



No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 Annual Report to Congress



February 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
State Standards and Assessments	3
English Language Proficiency	9
Title I Schools Identified for Improvement	10
Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services	13
Teacher and Paraprofessional Quality	19
Appendix A – State Assessment Data	
Alabama	A-1
Alaska	A-7
Arizona	A-15
Arkansas	A-19
California	A-23
Colorado	A-31
Connecticut	A-38
Delaware	A-42
District of Columbia	A-46
Florida	A-53
Georgia	A-61
Hawaii	A-65
Idaho	A-69
Illinois	A-72
Indiana	A-76
Iowa	A-80
Kansas	A-83
Kentucky	A-86
Louisiana	A-89
Maine	A-92
Maryland	A-95
Massachusetts	A-99
Michigan	A-102
Minnesota	A-106
Mississippi	A-108
Missouri	A-115
Montana	A-118
Nebraska	A-121
Nevada	A-124

New Hampshire	A-129
New Jersey	A-132
New Mexico	A-135
New York	A-143
North Carolina	A-146
North Dakota	A-153
Ohio	A-156
Oklahoma	A-159
Oregon	A-163
Pennsylvania	A-168
Puerto Rico	A-171
Rhode Island	A-175
South Carolina	A-178
South Dakota	A-185
Tennessee	A-192
Texas	A-196
Utah	A-205
Vermont	A-212
Virginia	A-222
Washington	A-226
West Virginia	A-229
Wisconsin	A-236
Wyoming	A-239

Appendix B – Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

Alabama	B-1
Alaska	B-4
Arizona	B-8
Arkansas	B-22
California	B-39
Colorado	B-111
Connecticut	B-116
Delaware	B-117
District of Columbia	B-118
Florida	B-119
Georgia	B-122
Hawaii	B-154
Idaho	B-159
Illinois	B-162
Indiana	B-199
Iowa	B-206
Kansas	B-207
Kentucky	B-209
Louisiana	B-211
Maine	B-216

Maryland	B-217
Massachusetts	B-224
Michigan	B-237
Minnesota	B-259
Mississippi	B-262
Missouri	B-263
Montana	B-265
Nebraska	B-268
Nevada	B-269
New Hampshire	B-271
New Jersey	B-272
New Mexico	B-287
New York	B-293
North Carolina	B-340
North Dakota	B-343
Ohio	B-345
Oklahoma	B-357
Oregon	B-360
Pennsylvania	B-361
Puerto Rico	B-379
Rhode Island	B-388
South Carolina	B-390
South Dakota	B-396
Tennessee	B-398
Texas	B-402
Utah	B-403
Vermont	B-404
Virginia	B-405
Washington	B-408
West Virginia	B-412
Wisconsin	B-413
Wyoming	B-417

Introduction

The *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB) significantly raises expectations for States, local educational agencies, and schools in that all students are expected to meet or exceed State standards in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 school year. To ensure authentic school reform, the Nation must raise the bar of expectations for all its students. Every child *can* learn. Every child *must* learn. And thanks to NCLB, every child *will* learn.

No Child Left Behind provides historic levels of resources and flexibility to improve results for all children, especially for those who may need extra assistance meeting grade-level standards. In NCLB, we have a powerful tool to support our efforts to provide all children the opportunity to receive the education they deserve and to meet academic goals. By devoting new energy to those schools identified for improvement, we have refocused the debate and taken the first steps toward changing students' lives for the better. The law is meant to spur improvement, encourage reform, and inspire new initiatives so that every child, regardless of his or her race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disability, or level of English language proficiency, has the opportunity to achieve and be successful.

Fortunately, there are schools and reform leaders across our Nation who have shown how quickly effective leadership can transform student achievement and how swiftly success can sweep through a school. With a dedicated focus on accountability and achievement, *any* school that needs improvement can create a new culture of learning and excellence. The good news is that we know much more about what works: scientifically proven methods; aligned standards, assessments, and instruction; school and district leadership focused on student learning; accountability for results; and highly qualified teachers will improve achievement and bring success. Admittedly, our Nation's commitment -- to teach every child -- is ambitious. But we have the tools and we have the know-how. Working together, we can ensure that all students succeed and that the achievement gap is closed, once and for all.

Under Section 1111(h)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by NCLB, the Secretary of Education is required to transmit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report that provides State-level data for each State receiving assistance under Title I of ESEA. In this first Secretary's NCLB report to Congress, the Department is reporting on State reported data for the 2002-2003 school year. Specifically, in this report the following data are reported:

- Information on States' progress in developing and implementing academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under section 1111(b)(3).
- Information on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year in

reading/language arts and mathematics for all students, disaggregated by major racial/ethnic groups, economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, migrant students, and gender.

- Information on the acquisition of English proficiency by children with limited English proficiency, including States' progress in developing and implementing English language proficiency standards and English language proficiency assessments.
- Information on the number and names of each Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2003-2004 school year under section 1116(b), the reasons for identification, and the measures taken to address the achievement problems of such schools.
- Information on the number of students and Title I schools that participated in public school choice and supplemental educational services under section 1116(b) during the 2002-2003 school year.
- Information on the quality of teachers and paraprofessionals and the percentage of public elementary and secondary school classes taught by highly qualified teachers in the States during the 2002-2003 school year.

