

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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
 Part I, 2004-2005 Part II, 2004-2005

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Ohio Department of Education

Address:
25 S. Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4183

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Barry L. Bentley, Director, Office of Quality Assurance
Telephone: 614-728-7851
Fax: 614-752-1622
e-mail: barry.bentley@ode.state.oh.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Susan T. Zelman

Signature

Date

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 Ohio Department of Education has completed the development of challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). Ohio's State Board of Education officially adopted the standards in December 2003. The academic content standards in science include 12th grade culminating expectations, benchmark expectations for the end of grades five and eight, and indicator expectations for the end of each grade level.

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

STATE RESPONSE

The Ohio Department of Education has developed assessments aligned to our academic content standards for grades 3-8 and for grade 10 in reading and mathematics. Science tests for grades 5 and 8 are at the field test stage and will be fully operational in 2006-07. Science test for grade 10 was operational in spring 2005. The development and implementation of the alternate assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities in all subject areas are on the same schedule as the regular assessment and are aligned with the grade level academic content standards.

The process of development includes widespread involvement of local district educators as content advisors, bias and sensitivity reviewers, and on a statewide testing steering committee. The development of alternate assessments includes the involvement of local district special educators as advisors. All test items are field tested before inclusion in operational administrations.

The first operation administration of these new assessments occurred in the spring 2004, when the third grade reading and tenth grade reading and mathematics tests were administered. In the spring 2005, operational administrations of the third through fifth, and eighth grade reading tests; the third, seventh, eighth, and tenth grade mathematics tests; and the tenth grade science occurred. In the spring 2006, all reading and mathematics tests will be operational in grades three through eight and ten and science at grade ten. In the spring 2007, the fifth and eighth grade science tests will be operational as well.

In addition, each operational administration includes the operational administration of alternate assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities that are aligned to grade level academic content standards.

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 Ohio Department of Education sets academic achievement standards based on data from the initial operational administration of each assessment. We apply a modified bookmark procedure, whereby content experts from Ohio local school districts apply their professional judgment to identify cut scores that represent student performance against Ohio's academic content standards.

To date, academic achievement standards have been set for the third through fifth, eighth, and tenth grade reading tests; the third, seventh, eighth, and tenth grade mathematics tests; and the tenth grade science test. In the spring 2006, academic achievement standards will be set for all remaining reading and mathematics tests. In the spring 2007, academic achievement standards will be set for the fifth and eighth grade science tests.

The standard setting for the alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities uses the collection of evidence method, whereby special education experts including teachers set the cut scores. Performance on the alternate assessment is measured against alternate achievement standards. The development of the alternate achievement standards has followed the same schedule as the regular assessment.

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	405118	98.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	537	98.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	5214	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	64639	96.5
Hispanic	8360	97.7
White, non-Hispanic	317660	99.1
Students with Disabilities	56101	97.9
Limited English Proficient	5284	99.0
Economically Disadvantaged	134160	98.0
Migrant	510	98.5
Male	206376	98.6
Female	198742	98.8

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested = 8,708 Percent of Students Tested = 98.5

- 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.

1.2.1.2 2004-2005 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	406443	98.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	535	98.7
Asian/ Pacific Islander	5331	99.2
Black, non-Hispanic	64872	96.6
Hispanic	8588	97.7
White, non-Hispanic	317921	99.1
Students with Disabilities	55693	98.1
Limited English Proficient	5652	99.0
Economically Disadvantaged	136352	98.1
Migrant	611	98.5
Male	207151	98.6
Female	199292	98.8

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested = 9,196 Percent of Students Tested = 98.6

- 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.

1.2.2 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	52200	91.1
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3901	6.8

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	51821	91.3
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3872	6.8

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		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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	135305	77.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	189	75.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	1974	87.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22575	58.6
Hispanic	3420	62.6
White, non-Hispanic	102834	81.8
Students with Disabilities	18871	54.1
Limited English Proficient	2646	59.7
Economically Disadvantaged	53983	64.5
Migrant	330	58.8
Male	69300	74.3
Female	66005	80.4

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested = 4,313 Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced = 74.1

- 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.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	134019	65.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	190	60.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1818	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic	22407	41.4
Hispanic	3133	52.1
White, non-Hispanic	102653	71.1
Students with Disabilities	19308	40.0
Limited English Proficient	2220	49.6
Economically Disadvantaged	51821	49.7
Migrant	228	53.1
Male	68539	65.6
Female	65480	65.3

