

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



**PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report is also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- o Title I, Part A - *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- o Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 - *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- o Title I, Part C - *Education of Migratory Children*
- o Title I, Part D - *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- o Title I, Part F - *Comprehensive School Reform*
- o Title II, Part A - *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- o Title II, Part D - *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- o Title III, Part A - *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- o Title IV, Part B - *21st Century Community Learning Centers*
- o Title V, Part A - *Innovative Programs*
- o Title VI, Section 6111 - *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- o Title VI, Part B - *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 2006** , requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- o **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- o **Performance goal 2** : All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- o **Performance Goal 5** : All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "2004-2005 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614	
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006	
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2004-2005 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2004-2005	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Alaska Department of Education & Early Development	
Address: PO Box 110500 Juneau, AK 99811-0500	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Margaret MacKinnon Telephone: 907-465-2970 Fax: 907-465-2989 e-mail: margaret_mackinnon@eed.state.ak.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Margaret MacKinnon	
_____ Signature	9/29/2006 2:44 PM EST _____ Date

Data amended as of 9/29/2006.

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006

1.1. STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).**STATE RESPONSE**

The Alaska State Board of Education & Early Development adopted state regulation 4 AAC 04.150 in June 2005, and it went into effect on November 10, 2005. This regulation adopts by reference the publication "Alaska Standards: Content and Performance Standards for Alaska Students" which includes academic content standards in science. The academic content standards for science are by grade level for grades 3 through 11.

These standards were developed over a period of several years, moving from general content goals to specific grade level expectations for each tested grade. Educators from the each LEA were invited to participate in the development and review committees.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

STATE RESPONSE

Alaska implemented assessments for reading/language arts (reading/writing) and mathematics for grades 3-9 in April 2005, and will implement the 10th grade assessment in the same content areas in April 2006, that are compliant with section 1111(b)(3). The assessments will be given annually in all grades 3-10 in April 2006 and each year thereafter.

Alaska is developing a science assessment that is compliant with section 1111(b)(3). The Alaska State Board of Education & Early Development adopted into regulation the requirement that students will be tested in science in grades four, eight and ten starting in April 2008. In February and March 2006 assessment items are being piloted (item try out) with selected teachers throughout the state. In April 2007 Alaska will field test the assessment, using 40% of the student population, and fully implement the new science assessment in April 2008.

Alaska has implemented an alternate assessment that is aligned to alternate achievement standards in grades 3-10 in reading, writing and mathematics in 2003. Alaska is in the process of redesigning the alternate to have a stronger assessment, however we currently have and will continue to have an assessment that tests students on alternate achievement standards in all the required grades consistent with 1111(b)(3).

Alaska has involved educators from each LEA in the review of items for content, bias and to determine the data quality for the regular assessment, and is in the process of intensively involving educators in the development of the alternate.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

STATE RESPONSE

The Alaska State Board of Education & Early Development adopted into regulation the academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading and writing (reading/language arts) for grades 3-9 in July 2005, and will take action on the academic achievement standards for grade 10 in the same content areas in July 2006.

The state is developing the science assessment to implement in April 2008 in grades four, eight and ten. In the fall of 2005 Alaska worked with stakeholders from across the state to design draft achievement level descriptors in science at each of the tested grade levels. These draft descriptors will be used for item development, standard setting, and then considered by the State Board of Education and Early Development as part of a package when the proficiency scores are adopted in the summer of 2008.

The state previously developed alternate achievement standards, but will be developing a new alternate, and in the summer of 2007 develop new achievement standards, which will be submitted to the United State Department of Education for peer review.

Alaska involves stakeholders, including educators from each LEA, in the development of recommendations regarding the academic achievement standards. The recommendations are forwarded to the department that in turn makes final recommendations to the State Board of Education & Early Development.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2004-2005 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2004-2005 school year academic assessments.

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

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2004-2005 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	79132	99.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	20355	98.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	5489	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3721	99.2
Hispanic	3220	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	46347	99.1
Students with Disabilities	10463	98.5
Limited English Proficient	12156	98.8
Economically Disadvantaged	27364	98.9
Migrant	5160	98.7
Male	40420	98.9
Female	38712	99.1

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

1.2.1.2 2004-2005 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	79543	99.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	20556	99.6
Asian/ Pacific Islander	5462	98.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3734	99.5
Hispanic	3203	98.6
White, non-Hispanic	46588	99.6
Students with Disabilities	10552	99.4
Limited English Proficient	12152	98.8
Economically Disadvantaged	27537	99.5
Migrant	5211	99.7
Male	40662	99.5
Female	38881	99.5

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

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

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	10463	98.5
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	497	94.7

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	10552	99.4
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	487	92.8

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2004-2005 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2004-2005 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2004-2005 school year.