The Department collected the information presented in this report from States through State Consolidated State Application submissions in June 2002, May 2003, and September 2003 and through Part I of the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year, which States submitted in December 2003. It is important to note that the 2002-2003 school year was the first year that States were required to collect and report data on the acquisition of English language proficiency by children with limited English proficiency, the number of students and Title I schools participating in public school choice and supplemental educational services, the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals, and the percentage of public elementary and secondary school classes taught by highly qualified teachers. The Department recognizes that these new data sets are complex and new to a number of States. The Department expects all States to be able to report more accurate and complete information beginning with the 2003-2004 school year. The Department has provided explanatory notes throughout this report to indicate caveats that must be considered when examining particular data elements provided by the States.

State Standards and Assessments

Under *The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), States are building on the work they had already begun in the area of academic standards and are implementing challenging academic content and student achievement standards in the core academic subjects of reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. The power of rigorous State academic standards is undeniable: they provide a clear direction for what all students should know and be able to do and establish clear expectations for schools, teachers, parents, and students.

Rigorous academic standards, however, are but one critical element to ensuring that all children attain to high levels of academic achievement. To reach our goal of high achievement for all children, we must also be able to measure accurately and efficiently whether or not students are meeting the standards of learning expected of them, diagnose problems, and offer immediate intervention. As President Bush has stated, "In order to make sure children are not simply shuffled through the system, we must measure. We must determine what needs to be corrected early, before it's too late."

Although previous federal legislation also required States to assess public school children, States were required to test only three times during a student's tenure in the K-12 educational system. This left too many intervening years in which children's academic difficulties went undiagnosed. The President and the Congress, in passing NCLB, recognized that these intervening years without assessments were precious years during which far too many children were slipping through the cracks and being left behind. Therefore, under NCLB, States are enhancing their existing assessment systems to include annual assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics for all public school students in each of grades 3 through 8 and at least once in grades 10 through 12 by the 2005-2006 school year.

The timeline for State implementation of the standards and assessments required by NCLB is as follows:

Academic Content and Student Achievement Standards

- By May 2003, as part of a State's consolidated application, States were required to have challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics to cover each of grades 3-8. Additionally, as required under the 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), States must continue to have academic content standards for grades 10-12 in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- By the 2005-2006 school year, States must develop academic content standards in science for elementary (grades 3-5), middle (grades 6-9), and high school (grades 10-12).
- By the 2005-2006 school year, States must develop and implement student academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics for

each of grades 3 through 8. As required under the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA, States must continue to have academic achievement standards for grades 10-12 in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- By the 2007-2008 school year, States must develop and implement student achievement standards in science for each of the grade spans 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12.

Assessments of Academic Standards

- Through the 2004-2005 school year, States must administer annual assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics at least once during grades 3 through 5; grades 6 through 9; and grades 10 through 12.
- By the 2005-2006 school year, States must develop and implement yearly, high-quality assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3 through 8 that are aligned with a State's challenging academic content and achievement standards. The requirement for annual assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics at least once in the grade span 10-12 remains and has not changed from the 1994 ESEA reauthorization.
- By the 2007-2008 school year, States must develop and implement yearly, high-quality annual assessments in science that are aligned with a State's challenging academic content and achievement standards at least once in each of the grade spans 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12.
- A State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics must be used to make annual accountability determinations of how well all students in public elementary and secondary schools are learning and mastering the subject material reflected in a State's academic content and achievement standards.
- Student achievement on assessments must be included in State and district report cards.

Immediately following enactment of NCLB, the Department conducted negotiated rulemaking on regulations to implement the NCLB standards and assessments requirements. The resulting regulations, published July 5, 2002, represented the consensus of a wide range of stakeholders--Federal, State, and local administrators, principals, teachers, parents, and assessment experts. The Department also issued non-regulatory guidance on the standards and assessments requirements on March 10, 2003, and Standards and Assessments Peer Review Guidance on April 28, 2004.

The purpose of the Peer Review guidance for standards and assessments is twofold: (1) to inform States about what is acceptable evidence in demonstrating that they have met the NCLB standards and assessments requirements; and (2) to guide teams of peer reviewers who will examine the evidence submitted by States and advise the Department as to

whether a State has met the requirements. The intent is to help States develop comprehensive assessment systems that provide accurate and valid information for holding districts and schools accountable for student achievement against State standards.

To ensure that States are taking the steps necessary to meet the deadline for administering annual academic assessments in each of grades 3-8 and at the high school level in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2005-2006 school year and annual academic assessments in science by the 2007-2008 school year, the Department had each State submit, as part of its May 2003 NCLB Consolidated State Application, detailed information and timelines for developing and implementing the standards and assessments required under NCLB. Specifically, in the May 2003 Consolidated State Application, States were asked to:

- Provide evidence that the State had adopted challenging content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics at each grade level for grades 3 through 8, consistent with section 1111(b)(1), or disseminated grade-level expectations for reading/language arts and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 to LEAs and schools if the State's academic content standards cover more than one grade level.
- Provide a detailed timeline for major milestones for adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).
- Provide a detailed timeline of major milestones for the development and implementation, in consultation with LEAs, of assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels.
- Provide a detailed timeline for major milestones for setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

Each State's May 2003 Consolidated State Application is available on the Department's website at: <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html>. As the Department monitors States under Title I, the Department is checking to ensure that each State is progressing on the timelines it submitted in the May 2003 Consolidated State Application. In January 2005, as part of the State's Consolidated State Performance Reports for the 2003-2004 school year, each State provided to the Department a detailed status report on its progress implementing the standards and assessments required by NCLB.

