

Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

**Submitted by the
Ohio Department of Education
September 1, 2003**

Contact: Linda C. Nusbaum, Ph.D.
25 South Front Street, Mail Stop 404
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4183
linda.nusbaum@ode.state.oh.us



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

As described in the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their September 1, 2003, consolidated applications is listed below.

Summary of Information Required for September 1, 2003 Submission

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS AND ESEA INDICATORS

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.

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34)).
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).

Performance goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- 4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.
- 5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

This workbook format has been developed to facilitate preparation and submission of the information required in this September 1, 2003, submission. States may use this format or another format of their choosing provided that all required information is provided in a clear and concise manner. The deadline for submission of this application is September 1, 2003.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

For this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- Address grades K through 12
- Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing
- Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)

STATE RESPONSE

Response: Current Status

With the assistance of a writing team representing Ohio educators in the fields of English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual education, the Ohio Department of Education has developed its first draft of English language proficiency (ELP) standards. These standards focus on the English language competencies that limited English proficient (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.

Ohio's ELP standards are grouped into the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Under each standard, benchmarks have been developed for each of the four English proficiency levels that have been established for LEP students in Ohio: Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced, and Proficient/Trial Mainstream. 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 the domain of writing. 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.

(continued on next page)

Response: Current Status, continued

It is also made clear in the document that Ohio's English Language Proficiency Standards are not the same as Ohio's English Language Arts Standards. The English Language Proficiency Standards have been specifically developed for limited English proficient students and define progressive levels of competence in the acquisition of the English language. On the other hand, Language Arts Standards describe what all students, including LEP students, should know and be able to do in a specific academic content area.

Although English Language Proficiency and English Language Arts standards are different, they are linked to one another. 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 towards proficiency in the English language and towards proficiency on Ohio's academic content standards. The goal of English language proficiency standards is to build a foundation in the English language that will enable LEP students to succeed in all their academic content subjects.

In order to articulate more clearly the link between Ohio's ELP standards and the State's academic content standards in areas such as language arts, mathematics and science (by 2005-2006), specific grade-level indicators will be developed for each ELP standard at the different proficiency levels. The grade-level indicators will represent specific statements of English language competencies that students need to attain in order to achieve Ohio's academic performance standards established for each grade, kindergarten through grade twelve.

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. English language proficiency baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

2. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
 - Describe how the composite score was derived;
 - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
 - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

Refer to pages 7-7a for the description of how composite score was derived.

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

Response: Ohio's Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

The total number of LEP students enrolled in Ohio LEAs as of June 2003 was 23,981, as reported via Ohio's Electronic Management Information System (EMIS). However, information on LEP students' proficiency levels is not available via EMIS for school year 2002-2003. Therefore, in order to gather the required baseline data, the Ohio SEA conducted an electronic survey during June-August 2003 of all Ohio LEAs requesting the results of their annual spring assessment of LEP students' level of English language proficiency. The following chart reflects the numbers as reported by LEAs via the online survey, with approximately 80% of the districts enrolling LEP students reporting to date.

Baseline Data for 2002-2003					
Spring 2003 Assessment of LEP students by Ohio LEAs (80% of LEAs reporting to date)					
(1)	(2)	(3)*	(4)*	(5)*	(6)*
Total number of students assessed during 2002-2003	Total number of LEP Identified	Number and Percentage at Beginning Level	Number and Percentage at Intermediate Level	Number and Percentage at Advanced Level	Number and Percentage at Proficient Trial/Mainstream Level
19,596	17,667	4,173 (24%)	6,230 (35%)	4,593 (26%)	1,937 (11%)

* Columns 3-6 represent the results of the spring 2003 annual progress of identified LEP students. A number of students identified as limited English proficient students by school districts at the beginning of the year were not included in the spring assessment due to having moved out of the district. For this reason, the percentages in columns 3-6 do not add up to 100%

(1) List all of the State-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2002-2003 school year to assess LEP students.

List of commercial assessments English language assessments used by Ohio school districts

Commercial Tests	Domain	Grades
Idea Proficiency Tests (IPT)	Oral/Reading/Writing	K-12
Language Assessment Scales (LAS)	Oral/Reading/Writing	K-12
Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey	Oral/Reading/Writing	K-12
BRIGANCE(r) Diagnostic Inventory of Basic Skills	Reading	K-12
Language Assessment Battery	Oral/Reading/Writing	K-12
Maculaitis Assessment of Competencies (MAC II)	Reading/Writing/Listening/Speaking	K-12
The BEST Test	Listening and Speaking	9-12

(2) Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s).