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	9170	75.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	2468	59.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	624	76.1
Black, non-Hispanic	439	66.5
Hispanic	430	72.1
White, non-Hispanic	5209	84.2
Students with Disabilities	1444	53.7
Limited English Proficient	1592	55.5
Economically Disadvantaged	3697	64.1
Migrant	561	58.8
Male	4709	74.6
Female	4461	76.5

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	9208	76.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	2480	56.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	626	78.0
Black, non-Hispanic	441	73.5
Hispanic	432	73.8
White, non-Hispanic	5229	85.8
Students with Disabilities	1454	48.6
Limited English Proficient	1599	52.1
Economically Disadvantaged	3716	64.0
Migrant	564	56.7
Male	4733	72.3
Female	4475	80.6

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	9429	68.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	2384	51.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	673	69.8
Black, non-Hispanic	485	57.5
Hispanic	413	61.7
White, non-Hispanic	5474	77.9
Students with Disabilities	1400	39.4
Limited English Proficient	1580	45.1
Economically Disadvantaged	3784	56.1
Migrant	542	46.9
Male	4777	68.1
Female	4652	69.6

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	9479	76.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	2405	57.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	673	76.7
Black, non-Hispanic	486	72.8
Hispanic	415	74.5
White, non-Hispanic	5500	86.2
Students with Disabilities	1411	46.4
Limited English Proficient	1591	49.6
Economically Disadvantaged	3806	63.6
Migrant	548	49.5
Male	4809	72.6
Female	4670	81.4

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	9758	66.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	2499	46.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	698	71.5
Black, non-Hispanic	471	56.1
Hispanic	412	63.6
White, non-Hispanic	5678	76.5
Students with Disabilities	1447	30.8
Limited English Proficient	1654	42.1
Economically Disadvantaged	3799	51.5
Migrant	629	47.9
Male	4906	65.9
Female	4852	67.8

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	9807	75.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	2516	53.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	698	76.2
Black, non-Hispanic	473	74.8
Hispanic	414	73.9
White, non-Hispanic	5706	85.4
Students with Disabilities	1463	38.8
Limited English Proficient	1670	46.5
Economically Disadvantaged	3820	60.2
Migrant	633	51.5
Male	4940	70.6
Female	4867	80.5

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	9939	64.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	2561	45.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	700	69.0
Black, non-Hispanic	490	54.3
Hispanic	423	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	5765	74.4
Students with Disabilities	1376	28.1
Limited English Proficient	1643	39.6
Economically Disadvantaged	3766	49.3
Migrant	677	43.6
Male	5136	63.5
Female	4803	66.5

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

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	9979	73.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	2575	48.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	700	74.3
Black, non-Hispanic	494	70.9
Hispanic	423	71.4
White, non-Hispanic	5787	84.3
Students with Disabilities	1387	34.0
Limited English Proficient	1653	41.9
Economically Disadvantaged	3780	57.6
Migrant	682	44.3
Male	5156	68.5
Female	4823	78.2

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	10504	61.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	2797	42.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	732	64.2
Black, non-Hispanic	502	39.8
Hispanic	416	56.7
White, non-Hispanic	6057	71.2
Students with Disabilities	1309	21.2
Limited English Proficient	1600	34.5
Economically Disadvantaged	3661	43.9
Migrant	742	43.3
Male	5325	60.2
Female	5179	62.0

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	10578	72.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	2820	53.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	734	68.3
Black, non-Hispanic	505	59.6
Hispanic	420	64.0
White, non-Hispanic	6099	83.2
Students with Disabilities	1323	30.9
Limited English Proficient	1611	39.7
Economically Disadvantaged	3690	55.8
Migrant	746	50.1
Male	5361	67.8
Female	5217	77.1

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	10396	62.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	2698	44.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	692	62.3
Black, non-Hispanic	487	39.8
Hispanic	383	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	6136	72.2
Students with Disabilities	1270	24.3
Limited English Proficient	1580	34.1
Economically Disadvantaged	3470	44.7
Migrant	741	46.6
Male	5401	61.4
Female	4995	63.2

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	10473	76.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	2729	57.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	696	73.1
Black, non-Hispanic	491	63.5
Hispanic	385	71.9
White, non-Hispanic	6172	86.0
Students with Disabilities	1284	36.9
Limited English Proficient	1595	45.6
Economically Disadvantaged	3508	60.4
Migrant	748	57.2
Male	5436	70.4
Female	5037	82.2