Finally, under NCLB States have received unprecedented federal resources to assist them in implementing the NCLB standards and assessments requirements. Between fiscal years 2002 and 2005, States have received over \$1.5 billion in federal funds to develop and implement the standards and assessments required by NCLB. Federal funds are available to States for the development and implementation of State standards and

assessments under section 6111 of NCLB (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) and section 6112 (Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments). The primary purpose of section 6111 funds is for the development of the new standards and assessments required by NCLB. If States have already developed the standards and assessments required by section 1111(b) of NCLB, States may use their section 6111 funds to pay for the administration of assessments or any of the following other activities:

- Developing challenging academic content and student achievement standards and aligned assessments in subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by NCLB.
- Developing or improving assessments of limited English proficiency to comply with section 1111(b)(7).
- Ensuring the validity and reliability of State assessments.
- Refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with State academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials.
- Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems.
- Strengthening the capacity of LEAs and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments.
- Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities to improve the rates of inclusion of these students.
- Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time.

Additionally, Section 6112 provides competitive grants to States or consortia of States to improve the quality, validity, and reliability of State academic assessments. For fiscal years 2002 and 2003, \$21.5 million were appropriated for these Enhanced Assessment grants. The funded projects focus on enhancement of assessments of students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency. Four projects address the assessment of English proficiency, two focus on appropriate test design and accommodations for LEP students, one project examines appropriate accommodations for special education students, one aims to improve the technical quality of alternate assessments for students with severe disabilities, and one project will enhance State

capacity to evaluate and document the alignment between State standards and State assessments.

The grants also enable consortia of States or individual States to:

- Measure student achievement using multiple measures of student academic achievement from multiple sources;
- Chart student progress over time; or
- Evaluate student academic achievement through the development of comprehensive academic assessment instruments, such as performance- and technology-based academic assessment.

A description of each project, as well as the collaborating states and groups and grant amounts, follows.

LEAD STATE	GRANT AMOUNT
Utah	\$1,842,893
Collaborators:	Montana, Idaho, New Mexico, Colorado, Oregon, Wyoming & North Dakota
The project aims to develop a series of assessments of English language proficiency at four levels (K-3; 4-6; 7-9; 10-12) to enable teachers diagnose the proficiency level of English language learners (ELLs).	
Rhode Island	\$1,788,356
Collaborators:	Maine, New Hampshire & Vermont
The project will build upon an existing collaboration among Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont and will help compare progress across states and combine resources to develop the highest quality assessments. States will examine the impact of computer-based testing accommodations on the validity of test scores for students with and without special needs, and train teachers to create and use the assessments.	
South Carolina	\$1,719,821
Collaborators:	American Association for the Advancement of Science, Austin Independent School District, The Council of Chief State School Officers, District of Columbia Public Schools, Maryland & North Carolina
The project will help gather valid information about ELLs' academic knowledge and skills, and different types accommodations that can match students with the proper accommodations.	
Oklahoma	\$1,442,453
Collaborators:	Alabama, California, Delaware, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Wyoming, West Virginia & Wisconsin
The project will work to expand and automate a process for judging the alignment of assessments with content standards, serve students with disabilities and help link assessments across grades. The alignment process system will be available on a CD-ROM that can be readily distributed to states to increase the use of the alignment tool in assessment development and verification.	
Nevada	\$2,266,506
Collaborators:	Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas & West Virginia
The project will help states implement assessments to measure the annual growth of English language development in speaking, listening, reading and writing. The project will produce test forms and an item bank from which states can draw to create test forms that reflect local needs and characteristics, and will help states predict ELLs' readiness for English language assessment.	
Pennsylvania	\$1,810,567

Collaborators: **Maryland, Michigan & Tennessee**

This project is designed to help states assess ELLs by analyzing state standards, establishing content benchmarks and developing standards-based assessments drawn from scientific research. The resulting assessments are to be shared with interested states and districts.

Colorado \$1,746,023

Collaborators: **Iowa, Oregon, Illinois, Missouri, South Carolina, West Virginia & Wyoming**

The project will help improve alternative assessments for students with complex disabilities, and the assessment methods will be developed, pilot tested and analyzed during the course of this project.

Wisconsin \$2,338,169

Collaborators: **Alaska, Delaware & Center for Applied Linguistics, Center for Equity and Excellence in Education, Second Language Acquisition, University of Wisconsin, University of Illinois**

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction plans to develop and enhance assessment instruments specially designed to measure ELLs' performance and progress in English proficiency and literacy skills based on state standards on reading, writing and language arts and alternate assessments to measure their performance in other academic content areas.

Minnesota \$2,013,503

Collaborators: **Nevada, North Carolina & Wyoming**

This project will develop new tools to measure the progress of ELLs using technology to pilot language assessment, develop new methods to organize, collect and score student assessment data and combine data from multiple measures to improve the evaluation of student progress over time. Staff development will help teachers use assessment results to improve instruction and the methods will be available to other states.

During the 2002-2003 school year, each State administered academic assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics as required by NCLB. The assessment results for each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are available in Appendix A.

English Language Proficiency

When applying for NCLB formula grant funds, States were required to submit detailed information regarding their English language proficiency standards, assessments, and accountability systems. In response, States provided a status update on standards, including definitions for *making progress* in English, for *proficient*, and for *cohort*. States also provided English language proficiency baseline data for the 2002–2003 school year, a list of assessments used to test limited English proficient students' progress in English language proficiency, and annual measurable achievement targets. Department staff reviewed State submissions and approved the submissions of 12 States and granted conditional approval to the remaining 40 jurisdictions. A subsequent review raised the number of those jurisdictions with full approval to 44. The remaining 8 jurisdictions had an October 29, 2004, deadline for submitting any missing or additional information which the Department is currently reviewing.¹

Prior to NCLB, only a few States had English language proficiency standards, and many States were using multiple English language proficiency assessments that were not aligned with English language proficiency standards. NCLB requires that State English language proficiency standards be aligned with State academic content and achievement standards. To assist with the development or revision of English language proficiency standards and assessments that are integrated into the broader accountability system, 40 States have joined the consortia funded by the Department's Enhanced Assessment Grants. Some States have completed and adopted integrated English language proficiency standards, assessments, and accountability systems, and all 52 States and jurisdictions have reported making significant progress.

