often minimal and presented without supporting information.
Proficient Fourth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should consistently apply integrated procedural knowledge and conceptual understanding to problem solving in the five NAEP content strands. Fourth-graders performing at the Proficient level should be able to use whole numbers to estimate, compute, and determine whether results are reasonable. They should have a conceptual understanding of fractions and decimals; be able to solve real-world problems in all NAEP content areas; and use four-function calculators, rulers, and geometric shapes appropriately. Students performing at the Proficient level should employ problem-solving strategies such as identifying and using appropriate information. Their written solutions should be organized and presented both with supporting information and explanations of how they were achieved.

## Mathematics Achievement Levels—Grade 8

Basic Eighth-grade students performing at the Basic level should exhibit evidence of conceptual and procedural understanding in the five NAEP content strands. This level of performance signifies an understanding of arithmetic operations-including estimation-on whole numbers, decimals, fractions, and percents. Eighth-graders performing at the Basic level should complete problems correctly with the help of structural prompts such as diagrams, charts, and graphs. They should be able to solve problems in all NAEP content strands through the appropriate selection and use of strategies and technological tools-including calculators, computers, and geometric shapes. Students at this level also should be able to use fundamental algebraic and informal geometric concepts in problem solving. As they approach the Proficient level, students at the basic level should be able to determine which of the available data are necessary and sufficient for correct solutions and use them in problem solving. However, these eighth-graders show limited skill in communicating mathematically.

Proficient Eighth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should apply mathematical concepts and procedures consistently to complex problems in the five NAEP content strands. Eighth-graders performing at the Proficient level should be able to conjecture, defend their ideas, and give supporting examples. They should understand the connections between fractions, percents, decimals, and other mathematical topics such as algebra and

- functions. Students at this level are expected to have a thorough understanding of Basic : level arithmetic operations—an understanding sufficient for problem solving in practi: cal situations. Quantity and spatial relations in problem solving and reasoning should be : familiar to them, and they should be able to convey underlying reasoning skills beyond the : level of arithmetic. They should be able to compare and contrast mathematical ideas and : generate their own examples. These students should make inferences from data and graphs; : apply properties of informal geometry; and accurately use the tools of technology. Students at this level should understand the process of gathering and organizing data and be able to calculate, evaluate, and communicate results within the domain of statistics and probability.


## Reading Achievement Levels—Grade 4

Basic Fourth-grade students performing at the Basic level should demonstrate an un-- derstanding of the overall meaning of what they read. When reading text appropriate for : fourth-graders, they should be able to make relatively obvious connections between the text - and their own experiences, and extend the ideas in the text by making simple inferences.
: Proficient Fourth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to dem-
: onstrate an overall understanding of the text, providing inferential as well as literal informa: tion. When reading text appropriate to fourth grade, they should be able to extend the ideas : in the text by making inferences, drawing conclusions, and making connections to their own : experiences. The connection between the text and what the student infers should be clear.

## : Reading Achievement Levels-Grade 8

: Basic Eighth-grade students performing at the Basic level should demonstrate a literal understanding of what they read and be able to make some interpretations. When reading text : appropriate to eighth grade, they should be able to identify specific aspects of the text that : reflect overall meaning, extend the ideas in the text by making simple inferences, recognize : and relate interpretations and connections among ideas in the text to personal experience, and draw conclusions based on the text.
: Proficient Eighth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to show : an overall understanding of the text, including inferential as well as literal information.
When reading text appropriate to eighth grade, they should be able to extend the ideas in the text by making clear inferences from it, by drawing conclusions, and by making connections to their own experiences-including other reading experiences. Proficient eighth-graders should be able to identify some of the devices authors use in composing text.
*Additional information is available at the NAEP Web site, http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard.


The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.


[^0]:    +2 schools did not report.

[^1]:    +56 schools did not report.

[^2]:    †2 schools did not report.

[^3]:    Title I school choice:
    Supplemental educational services

[^4]:    *Please visit each state's Web site for additional information.