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	19943	63.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	4949	45.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	1371	65.7
Black, non-Hispanic	847	44.7
Hispanic	743	53.4
White, non-Hispanic	12033	73.1
Students with Disabilities	2220	23.3
Limited English Proficient	2507	36.1
Economically Disadvantaged	5191	45.2
Migrant	1269	49.6
Male	10169	63.4
Female	9774	64.3

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

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	20402	73.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	5119	53.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	1395	69.4
Black, non-Hispanic	861	64.7
Hispanic	758	66.6
White, non-Hispanic	12269	83.1
Students with Disabilities	2295	31.1
Limited English Proficient	2584	40.3
Economically Disadvantaged	5350	54.7
Migrant	1308	55.9
Male	10422	67.5
Female	9980	79.5

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	495	292	59.0

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	54	22	40.7

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	287	166	57.8

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	53	21	39.6

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2005-2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2005 - 2006 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP 2004-2005."

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Alaska Department of Education & Early development requires each district to submit school improvement plans for all of its Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Those plans are reviewed and technical assistance is provided to districts for those schools. Recommendations are provided for improvement in the plans. Technical assistance audio conferences are held to discuss requirements of school improvement plans and strategies for improvement. Presentations on using data to drive instructional decisions and on using regular assessments aligned to state standards have been presented by audio conference and at major state conferences. Six schools that were identified as making AYP were invited to present at the annual NCLB conference in January 2006. The information provided was very well received by other districts in attendance. An instructional audit tool is being developed by the Alaska Comprehensive Center that will be used by teams visiting schools on-site to gather information upon which to make recommendations for changes to positively impact student achievement. The state also provides technical assistance for schools in corrective action and restructuring. Schools in corrective action must include a corrective action component in their school improvement plan. Districts with schools in restructuring must submit a separate alternative governance plan at the end of the first year in restructuring. The department presents information on requirements for corrective action and restructuring by audio conference and at roundtable presentations at the annual NCLB conference. The commissioner holds individual audio conferences with each district superintendent and principals of schools in restructuring to focus on ways to improve student achievement.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.

1.4.4.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2005 - 2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action). Additionally for any Title I district identified for improvement or corrective action for the 2005 - 2006 school year that made AYP based on data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP for 2004-2005."

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

Alaska Department of Education & Early development requires districts identified for improvement and corrective action to submit district improvement plans for review and approval by the department. Those plans are reviewed and technical assistance is provided to districts. Recommendations are provided for improvement in the plans. Technical assistance audio conferences are held to discuss requirements of district improvement plans and strategies for improvement. Presentations on using data to drive instructional decisions and on using regular assessments aligned to state standards have been by audio conference and at major state conferences.

When a district reaches the level of corrective action, the department performs a desk audit of available data, including student achievement and AYP data. Audio conferences are held with each district in corrective action. As warranted, a team is sent to a district to provide on-site training and technical assistance in analyzing data and making instructional changes to improve student achievement. An instructional audit tool is being developed by the Alaska Comprehensive Center that will be used by teams visiting schools and districts on-site to gather information upon which to make recommendations for improvement to positively impact student achievement. The department will take corrective action that is most likely to positively impact student achievement.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 22
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 17 How many of these schools were charter schools? 1
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 200
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 7618

Optional Information :

5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. _____

7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2004-2005 school year. _____

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 19

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 513

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 9653

Optional Information :

If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. _____

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	21175	7254	34.3
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	1953	404	20.7
Low-Poverty Schools	1660	438	26.4
All Elementary Schools	7148	2087	29.2
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	1153	522	45.3
Low-Poverty Schools	4579	1270	27.7
All Secondary Schools	14027	5167	36.8

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [*Title IX*, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes; or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003.

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2005, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are being taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (note: percentages should add to 100 percent of the classes taught by not highly qualified teachers).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	34.9
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	1.5
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0
d) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	60.8
e) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	2.8
f) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0
g) Other (please explain)	0

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty *elementary and secondary* schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Elementary Schools	More than <u>77.3%</u>	Less than <u>29.3%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Free & Reduced Lunch	
Secondary Schools	More than <u>48.0%</u>	Less than <u>14.5%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Free & Reduced Lunch	

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

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

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

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

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

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

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2004-2005 School Year	43.8

1.6 English Language Proficiency**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

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

Developed Yes No

Approved, adopted, sanctioned Yes No

Operationalized Yes No (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

The state adopted the first version of the English Language Proficiency Standards in March 2004. Since that time, the Alaska grade level expectations were adopted in reading, writing, science and math. In addition, much work had been done on ELP standards by other states and consortiums. Consequently, the Alaska ELP Standards were reviewed and revised by stakeholders from throughout the state in December 2005. The revised standards are linked/aligned with the academic content standards in reading, writing, science and math. They were put out for public comment by the State Board of Education & Early Development in December 2005, and the State Board adopted the revised ELP Standards on March 16, 2006.