Because school districts within the individual States were using multiple assessments of English language proficiency, many States were initially unable to aggregate up to the State level data from these various assessments to report in a coherent fashion information on the progress of limited English proficient (LEP) students in acquiring English language proficiency. However, the Department's Office of English Language Acquisition will soon be providing to Congress its first biennial report under section 3123(b), which will contain updated information on the acquisition of English by LEP students.

¹Office of English Language Acquisition program officers' detailed reviews of State submissions are available in official state educational agency grantee files. The accountability sections of State Consolidated State Applications are available at <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html>.

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

Accountability is central to the success of the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB): States need to set high standards for improving academic achievement in order to improve the quality of education for all students. Under NCLB, each State establishes a definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP) to use each year to determine the achievement of each public elementary and secondary school district and school. AYP definitions are intended to highlight the specific areas where schools need improvement and should focus their resources. The statute gives States and local educational agencies significant flexibility in how they direct resources and tailor interventions to the needs of individual schools identified for improvement. Under NCLB, schools are held accountable for the achievement of all students, not just average student performance. Ensuring that schools are held accountable for all students meeting State standards represents the core of the bipartisan Act's goal of ensuring that no child is left behind.

To make AYP, a school must demonstrate that it has met the State's target for proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics for the school as a whole and for each of its subgroups of students, ensure that at least 95 percent of all students and each subgroup of students participated in the State's reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, and that the school has met the State's target for an additional academic indicator. At the high school level, this additional academic indicator must be the graduation rate.

In an historic milestone of education reform, in June 2003 the Department announced that every State, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia had put into place new accountability plans outlining how they would achieve the bold goal of making sure no child in America is left behind. Under NCLB's strong accountability provisions, States must describe how they will close the achievement gap and make sure all students, achieve academic proficiency. In addition, they must produce annual State and school district report cards that inform parents and communities about State, district, and school progress. All states submitted draft accountability plans to the U.S. Department of Education by January 31, 2003. Following an initial review and technical assistance, if needed, the next step was onsite peer reviews of each State's proposed accountability plan. Teams of three peer reviewers -- independent, non-Federal education policy, reform or statistical experts -- conducted each peer review. Following a review of the team's consensus report, the Department provided feedback to the State and worked to resolve any outstanding issues. Specific details on each State's accountability plan can be found on the Department's website at: <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html>.

Under their approved State accountability plans, States are to identify for improvement any Title I school that does not meet the State's definition of AYP for two or more consecutive years. Once identified, States and local educational agencies have significant flexibility to direct resources and tailor interventions to the needs of individual schools. For example, the statute gives States and districts flexibility in how they can direct Title I school improvement funds to schools that need the most improvement. NCLB also provides a series of interventions under "school improvement," "corrective action" and

"restructuring" that allow States, districts, and schools to improve the academic achievement of all students. The various school improvement activities associated with each stage of school improvement are outlined below:

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT OPTIONS	
	<p>A Title I school is identified for school improvement after it has not made AYP for two consecutive school years. A school moves to the next "step" or "year" in this chart if it continues to not make AYP.</p>
<i>School Improvement (Year One)</i>	<p>In general, Title I schools identified for improvement must receive technical assistance that enables them to specifically address the academic achievement problem that caused the school to be identified for improvement. The LEA is required to provide technical assistance as the school develops and implements the plan, including specific assistance in analyzing assessment data, improving professional development, and improving resource allocation. In addition, the following must take place:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All students are offered public school choice. 2. Each school identified for improvement must develop or revise a two-year school improvement plan, in consultation with parents, school staff, the local educational agency, and other experts, for approval by the LEA. The plan must incorporate research-based strategies, a 10 percent set-aside of Title I funds for professional development, extended learning time as appropriate (including school day or year), strategies to promote effective parental involvement, and mentoring for new teachers.
<i>School Improvement, (Year Two)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make available supplemental educational services to students from low-income families. <p><i>In addition, the LEA continues to offer technical assistance to implement the new plan and offer public school choice.</i></p>
<i>Corrective Action (Year Three)</i>	<p>Corrective Action requires an LEA to take actions likely to bring about meaningful change at the school. To accomplish this goal, LEAs are required to take at least one of the following corrective actions, depending on the needs of the individual school:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replace school staff responsible for the continued failure to make AYP; 2. Implement a new curriculum based on scientifically based research (including professional development); 3. Significantly decrease management authority at the school level; 4. Extend the school day or school year; 5. Appoint an outside expert to advise the school on its progress toward making AYP in accordance with its school plan; OR 6. Reorganize the school internally. <p><i>In addition, the LEA continues to offer technical assistance, public school choice, and supplemental educational services.</i></p>

<p><i>Restructuring (Year Four)</i></p>	<p>During the first year of restructuring, the LEA is required to prepare a plan and make necessary arrangements to carry out one of the following options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reopen school as charter school. 2. Replace principal and staff. 3. Contract for private management company of demonstrated effectiveness. 4. State takeover. 5. Any other major restructuring of school governance. <p><i>In addition, the LEA continues to offer public school choice and supplemental educational services.</i></p>
<p><i>Implementation of Restructuring (Year Five)</i></p>	<p>Implement alternative governance plan no later than first day of school year following year four described above.</p>

Implementing the State accountability plan that was approved in spring and early summer of 2003, each State, based on data from the 2002-2003 school year, identified Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring for the 2003-2004 school year. States provided to the Department a list of their Title I schools identified for improvement, the reason for the school being identified (e.g., reading/language arts proficiency, math participation rate, graduation rate), and each school's Title I school improvement status for the 2003-2004 school year. States' lists of these Title I schools are provided in Appendix B.

Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

When schools do not meet State targets for improving the achievement of all students, parents need to have better options, including the option to send their child to another school. NCLB responds to that need by giving parents of children enrolled in schools that receive Title I funding and that are identified for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring the opportunity to transfer their children to a school that has not been so identified. These statutory provisions, along with other elements that focus new attention and resources on turning around the schools identified for improvement, are critical mechanisms for achieving the vision embodied in NCLB, a high-quality education for all children.

Additionally, low-income parents of students enrolled in Title I schools identified for their second year of school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring may also have the opportunity to obtain, for their child, “supplemental educational services,” which are tutoring and other academic enrichment services provided in addition to the regular program of instruction and that are designed to enable children from low-income families to reach academic proficiency. The opportunity to obtain supplemental educational services is another parental choice component of NCLB. When both options are available, parents may have the choice of which option they would prefer for their child.

Students Participating in Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services during the 2002-2003 School Year

The charts on the following pages report data submitted by the States regarding the number of students who participated in public school choice and supplemental educational services, as required under section 1116, during the 2002-2003 school year. The schools these students attended had been identified for improvement or corrective action based on data from the 2001-2002 school year and based on each State’s definition of AYP under the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 (IASA).

NCLB included specific transition provisions governing Title I schools that were identified for improvement under IASA. With one exception stated under the law, districts were to provide public school choice at the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year to all students in Title I schools that had been identified for improvement or corrective action (based on AYP under IASA) as of January 7, 2002. The exception was that if a Title I school that was in school improvement on January 7 made its second year of adequate yearly progress based on its 2002 assessment results, the district was not required to provide choice to the students in that school. Additionally, Title I schools that had been identified for school improvement for two or more consecutive years as of January 7, 2002, were to begin offering supplemental educational services at the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year.

The data reported by States reflect their first efforts to collect information on public school choice and supplemental education services under NCLB. All States are working

to improve their data collections in these areas, and the Department anticipates having complete data from all States for the 2003-2004 school year.

**Public School Choice
2002-2003 School Year**

State	Number of Students Participating in Public School Choice	Number of Schools from Which Students Transferred	Number of Schools to Which Students Transferred
Alabama	836	51	128
Alaska	2	1	1
Arizona	83	25	30
Arkansas	171	25	29
California ¹	31,469	282	Data not available
Colorado	194	16	12
Connecticut	7	8	4
Delaware	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
District of Columbia	192	15	34
Florida ²	0	0	0
Georgia	1874	215	176
Hawaii	21	15	15
Idaho	0	0	0
Illinois ³	1097	38	369
Indiana	1301	120	132
Iowa	170	12	Data not available
Kansas	202	18	25
Kentucky	229	15	28
Louisiana	37	16	15
Maine	0	0	0
Maryland	709	105	92
Massachusetts	845	87	161
Michigan	19	9	5
Minnesota	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
Mississippi	4	2	2
Missouri	91	19	5
Montana	38	3	5
Nebraska	0	0	0
Nevada	127	12	9
New Hampshire	1	1	1
New Jersey	289	Data not available	Data not available
New Mexico	529	58	65
New York	1507	222	268
North Carolina	99	2	6

¹ These are the best data currently available to the California Department of Education regarding the first year of NCLB implementation. California continues to work with its districts and schools to improve the quality of the information they provide.

² Florida had no Title I schools identified for improvement or corrective action during the 2002-2003 school year.

³ These data represent only the Chicago school district. Statewide numbers will be available in future years.

State	Number of Students Participating in Public School Choice	Number of Schools from Which Students Transferred	Number of Schools to Which Students Transferred
North Dakota	11	4	2
Ohio	698	97	126
Oklahoma	549	8	58
Oregon	742	3	8
Pennsylvania	116	34	23
Puerto Rico	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
Rhode Island	17	3	6
South Carolina	519	27	42
South Dakota	1	1	1
Tennessee	810	56	74
Texas	59	30	Data not available
Utah	204	18	17
Vermont	0	0	0
Virginia	277	28	25
Washington	620	28	35
West Virginia	49	8	6
Wisconsin	111	35	65
Wyoming ⁴	0	0	0
TOTAL	46,926	1,772	2,105

⁴ Wyoming had no Title I schools identified for improvement or corrective action during the 2002-2003 school year.

**Supplemental Educational Services
2002-2003 School Year**

State	Number of Students Receiving Supplemental Services	Number of Schools Whose Students Received Supplemental Services
Alabama	726	38
Alaska	1295	15
Arizona	122	21
Arkansas	133	5
California ¹	30,049	295
Colorado	77	4
Connecticut	718	8
Delaware	0	0
District of Columbia	1120	15
Florida ²	0	0
Georgia	14,588	384
Hawaii	1406	54
Idaho	0	0
Illinois	773	25
Indiana	1212	39
Iowa	319	6
Kansas	Data not available	15
Kentucky	1132	26
Louisiana	0	0
Maine	0	0
Maryland	902	54
Massachusetts	3063	96
Michigan	3376	157
Minnesota ³	0	0
Mississippi	188	4
Missouri	66	4
Montana	84	3
Nebraska	0	0
Nevada ⁴	0	0
New Hampshire	23	2
New Jersey	11,097	Data not available
New Mexico	583	19

¹ These are the best data currently available to the California Department of Education regarding the first year of NCLB implementation. California continues to work with its districts and schools to improve the quality of the information they provide.