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested = 3,818 Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced = 59.6

- 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		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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	141469	62.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	183	55.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	1722	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	24949	36.6
Hispanic	2935	48.6
White, non-Hispanic	108432	68.7
Students with Disabilities	20529	27.3
Limited English Proficient	1828	44.3
Economically Disadvantaged	52782	43.8
Migrant	242	45.0
Male	72715	61.7
Female	68754	63.4

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested = 3,248 Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced = 57.0

- 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.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	141450	69.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	183	63.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	1688	78.8
Black, non-Hispanic	24981	47.7
Hispanic	2903	56.0
White, non-Hispanic	108455	75.2
Students with Disabilities	20537	33.3
Limited English Proficient	1782	43.0
Economically Disadvantaged	52799	53.6
Migrant	242	54.5
Male	72696	66.4
Female	68754	73.4

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested = 3,240 Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced = 67.5

- 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.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Note: no data are entered; but, data are displaying on PDF.

- 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		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- 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	129624	81.6
American Indian/Alaska Native	164	73.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	1674	90.8
Black, non-Hispanic	17282	57.1
Hispanic	2292	66.3
White, non-Hispanic	106570	85.9
Students with Disabilities	16247	39.6
Limited English Proficient	1235	57.2
Economically Disadvantaged	29557	63.7
Migrant	40	50.0
Male	65111	81.7
Female	64513	81.6

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested = 1,642 Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced = 76.7

- 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	129683	92.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	163	92.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	1669	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	17314	81.2
Hispanic	2265	83.0
White, non-Hispanic	106630	93.9
Students with Disabilities	16269	59.7
Limited English Proficient	1223	72.6
Economically Disadvantaged	29570	81.7
Migrant	39	76.9
Male	65145	89.7
Female	64538	94.2

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested = 1,642 Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced = 89.5

- 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	3838	2906	75.7

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	613	342	55.8

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	2049	1364	66.6

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	583	317	54.4

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.

The Ohio Department of Education, through its Office of Field Relations, is implementing a statewide system of support for school improvement services. The primary focus of the system is to support district leadership to build the capacity to help their low performing schools improve.

The system is deployed through 12 Regional School Improvement Teams. These teams identify strategic and focused support for district leaders by:

- Further analyzing the raw data that resulted in the August 2005 Report Card results to determine specific academic needs, including the performance of subgroups;
- Creating district profiles of priority districts and their low performing schools, using information from discussion with the district leadership team and a review of district accountability data;
- Creating a plan for each service delivery area to provide professional development and technical assistance, targeted first to priority districts; and
- Deploying services and evaluating their effectiveness.

During the 2005-06 school year, technical assistance, based on student performance data, is deployed strategically to those districts most in need, prioritized as follows:

- Districts with buildings in School Improvement Status (SIS);
- Districts with buildings in At Risk Status or SI Delay status;
- Districts with buildings that met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two years and have recently exited School Improvement status; and
- Districts in Improvement Status, Academic Watch or Academic Emergency (not already identified in the other priority areas).

Resources provided to districts to support their schools include the services of a district coach. District coaches, as members of the Regional School Improvement Team, assist district leadership in developing and implementing their district and school improvement plans. For districts with low performing schools, district coaches help district and school leadership align their improvement efforts. Additionally, other state products, programs and services are strategically targeted to those districts to support their low performing schools. For example, state professional development training in reading instruction is targeted to the following:

- Helping district and school leadership in understanding the initiative and the role that leadership plays to support teachers in using the information to improve classroom practice; and

- Assuring a critical mass of educators in those schools participate in the initiatives to assure that there is an ongoing professional dialogue that extends beyond the training, with a resulting impact on educator practice and ultimately student achievement.

Additionally, Title I served schools identified for improvement are eligible for targeted Title I school improvement funds. Those schools are to employ academic coaches (educational leaders) who are employed by the district through an entity other than the district, to work with internal Building Coaches, building staff, and building leadership to increase ongoing capacity to implement standards-based education. Building coaches work with district coaches to ensure efforts at the building and district are aligned.

We are also piloting 34 Math Specialists in buildings that are Title I served and in SI year one or At Risk in Math according to the 2005 Local Report Card. These Specialists receive intensive technical assistance from Ohio State University to develop the district's capacity to deliver high quality instruction in mathematics. They then coach the other math teachers in their buildings to increase the collective content and instructional knowledge of all teachers in the area of mathematics.

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.