The ELP Standards are implemented and operationalized by districts and school teachers. The ELP Standards have been presented to district bilingual coordinators and to teachers at the annual Bilingual Multicultural Education and Equity Conferences in February 2005 and February 2006. Furthermore, the ELP Standards are posted on the state's website for teacher access. After the formal adoption by the State Board, the department will take further steps to widely distribute the newest version of the ELP Standards.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The committee that revised the Alaska ELP Standards in November 2005 directly linked/aligned the ELP Standards to the appropriate Alaska Content Standards in reading, math, science and writing. In addition, linking/alignment is shown to the appropriate grade level expectations in math, reading, writing, and science by the use of content examples for each ELP indicator. All ELP Standards are linked/aligned to the Alaska Content Standards by item reference. After the standard setting session in June, the ELP Standards will also link/align to the Alaska Achievement Standards.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. **The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113(b)(2) is spring 2006 . Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:**
 - An independent alignment study Yes
 - Other evidence of alignment _____
2. **Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:**
 - The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
 - The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
 - ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
 - Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

1. State regulation 4 AAC 34.055(c) requires all LEP students in the state in grades K-12 to be tested annually by the state approved ELP assessment.
2. Alaska has adopted the newest version of the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT) by Ballard & Tighe, © 2005, as its ELP assessment. The first administration will be in spring, 2006. The test was developed after significant research. The four domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing are assessed and results are reported for these domains as well as for comprehension.
3. The state is conducting an independent alignment study of the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT) based on the Alaska ELP standards. The results of that alignment study will be finalized in the spring of 2006.
4. Alaska required evidence of technical quality as part of the original RFP when seeking a contractor to provide an ELP assessment. Ballard & Tighe provided a technical quality manual for the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT) showing details on validity and reliability that met the requirements outlined in the RFP and outlined in the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. The field test for the IPT 1-12 was conducted in April and May of 2004 using a nationally representative sample of students. The IPT K was field tested in December 2004 and January 2005. All the items from the field testing of the IPT K, IPT 1-2, IPT 3-6, IPT 6-8 and IPT 9-12 were simultaneously scaled using WINSTEPS, a computer program for Rasch analysis. Using WINSTEPS, items were checked for statistical bias or differential item functioning. Furthermore, the pilot test for IPT 1-12 was administered in October and November 2004 to about 1,000 students in six different states. The pilot test for the IPT K was administered in April and May 2005 to 431 students from seven states across the United States.

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2004-2005** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information. The information following the chart is meant to explain what is being requested under each column.

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State											
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency							
		Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)	Number and Percentage at Level 2 (4)	Number and Percentage at Level 2 (5)	Number and Percentage at Level 3 (6)	Number and Percentage at Level 4 (7)	Number and Percentage at Level 4 (8)	Number and Percentage at Level 4 (9)	Number and Percentage at Level 4 (10)	Number and Percentage at Level 4 (11)	Number and Percentage at Level 4 (12)
IPT 2004 or earlier	18572	18432	99.3	1371	7.4	8773	47.6	5432	29.5	2531	13.7
LAS	812	723	89.0	62	8.6	203	28.0	232	32.1	226	31.3
Woodcock-Munoz	992	985	99.3	16	1.6	332	33.7	472	47.9	157	15.9
TOTAL	20376	20140	98.9	1449	7.2	9308	46.2	6136	30.5	2914	14.5

Alaska has 5 proficiency levels rather than 4, but for the purposes of this report, the early intermediate level and intermediate level data were totaled for reporting as Intermediate - Level 2.

- (1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
- (3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
- (4-7) In columns four-seven, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State

2004-2005 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number and Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State	
1. Yup'ik	7471	37.1
2. Spanish	2348	11.7
3. Inupiaq	2168	10.8
4. Filipino	1504	7.5
5. Russian	921	4.6
6. Hmong	863	4.3
7. Samoan	816	4.1
8. Korean	465	2.3
9. Athabascan	464	2.3
10. Tlingit	367	1.8

Yup'ik, Inupiaq, and Athabascan include dialects within the larger language family.