² Florida had no Title I schools identified for school improvement year 2 or corrective action during the 2002-2003 school year.

³ Minnesota had no Title I schools identified for school improvement year 2 or corrective action during the 2002-2003 school year.

⁴ Nevada had no Title I schools identified for school improvement year 2 or corrective action during the 2002-2003 school year.

State	Number of Students Receiving Supplemental Services	Number of Schools Whose Students Received Supplemental Services
New York ⁵	31,656	370
North Carolina	129	3
North Dakota	Data not available	27
Ohio	1518	100
Oklahoma	378	21
Oregon	198	3
Pennsylvania	2541	203
Puerto Rico	2741	32
Rhode Island	82	1
South Carolina	297	15
South Dakota	7	1
Tennessee	3195	88
Texas	8	3
Utah	65	2
Vermont	7	2
Virginia ⁶	0	0
Washington	0	0
West Virginia	2	1
Wisconsin	750	33
Wyoming ⁷	0	0
TOTAL	116,626	2,194

⁵ Includes data from New York City school district only. Data on Districts outside of New York City will be available beginning with the 2003-2004 school year. In 2002-03, the number of children transferring under the choice option in other districts was minimal.

⁶ Virginia had no Title I schools identified for school improvement year 2 or corrective action during the 2002-2003 school year.

⁷ Wyoming had no Title I schools identified for school improvement year 2 or corrective action during the 2002-2003 school year.

Teacher and Paraprofessional Quality

NCLB places a major emphasis on teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. To help ensure that all teachers of core academic subjects are highly qualified no later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year, Title II, Part A of ESEA - *the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program* - provides nearly \$3 billion a year to the States. These funds can be used to prepare, train, and recruit highly-qualified teachers and principals capable of ensuring that all children will achieve to high academic standards. In 2002-2003, approximately 93 percent of all school districts received *Title II, Part A* funds. The new Title II program requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Since January 2002, State and local educational agencies, along with State agencies for higher education, have been working to implement the *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants* program. In designing their teacher training, recruitment, retention, and professional development activities, States and local districts must incorporate scientifically based strategies that have been shown to increase student academic achievement.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified applies to all public elementary and secondary school teachers employed by a local educational agency who teach a core academic subject. "Highly qualified" means that the teacher:

1. Has obtained full State certification as a teacher or passed the State teacher licensing examination and holds a license to teach in the State, and does not have certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis;
2. Holds a minimum of a bachelor's degree; and
3. Has demonstrated subject matter competency in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches, in a manner determined by the State and in compliance with Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

The statutory definition includes additional elements that apply somewhat differently to new and current teachers, and to elementary, middle, and secondary school teachers. The complete definition of a "highly qualified" teacher is in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA. The term "core academic subjects" means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Section 9101(11)].

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application and the December 2003 Consolidated State Performance Report Part I, States were asked to provide baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in high and low-poverty schools. Section

1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” and “low-poverty schools” as schools in the top and bottom quartiles of poverty in the State.

The 2002-2003 school year was the first year that States were required to collect and report data on the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly-qualified teachers. The information that must be collected for this data requirement is complex—States must match individual classroom data with individual teacher qualification data and then disaggregate those data by school poverty levels. For those States that were unable to collect and merge these data sets for the 2002-2003 school year, the Department placed conditions on their Title I and Title II October 2003 grant awards requiring them to submit detailed data collection plans for the 2003-2004 school year and for future years for how the State will collect and report these data. The Department expects to be able to report more accurate and complete data for all States beginning with the 2003-2004 school year.

**Percent of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
2002-2003 School Year**

State	State Aggregate	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Alabama ¹	35	29	36
Alaska ²	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
Arizona	95	90	100
Arkansas ³	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
California ⁴	48	35	53
Colorado ⁵	86	Data not available	Data not available
Connecticut	96	95	98
Delaware	85	85	95
District of Columbia	43	37	44
Florida	91	93	92
Georgia	94	95	96
Hawaii ⁶	80	73	84
Idaho	98	99	Data not available
Illinois	98	95	100
Indiana	96	95	97
Iowa	95	95	95
Kansas	80	80	79
Kentucky ⁷	95	97	93
Louisiana ⁸	85	78	90
Maine	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
Maryland	65	47	76
Massachusetts	94	88	Data not available
Michigan	95	90	99
Minnesota ⁹	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
Mississippi	85	81	87

¹ During 2002-2003, Alabama employed 37,787 teachers who must document that they are highly qualified because they teach core academic subjects as defined by NCLB. Following training sessions provided by the State Department of Education (SDE), local educational agencies (LEAs) submitted a checklist their teachers. SDE staff members were able to review 14,250 checklists before the 8/15/03 cut-off date for 2002-2003. Thus, the 12,985 highly qualified teachers indicated above represent 91.1% of the 14,250 teachers for whom checklists were reviewed and 69.8% of the teachers for whom checklists were received. Subsequent updates on highly qualified teachers will include teachers who met the criteria during summer 2003 and the review of checklists received after 8/15/03.

² For the 2002-2003 school year, Alaska was unable to report this information at the individual classroom level.

³ For the 2002-2003 school year, Arkansas was unable to report this information at the individual classroom level.