The Ohio Department of Education, through its Office of Field Relations, is implementing a statewide system of support for school improvement services. The primary focus of the system is to support district leadership to build the capacity to help their low performing schools improve.

The system is deployed through 12 Regional School Improvement Teams. These teams identify strategic and focused support for district leaders by:

- Further analyzing the raw data that resulted in the August 2005 Report Card results to determine specific academic needs, including the performance of subgroups;

- Creating district profiles of priority districts and their low performing schools, using information from discussion with the district leadership team and a review of district accountability data;

- Creating a plan for each service delivery area to provide professional development and technical assistance, targeted first to priority districts; and

- Deploying services and evaluating their effectiveness.

During the 2005-06 school year, technical assistance, based on student performance data, is deployed strategically to those districts most in need prioritized as follows:

- Districts with buildings in School Improvement Status (SIS);

- Districts with buildings in At Risk Status or SI Delay status;

- Districts with buildings that met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two years and have recently exited School Improvement status; and

- Districts in Improvement Status, Academic Watch or Academic Emergency (not already identified in the other priority areas).

Resources provided to districts to support their schools include the services of a district coach. District coaches, as members of the Regional School Improvement Team, assist district leadership in developing and implementing their district and school improvement plans. For districts with low performing schools, district coaches help district and school leadership align their improvement efforts. Additionally, other state products, programs and services are strategically targeted to those districts to support their low performing schools. For example, state professional development training in reading instruction, is targeted to the following:

- Helping district and school leadership in understanding the initiative and the role that leadership plays to support teachers in using the information to improve classroom practice; and

- Assuring a critical mass of educators in those schools participate in the initiatives to assure that there is an ongoing professional dialogue that extends beyond the training, with a resulting impact on educator practice and ultimately 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. 151

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. 199 How many of these schools were charter schools?
12

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. 1614

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. 130766

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. 0

7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2004-2005 school year. 0

Note: The Ohio Department of Education is not providing the optional information requested; however, the online submission tool will not allow for the page to be saved unless a numeric value is entered. For this reason, zeroes have been supplied.

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. 126

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 5012

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. 53139

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. 0

Note: The Ohio Department of Education is not providing the optional information requested; however, the online submission tool will not allow for the page to be saved unless a numeric value is entered. For this reason, zeroes have been supplied.

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	506938	469159	92.6
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	60450	54244	89.7
Low-Poverty Schools	47346	46505	98.2
All Elementary Schools	229246	219271	95.6
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	48349	37245	77.0
Low-Poverty Schools	62114	58996	95.0
All Secondary Schools	277692	249888	90.0

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	15.0
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	3.4
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	6.5
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)	13.7
e) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	34.5
f) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	21.1
g) Other (please explain)	5.8

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>53.0%</u>	Less than <u>18.1%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Economic Disadvantage	
Secondary Schools	More than <u>37.0%</u>	Less than <u>9.7%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Economic Disadvantage	

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	63.8

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 Ohio Department of Education, with the assistance of a writing team representing Ohio educators in the fields of English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual education, has completed the development of Ohio English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards. Throughout the development process, periodic reports and updates were provided to the State Board of Education, and opportunities were given to the members of the State Board for questions and feedback. The final draft was completed in September 2004, and a written report on the final draft was provided to the State Board of Education in its October 2004 meeting. The latest draft of the English Language Proficiency Standards is currently posted on the Ohio Department of Education website. Additionally, information and copies of the latest draft have been provided to school districts at statewide conferences, regional meetings and local workshops during the past thirteen months.

The current draft has been edited by the Ohio Department of Education's Office of Communications and is now being prepared for printing in its final form. Copies of the printed version of the Ohio English Language Proficiency Standards will be disseminated to all school districts serving Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in Ohio. The ELP Standards serve as the framework for school districts' instructional programs designed to meet the needs of LEP students.

Ohio's English Language Proficiency Standards focus on the English language competencies that LEP students need to develop in order to: a) participate effectively in classrooms in which English is the language of instruction; b) achieve Ohio's academic content standards; and c) fully participate in U.S. society. The Standards are grouped into the four language domains of **listening, speaking, reading** and **writing**. Under each standard, benchmarks have been developed for four English proficiency levels that have been established for LEP students in Ohio: Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced, and Proficient/Trial Mainstream. Since its last Consolidated Performance Report, Ohio has divided the Beginning level into Low Beginning (now called "Pre-functional" Level) and Mid-High Beginning (now called "Beginning" Level).