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.4.1.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III												
Name of ELP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency								Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (7)	
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)			
IPT 2004 or earlier	16670	100.0	1315	7.9	8114	48.7	4914	29.5	2327	14.0	559	3.4
LAS	676	100.0	59	8.7	188	27.8	208	30.8	221	32.7	44	6.5
Woodcock-Munoz	876	100.0	16	1.8	290	33.1	445	50.8	125	14.3	58	6.6
TOTAL	18222	100.0	1390	7.6	8592	47.2	5567	30.6	2673	14.7	661	3.6

Alaska has 5 proficiency levels rather than 4, but for the purposes of this report, the early intermediate level and intermediate level data were totaled for reporting as Intermediate - Level 2.

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year.
- (3-6) In columns three-six, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2004-2005 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-6 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (7) In column seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111©:

1.6.4.1	Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2004-2005	<u>947</u>
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	<u>797</u>
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	<u>2</u>

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

- 1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;**
- 2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;**
- 3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.**

STATE RESPONSE

The State has not made changes in the definition of proficient since the 2003-2004 Consolidated State Performance Report submission. For the 2004-2005 test administration, the definition of overall proficiency for the ELP test chosen by a district was determined by the publisher's proficiency levels. Alaska will use the student data from the spring administration to establish the definition of proficiency for the newly adopted ELP Assessment through a committee process to set cut scores for each proficiency level in June, 2006.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

The State has not made changes in the definition of making progress since the 2003-2004 Consolidated State Performance Report submission. A student who is not yet fully proficient and scores at the designated level of proficiency will be considered to be "making progress" if he or she makes the expected gains in proficiency levels per year of program service as seen in the following chart. These gains are based on the cut scores and/or test score ranges as determined by the test publishers for the three state-approved ELP assessments given in 2004-2005, the LAS, the IPT, and the Woodcock-Munoz.

Definition of Making Progress				
The expected level of gain in proficiency per year of program service.				
Cohort	Beginning (Level 1)	Early Intermediate (Level 2)	Intermediate (Level 3)	Advanced Intermediate (Level 4)
K-5	1 level	1 level	1/2 level	1/4 level
6-12	1/2 level	1/2 level	1/4 level	1/4 level

Alaska will change the definition of making progress to align with the newly adopted IPT after the standards-setting/cut score setting process during the summer 2006.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

The State has not made changes in the definition of cohort since the 2003-2004 Consolidated State Performance Report submission. Alaska has two cohorts, grades K-5 and grades 6-12. If a district serves pre-school students, those will be reported separately.

To provide consistent reporting, Alaska will report grades K-12 together rather than separate out data for grades K-5 and 6-12.

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

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

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

Yes No

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	77.0	13037	37.9	6423	15.0	3120	12.6	2533

Alaska's targets for attaining proficiency were set at 10% for grades K-5 and 21% for grades 6-12. In order to report for grades K-12, the projected target has been set at 15%.

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

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

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	77.0	11985	37.5	5829	15.0	2864	12.6	2337

Alaska's targets for attaining proficiency were set at 10% for grades K-5 and 21% for grades 6-12. In order to report for grades K-12, the projected target has been set at 15%.

1.6.10 Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2004-2005 School Year

	Number:
Number of Title III subgrantees	14
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	0
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	14

While no subgrantees met all three AMAO targets, up to 3 subgrantees met at least one AMAO target, including the AYP target.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2004-2005, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2004-2005 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	1	100.0
4	16	94.1
5	4	66.7
6	13	86.7
7	20	90.9
8	17	85.0
H.S.	31	44.9

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	1	100.0
4	15	88.2
5	3	50.0
6	13	86.7
7	15	68.2
8	16	80.0
H.S.	30	43.5

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2005 - 2006 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2005-2006 School Year	0

1.8 Graduation and Dropout Rates

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

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

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2003-2004 school year.

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

High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	61.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	43.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	59.6
Black, non-Hispanic	47.2
Hispanic	51.0
White, non-Hispanic	70.8
Students with Disabilities	38.7
Limited English Proficient	36.1
Economically Disadvantaged	47.5
Migrant	50.2
Male	57.3
Female	65.6

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2003-2004 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	8.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	11.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	7.9
Black, non-Hispanic	13.3
Hispanic	11.6
White, non-Hispanic	6.5
Students with Disabilities	7.1
Limited English Proficient	7.9
Economically Disadvantaged	6.4
Migrant	4.4
Male	8.7
Female	7.4

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