⁴ The data used to generate this information were collected through the annual California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS). More specifically, data from the Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) were used to determine the percentage of credentialed teachers in core academic subject classes in California. That number was reduced to reflect the likelihood (based on the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing data) that elementary teachers had passed a rigorous State assessment to gain their credentials (about 60%), and that about 25% of secondary core academic subject class teachers had earned their supplemental authorizations by completing a major or major equivalent of credits.

⁵ Colorado's data are for the 2003-2004 school year.

⁶ "High-poverty schools" were defined by Hawaii as those receiving Title I funds in school year 2002-03.

⁷ Data reflect Kentucky's best estimate for the 2002-2003 school year.

⁸ This report represents the best data available at this time. It does not include special education teachers due to difficulties with data collection in that area. Louisiana is working to develop a mechanism to collect the required data for special education teachers.

⁹ For the 2002-2003 school year, Minnesota was unable to collect this information at the individual classroom level.

State	State Aggregate	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Missouri	95	90	97
Montana	Data not available	Data not available	97
Nebraska ¹⁰	90	82	93
Nevada	50	50	62
New Hampshire	86	84	88
New Jersey	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
New Mexico	77	71	76.5
New York	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
North Carolina	83	78	86
North Dakota	91	94	91
Ohio ¹¹	82	78	97
Oklahoma ¹²	98	97	98
Oregon	82	72	86
Pennsylvania	95	93	99
Puerto Rico	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
Rhode Island ¹³	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
South Carolina ¹⁴	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
South Dakota	89	79	91
Tennessee	34	35	33
Texas ¹⁵	76	69	81
Utah ¹⁶	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
Vermont	92	93	92
Virginia	83	77	87
Washington	83	88	79
West Virginia	94	96	98

¹⁰ The data include only the classes at the secondary level (grades 9-12). Nebraska's data collection system for teacher qualifications is being revised to allow for the collection of data to determine the highly qualified status of all teachers. Revisions to the system and to the data collections for the 2003-2004 reporting are being made that will include teachers at all levels.

¹¹ Ohio's data do not include those people who may be highly qualified through the use of a Master's degree in the content area, a major with 30 or more semester hours in the content area or those who qualify using the rubric, items not collected in the 2002-2003 school year. All options will be included in future school years.

¹² Oklahoma's data are for the 2003-2004 school year.

¹³ In the fall of 2002, Rhode Island implemented a new computer application called RICERT. The purpose of RICERT is to replace an antiquated mainframe system that tracked teachers' State certification. A revision is being made to the RICERT that will allow the State to identify teachers meeting the criteria of a "highly qualified" teachers in any given assignment area reported. Once so identified, the teacher will be counted in the equation that will determine the percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers.

¹⁴ For the 2002-2003 school year, South Carolina was unable to collect this information at the individual classroom level.

¹⁵ These percentages underestimate the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers because data related to college coursework and other professional development and experience were not available for 2002-2003. Texas relied solely on certification records, which are maintained at the State level, for the purpose of determining baseline data from 2002-2003: Number of teacher FTEs with State certification in core subject areas divided by total number of teacher FTEs in core subject areas. It should be noted that local educational agencies will be using additional information when implementing parental notification requirements. Further, the methodology for determining the baseline and projections is subject to annual review and modification to incorporate improvements in data collection systems.

¹⁶ Utah submitted the percentage of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) teachers under NCLB subject areas rather than the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers. The information submitted was available from Utah's database of licensed educators; the information needed for the latter percentage is not yet available from the State's student database.

State	State Aggregate	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Wisconsin ¹⁷	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
Wyoming	95	99	98

¹⁷ For the 2002-2003 school year, Wisconsin was unable to collect this information at the individual classroom level.

Professional Development

NCLB recognizes the critical importance of teachers having access to high-quality professional development to improve the academic performance of all students. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria contained in the definition of professional development in section 9101(34) of ESEA. Professional development includes, but is not limited to, activities that:

- Improve and increase teachers’ knowledge of academic subjects and enable teachers to become highly qualified;
- Are an integral part of broad schoolwide and districtwide educational improvement plans;
- Give teachers and principals the knowledge and skills to help students meet challenging State academic standards;
- Improve classroom management skills;
- Are sustained, intensive, and classroom-focused and are not one-day or short-term workshops;
- Advance teacher understanding of effective instruction strategies that are based on scientifically based research; and
- Are developed with extensive participation of teachers, principals, parents, and administrators.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Applications, States reported the percentage of public elementary and secondary school teachers who received high-quality professional development during the 2002-2003 school year. The 2002-2003 school year was the first year that States were required to collect and report data on high-quality professional development. For those States that were unable to collect and merge these data for the 2002-2003 school year, the Department placed conditions on their Title II October 2003 grant awards requiring them to submit detailed data collection plans for the 2003-2004 school year and for future years for how the State will collect and report these data. The Department expects to be able to report more accurate and complete data on professional development for all States beginning with the 2003-2004 school year.

**Percent of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 School Year**

State	% of Teachers Receiving High Quality Professional Development
Alabama	83
Alaska	100
Arizona	83
Arkansas	100
California ¹	25
Colorado	60
Connecticut	100
Delaware	75
District of Columbia	60
Florida	90
Georgia	69
Hawaii	17
Idaho	94
Illinois ²	Data not available
Indiana	99
Iowa	77
Kansas	50
Kentucky ³	Data not available
Louisiana ⁴	53
Maine ⁵	Data not available
Maryland	33
Massachusetts ⁶	Data not available
Michigan ⁷	Data Not Available
Minnesota ⁸	Data Not Available
Mississippi ⁹	Data not available
Missouri	61
Montana ¹⁰	Data Not Available
Nebraska	41
Nevada	36
New Hampshire	75

¹ This number reflects California's best estimate for the 2002-2003 school year. The State has refined its data collection to report more accurate data in the future.