Response: As reported by LEAs via Ohio’s Electronic Management Information System, the number of LEP students enrolled as of June 2003 is **23,981**.

(3-6) Number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency, as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments. If the State uses labels such as Level 1, Level 2, etc., the level at which students are designated “Proficient” should be indicated. For example, in this sample format, students at Level 4 are considered proficient in English. States should use the same ELP labels as defined in State ELP standards and assessment(s). If the ELP standards and assessment(s) define more than four levels, the table should be expanded to incorporate all levels.

Response: Refer to chart (Baseline Data for 2002-2003) on the previous page. As the chart reflects the numbers as reported by LEAs via the online survey, with approximately 80% of the districts enrolling LEP students reporting to date.

Response: Composite Score Derivation and Calculation

The composite score was derived from the results of the English language proficiency assessments in the four domains of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. A fifth domain, comprehension, was calculated by school districts from the average of reading and listening scores. The following chart is used for calculating the composite score.

Composite Score Calculation Worksheet

	Proficiency levels – assigned values			
<u>Language domain</u>	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient/Trial Mainstream
Listening	1	2	3	4
Speaking	1	2	3	4
Reading	1	2	3	4
Writing	1	2	3	4
Comprehension	1	2	3	4
Total maximum scores	5	10	15	20

Based on the above chart, the composite proficiency level is calculated by adding the values assigned to scores on each language domain. The lowest score possible is 5, since a student's score in each of the five domains is at least 1. The following are the range of scores for each proficiency level. Each domain is given equal weight.

- Beginning level: total score = 5 – 9
- Intermediate level: total score = 10 - 14
- Advanced level: total score = 15-19
- Proficient/Trial Mainstream level: total score = 20

Example: A student is assessed as follows:

Language Domain	Proficiency level	Assigned value
Reading	Beginning	1
Writing	Beginning	1
Listening	Intermediate	2
Speaking	Intermediate	2
Comprehension	Beginning	1
Total		7

With a total score of 7, this student would be rated as beginning level.

Please provide the following additional information:

1. English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

Response: Refer to chart “List of commercial assessments English language assessments used by Ohio school districts” on page 7.

2. Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

Response: Refer to chart “Baseline Data for 2002-2003” on page 7.

3. Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

Response: Refer to chart “Baseline Data for 2002-2003” on page 7.

C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments
- 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.

STATE RESPONSE

Response: Ohio's definition of "proficient in English"

The ability to understand, speak, read, and write the English language at a level in which an individual is able to a) achieve successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is in English, b) to meaningfully participate in academic assessments in English, and c) participate fully in society in the United States.

Demonstration of proficiency in English by students in Ohio's elementary and secondary schools will be based on the following criteria:

1. Achieving the advanced level in Ohio's approved English language proficiency test in all language domains: listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension; **and**,
2. Two years of successful participation in classrooms where the language of instruction is in English **and**
3. Attainment of proficient or above for two years in the State's Language Arts assessment.

Response: Assessment scores for determining proficiency levels

As stated in Ohio's original Consolidated State Application, during 2002-2003, LEAs had the option of selecting from among nationally-recognized standardized English proficiency tests to identify the proficiency levels of their LEP student (see list in

Continued on next page

Response: Assessment scores for determining proficiency levels, continued

previous section). Information about each test was made available in guidelines disseminated to LEAs at workshops, conferences, and on the Ohio Department of Education's webpage.

Also, guidelines were provided for using assessments to identify the proficiency level of each student in the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing (comprehension was considered as an underlying competency of both oral and written communication). The assessment of students' English proficiency includes language skills required to succeed in academic content areas.

In its assessment guidelines for 2002-2003, the Ohio Department of Education did not set specific cutoff points for each commercial test in order to determine LEP students' level of proficiency. Rather, narrative descriptors for each proficiency level by domain were provided to serve as a guide. Refer to the chart on the next page "English Language Proficiency Levels – Descriptions" for a description of the proficiency levels in each domain.