The benchmarks describe the specific language skills that LEP students can demonstrate as they progress to the designated proficiency level for each standard. Also, the benchmarks indicate the grade-level spans for which they are applicable. For the purposes of the benchmarks, the grade-level spans have been designated as follows: **K-2, 3-5, 6-8** and **9-12**. The benchmarks describe specific language skills that LEP students are expected to demonstrate by the end of a given proficiency level and a given grade cluster. As such, the benchmarks can be used to monitor students' progress toward meeting the ELP standards.

Most of the benchmarks are applicable to all four grade-level spans. This means that LEP students at all grade levels are expected to go through the same stages in developing grammatical competency in each domain. However, even though LEP students at different grade spans go through similar stages in their English

language writing development, they are expected to focus on different content and subject matter in their writing. For this reason, it is made clear in the standards document that all Ohio English language proficiency standards relate to language used in grade-appropriate academic settings and age-appropriate social settings.

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

Although Ohio's English Language Proficiency and English Language Arts Standards are not the same, they are linked to each other. English language proficiency standards define proficiency levels that will help LEP students to acquire the English language skills necessary to meet academic content and achievement standards in language arts as well as in other content areas. As such, English language proficiency standards have been designed to assist teachers in moving LEP students both toward proficiency in the English language and toward proficiency on Ohio's English Language Arts content standards.

The goal of Ohio's ELP standards is to build a foundation in the English language that will enable LEP students to succeed in all their academic content subjects, including the core content areas of **mathematics** and **science**. For this reason, in developing the ELP Standards, the writing team referred on an ongoing basis to Ohio's academic content standards and noted the kinds of language competencies needed to make academic progress. Taking academic language into account, the writing team made sure that Ohio's ELP Standards included linkage to content area standards. For example, the following examples of benchmarks included in the ELP Standards focus on the kind of English language communication skills that are needed in order to access the mathematics and science curriculum in mainstream classroom settings:

- Listening benchmark: Recognize and comprehend grade-level academic spoken vocabulary;
- Speaking benchmark: Make formal and informal multimedia presentations;
- Reading benchmark: Monitor reading comprehension by summarizing, note taking, making lists or graphic organizers to construct meaning; and
- Writing benchmark: Publish for display and/or sharing, using available technology.

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
 - Other evidence of alignment Yes

2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:
 - 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

OHIO submission exceeds the character limit for Question 1.6.2. Submitted via e-mail to eden_ss@ed.gov
March 03, 2006 @ 10:30 AM.

Filename = Question 1-6-2 - OHIO 20060303.doc

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 Level 1 (4)	Number and Percentage at Level 2 (5)	Number and Percentage at Level 3 (6)	Number and Percentage at Level 4 (7)						
English Language Development Assessment	13876	13876	60.6	5981	43.1	3789	27.3	3733	26.9	373	2.7
Language Assessment Scales	2421	2421	10.6	798	33.0	839	34.7	600	24.8	184	7.6
IDEA Proficiency Tests	873	873	3.8	329	37.7	273	31.3	230	26.4	41	4.7
Maculaitis Assessment of Competencies	339	339	1.5	69	20.4	115	33.9	125	36.9	30	8.9
Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Basic Skills	254	254	1.1	182	71.7	48	18.9	23	9.0	1	0.3
Language Assessment Batter	191	191	0.8	46	24.0	59	30.9	59	30.9	27	14.1
Woodcock Munoz Language Survey	12	12	0.1	1	8.3	3	25.0	6	50.0	2	16.7
The Best Test	5	5	0.1	5	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District-level Performance Tests	3639	3639	15.9	1175	32.3	1009	27.7	1178	32.4	277	7.6
Classroom performance - state achievement tests	2557	1303	5.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1303	51.0
Totals	24167	22913	100.0	8586	37.0	6135	27.0	5954	26.0	2238	10.0

- (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. Spanish	11587	48.0
2. Somali	2369	10.0
3. Arabic	1821	8.0
4. Japanese	1033	4.3
5. Pennsylvania-Dutch / German	988	4.1
6. Vietnamese	611	2.5
7. Korean	579	2.4
8. Russian	568	2.3
9. Ukrainian	554	2.3
10. Serbo-Croatian	360	1.5