² Illinois was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

³ Kentucky was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

⁴ At the present time, Louisiana local education agencies (LEAs) are only reporting an unduplicated count of teachers that receive high-quality professional development that is supported using Title II funds. Beginning in 2003-2004, LEAs will report an unduplicated count of teachers receiving high-quality professional development through all of the State formula programs under NCLB.

⁵ Maine was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

⁶ Massachusetts was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

⁷ Michigan was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

⁸ Minnesota was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

⁹ Mississippi was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

¹⁰ Montana was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

State	% of Teachers Receiving High Quality Professional Development
New Jersey	98
New Mexico	95
New York ¹¹	Data not available
North Carolina	69
North Dakota	12
Ohio	73
Oklahoma ¹²	Data Not Available
Oregon	79
Pennsylvania	86
Puerto Rico	20
Rhode Island	65
South Carolina ¹³	Data not available
South Dakota	22
Tennessee	49
Texas	90
Utah	18
Vermont	100
Virginia	85
Washington	46
West Virginia ¹⁴	Data not available
Wisconsin	100
Wyoming	79

¹¹ New York was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

¹² Oklahoma was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

¹³ South Carolina was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

¹⁴ West Virginia was unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year.

Paraprofessionals

Title I of ESEA is designed to help disadvantaged children reach high academic standards. Properly trained paraprofessionals can play important roles in improving student achievement in Title I schools where they can reinforce a teacher's effort in the classroom. Unfortunately, studies indicate that paraprofessionals are used in many Title I schools for teaching and assisting in teaching when their educational backgrounds do not qualify them for such responsibilities. Title I of ESEA requires that paraprofessionals meet higher standards of qualification and ensures that students who need the most help receive instructional support only from qualified paraprofessionals.

For the purposes of Title I, Part A, a paraprofessional is an employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Paraprofessionals who provide instructional support includes those who (1) provide one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assist with classroom management, such as by organizing instructional materials; (3) provide instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conduct parental involvement activities; (5) provide instructional support in a library or media center; (6) act as a translator; or (7) provide instructional support services under the direct supervision of a highly qualified teacher.

Although paraprofessionals provide instructional support, they should not be providing planned direct instruction, or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I, Part A.

To be qualified under NCLB,

(1) All Title I paraprofessionals must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

(2) Additionally, except as noted below, paraprofessionals hired after January 8, 2002, and working in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds must have—

- Completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; or
- Obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or
- Met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing, reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness).

(3) Paraprofessionals hired on or before January 8, 2002, and working in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds must meet these requirements by January 8, 2006.

Paraprofessionals who only serve as translators or who only conduct parental involvement activities must have a secondary school diploma or its equivalent but do not have to meet the additional requirements.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Applications, States were asked to provide baseline data for the percentage of their Title I paraprofessionals who met NCLB qualification requirements during the 2002-2003 school year. The 2002-2003 school year was the first year that States were required to collect and report data on qualified Title I paraprofessionals. For those States that were unable to collect these data for the 2002-2003 school year, the Department placed conditions on their Title I October 2003 grant awards requiring them to submit detailed data collection plans for the 2003-2004 school year and for future years for how the State will collect and report these data. The Department expects to be able to report more accurate and complete data on Title I paraprofessionals for all States beginning with the 2003-2004 school year.

**Percent of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 School Year**

State	Percent of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
Alabama	38
Alaska	27
Arizona	38
Arkansas ¹	Data Not Available
California	20
Colorado	22
Connecticut	30
Delaware ²	52
District of Columbia	5
Florida	39
Georgia	67
Hawaii	11
Idaho	87
Illinois ³	Data Not Available
Indiana	43
Iowa	99
Kansas	60
Kentucky	60
Louisiana ⁴	0
Maine	Data Not Available
Maryland	21
Massachusetts	46
Michigan	Data Not Available
Minnesota	Data Not Available
Mississippi	65
Missouri	26
Montana	Data Not Available
Nebraska	42
Nevada	56
New Hampshire	54
New Jersey	42
New Mexico	24

¹Arkansas did not collect these data prior to the 2003-2004 school year. The State's data management system has been revised to collect these data.

² These data are estimates.

³ Illinois did not collect these data prior to the 2003-2004 school year. The State's data management system has been revised to collect these data.

⁴ For the 2002-2003 school year, Louisiana did not have a State definition of highly qualified paraprofessional as delineated in section 1119(c) and (d) and did not collect information regarding the qualifications of paraprofessionals at the state level. The State is reporting the 2002-2003 baseline for this indicator as 0%. Louisiana has collected 2003-2004 school year data from the districts and is in the process of verifying these data through its monitoring processes. The State will, therefore, be able to report on this indicator for the Consolidated Performance Report for 2003-2004.

State	Percent of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
New York	Data Not Available
North Carolina	35
North Dakota	Data Not Available
Ohio ⁵	5
Oklahoma	Data Not Available
Oregon	44
Pennsylvania	19
Puerto Rico	44
Rhode Island	40
South Carolina	17
South Dakota	54
Tennessee	41
Texas	50
Utah	46
Vermont	31
Virginia	24
Washington	39
West Virginia	53
Wisconsin	35
Wyoming	54

⁵ The numbers represented in this calculation do not include those paraprofessionals who have taken a Statewide or local assessment.

Appendix A

State Assessment Data from the 2002-2003 School Year

Appendix B

**State Lists of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement
during the 2003-2004 School Year**