Response: For future years, beginning 2003-2004

Ohio is a member of a consortium of states under the sponsorship of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) that received a grant award from the U.S. Department of Education to improve the quality of English language assessment instruments and systems to measure the achievement of LEP students. The consortium is in the process of developing test forms and an item bank from which member states can draw to create test forms that reflect local needs and characteristics for the assessment of English language proficiency. Ohio participated in a small-scale pilot of the assessment in May 2003 and will participate in a large-scale field test in spring 2004. The plan is to have all Ohio LEAs participate in the spring 2004 field test, and pending authorization from the U.S. Department of Education, use test results both to provide new base-line data and to determine if there is a need to revise AMAOs based on the new test specifications and cut-off scores. This will allow for a common test to be used across Ohio for the assessment of LEP students' progress in attaining English language proficiency and facilitate standardization in data collection and reporting.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

**English Language Proficiency Levels —Descriptions
Ohio Department of Education**

Levels – Modes of Communication	Level One Beginning Level Proficiency	Level Two Intermediate Level Proficiency	Level Three Advanced Level Proficiency	Level Four Proficient/Trial Mainstream
Listening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Has zero to very limited ability in understanding spoken English ➤ Has difficulty following simple directions ➤ Often needs explanations repeated or with non-verbal cues ➤ Prefers oral information in native language ➤ Frequently appears confused when spoken to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Shows understanding simple questions and statements on familiar topics ➤ Often requires restatements in graphic terms or at a lower rate ➤ Can follow many simple directions ➤ Shows appropriate responses when read or told a story (example – laughs at humor) ➤ Has difficulty comprehending academic-related discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Understands most questions and conversations on familiar topics spoken distinctively at normal speed. Comprehends lectures on familiar topics with some difficulty ➤ May ask for clarification on oral information related to academic content ➤ Usually can follow complex or multi-step directions ➤ May misinterpret idiomatic expressions or figures of speech 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Shows understanding of academic topical conversations without difficulty ➤ Can follow complex and multi-level directions without difficulty ➤ Shows understanding of oral information provided via electronic audio and video media
Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Has zero to very limited ability in speaking English ➤ Rarely participates in discussions in English ➤ May produce some common English words and phrases ➤ May be able to repeat short sentences or questions ➤ Can not retell a simple story or event 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Can communicate ideas and feelings in English, but with some difficulty ➤ Speaks coherently, but with hesitations and with grammatical and syntactic errors ➤ Can retell a simple story, but detail may be lacking ➤ Can respond appropriately to many questions, but with errors in grammar and vocabulary ➤ May participate effectively, although hesitantly in social conversations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Speaks in coherent, fluent sentences, but with occasional errors in vocabulary and syntax ➤ Can retell a story or event with details, but may have hesitations and digressions ➤ Has little difficulty communicating personal ideas and feeling in English ➤ Can respond appropriately to many questions in classroom settings, but makes some errors in more complex grammatical structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Speaks English fluently in social and grade-level academic settings ➤ Produces speech that include a variety of adverbs and transitional signals ➤ Participates in classroom discussions without difficulty ➤ Demonstrates control of age-appropriate syntax and vocabulary when speaking ➤ Can retell a story or event with appropriate detail and coherency
Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Has zero to very limited ability in reading English ➤ Has little or no sight vocabulary ➤ Does not use details to extract meaning ➤ Does not grasp the main idea ➤ Can not explain what he/she reads ➤ Has difficulty predicting cause and effect relationships ➤ Has difficulty understanding figurative language in poems ➤ Can not use context to assist in making sense of unknown words 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Reads simple printed material within a familiar context ➤ Understands simple material (messages, greetings, popular advertising, letters, and invitations). Understands short discourse on familiar topics. ➤ Has limited sight vocabulary ➤ Partially uses details to extract meaning ➤ Partially perceives the feeling and tone in a poem or story ➤ Has some weaknesses in predicting from details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Can identify main idea of many reading passages ➤ Occasionally has some difficulty interpreting meaning of specific details ➤ May have some difficulty applying reading to practical, real-life situations ➤ Demonstrates understanding of many sight words ➤ Able to identify most specific facts within a text ➤ May have some difficulty using details to make predictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Reads and understands factual information in non-technical prose as well as discussion on concrete topics related to special events ➤ Comprehends standard newspaper items addressed to the general reader, correspondence reports and technical materials ➤ Has an adequate sight vocabulary ➤ Shows understanding of the main idea ➤ Understands figurative language in a poem
Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Has zero to very limited ability in writing English ➤ Copies isolated words or short phrases ➤ Frequently misspells words. ➤ Produces writing that fails to respond to the topic ➤ Produces writing that contains few complete thoughts ➤ Uses vocabulary and syntax that are not adequate for his/her grade level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Composes short paragraphs that are mostly intelligible ➤ Takes simple notes on very familiar topics ➤ Produces writing that contains some complete thoughts ➤ Shows some knowledge of basic sentence construction though errors frequently occur ➤ Produces writing with limited range of vocabulary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Writes simple social correspondence with some errors in spelling and punctuation ➤ Has some difficulty in producing complex sentences ➤ Produces writing that generally addresses given topic ➤ Produces writing that is generally intelligible but lacking grade-level quality ➤ Produces writing that generally expresses complete thoughts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Writes short papers and clearly expresses statements of position, points of view and arguments ➤ Shows good control of sentence structure, spelling, and vocabulary ➤ Produces writing that expresses complete thoughts ➤ Produces writing that is comparable to grade-level quality and quantity ➤ Produces writing with wide range of vocabulary