- 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)				
English Language Development Assessment	13119	57.3	5730	43.7	3583	27.3	3464	26.4	342	2.6	0	0	
Language Assessment Scales	2373	10.4	792	33.3	822	34.6	581	24.5	178	7.5	0	0	
IDEA Proficiency Tests	757	3.3	216	28.5	275	36.3	225	29.7	41	5.4	0	0	
Maculaitis Assessment of Competencies	319	1.4	59	18.5	107	33.5	123	38.6	30	9.4	0	0	
Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Basic Skills	254	1.1	182	71.7	48	18.9	23	9.0	1	0.4	0	0	
Language Assessment Battery	190	0.8	45	23.7	59	31.0	59	31.0	27	14.2	0	0	
Woodcock Munoz Language Survey	11	0.1	1	9.0	3	27.3	5	45.5	2	18.1	0	0	
District-level Performance Tests	3388	14.8	1058	31.2	913	26.9	1145	33.8	272	8.0	0	0	
Classroom performance â€ˆ state achievement tests in	2501	10.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1296	51.8	1205	48.2	
Totals	22912	100.0	8083	35.0	5810	25.0	5625	25.0	2189	10.0	1205	5.0	

OHIO submission exceeds the character limit for Question 1.6.3.3 Comments. Submitted via e-mail to eden_ss@ed.gov September 29, 2006. Filename = Question 1-6-3-3 Comments - OHIO 20060929.doc

- (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>12019</u>
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	<u>7196</u>
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	<u>39</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

As of this date, Ohio has not made changes in the definition of proficient in English since the last Consolidated State Application (for school year 2003-2004).

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

As of this date, the Ohio Department of Education has not made any changes in its definition of making progress since the last Consolidated State Performance Report. However, as stated in Section 1.6.1.1 of this report, the State has modified the proficiency levels by dividing the Beginning level into two sub-levels: Low Beginning (now called "Pre-functional" Level) and Mid-High Beginning (now called "Beginning" Level).

The Pre-functional Level (Low Beginning) represents those students who are consistently unable to communicate with any success in the English of the school environment, although may have some very limited knowledge of isolated English words and phrases. The Beginning Level (Mid-High Beginning) represents those students who are able to understand and produce basic and common phrases in English. With support, they are able to participate in simple, everyday conversations, and they are able to read and write simple messages.

Based on the above information, beginning with 2005-2006, Ohio will use the following levels for reporting purposes:

- Level 1 – Pre-functional - comparable to Ohio's former Beginning level (low end)
- Level 2 – Beginning - comparable to Ohio's former Beginning level (mid-upper end)
- Level 3 – Intermediate - comparable to Ohio's current Intermediate level
- Level 4 – Advanced - comparable to Ohio's current Advanced level
- Level 5 – Proficient - comparable to Ohio's current Proficient/Trial Mainstream level

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

As of this date, Ohio has not made changes in the definition of cohort since the last Consolidated State Application (for school year 2003-2004).

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	54.9	8127	34.1	5046	0	0	5.5	1254

OHIO submission exceeds the character limit for Question 1.6.8 Comments. Submitted via e-mail to eden_ss@ed.gov September 29, 2006. Filename = Question 1-6-8 Comments - OHIO 20060929.doc

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	54.9	7946	33.9	4903	0	0	5.3	1205

OHIO submission exceeds the character limit for Question 1.6.9 Comments. Submitted via e-mail to eden_ss@ed.gov September 29, 2006. Filename = Question 1-6-9 Comments - OHIO 20060929.doc

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

	Number:
Number of Title III subgrantees	195
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	4
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	191

OHIO submission exceeds the character limit for Question 1.6.10 Comments. Submitted via e-mail to eden_ss@ed.gov September 29, 2006. Filename = Question 1-6-10 Comments - OHIO 20060929.doc

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	88	88.0
4	113	82.5
5	111	76.6
6	85	65.4
7		
8	93	73.2
H.S.	110	81.6

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	78	87.6
4	102	85.0
5	103	81.1
6	76	68.5
7		
8	87	75.7
H.S.	101	94.4

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	85.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	71.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	66.8
Hispanic	71.8
White, non-Hispanic	89.8
Students with Disabilities	82.4
Limited English Proficient	74.2
Economically Disadvantaged	82.9
Migrant	74.2
Male	84.1
Female	87.7

Multiracial Graduation Rate = 81.6

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	3.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	7.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.8
Black, non-Hispanic	7.8
Hispanic	6.5
White, non-Hispanic	2.5
Students with Disabilities	3.6
Limited English Proficient	4.0
Economically Disadvantaged	4.5
Migrant	5.0
Male	3.8
Female	3.0

Multiracial Dropout Rate = 5.6

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.