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

- **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments**
- **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)**
- **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next**

STATE RESPONSE

Response: English language proficiency levels

As indicated on the chart on the previous page "English Language Proficiency Levels – Descriptions", Ohio has designated four levels of English proficiency for LEP students. These are beginning, intermediate, advance, and proficient/trial mainstream. The fourth level represents those students who have demonstrated sufficient competencies in all language domains to transition on a trial basis to classrooms not designed to meet the special needs of LEP students. During this transition stage, the students' progress is carefully monitored and additional support is provided on an "as-needed" basis. It should be recognized that within each of these levels, students represent a certain range of proficiencies (low, mid, high).

Response: Criteria for making progress in the achievement of English proficiency

In order to demonstrate progress in their acquisition of English proficiency, LEP students need to move from one composite proficiency level to another. In order to move from one composite proficiency level to another, LEP students need to demonstrate progress in each of the language domains, based on the calculation formula described in the previous section.

In the table that follows, please provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives are projections for increases in the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and who will attain English language proficiency.

A table has been provided to accommodate States' varying approaches for establishing their performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives. Some States may establish the same performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for all grade levels in the State. Other States may establish separate performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for elementary, middle, and high school, for example. If a State establishes different performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for different grade levels/grade spans/cohorts, the State should complete a separate table for each grade level/grade span/cohort and indicate next to the "unit of analysis/cohort" the grade level/grade span/cohort to which the performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives apply.

Response: The tables on pages 12a – 12b provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for Ohio's LEP students in terms of the percentage of LEP students by cohort who will make progress in learning English on an annual basis, and who will attain English language proficiency on an annual basis. Ohio's definition of cohort is provided on the next page.

Ohio's performance targets for each cohort of students have been developed through a review of the literature on second language acquisition and through consultation with Ohio ESL educators. As noted on the tables on pages 12a – 12b, the performance target is to have 100% of Ohio's LEP students attain English proficiency after a period of time in a program designed to meet their specific language needs. However, the length of time that it takes to attain English proficiency will vary according to a number of variables including age, grade level, extent of prior formal schooling, and current level of English proficiency. Taking these variables into account, Ohio has set performance targets that reflect different rates of English acquisition for different cohorts of students and for different groups within a cohort. For example, for LEP students in the Beginning Level, K-6 cohort, performance targets indicate that a subset of students are expected to achieve English proficiency after four years, while another subset of students are expected to take up to seven years. On the other hand, the performance targets set the expectation that all LEP students will make steady progress in their acquisition of English and attain English proficiency within a reasonable length of time.

Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

Response: Definition of cohort

For the purpose of setting performance targets or annual measurable objectives for the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English, and who will attain English proficiency, Ohio will define a cohort as follows:

The total percentage of students assessed at a given proficiency level in a given year by grade spans K-6 and 7-12.

Given this definition, there will be eight cohorts of students for school year 2002-2003. These are as follows:

- All students in grades K-6 assessed as beginning level
- All students in grades K-6 assessed as intermediate level
- All students in grades K-6 assessed as advanced level
- All students in grades K-6 assessed as proficient/trial mainstream level
- All students in grades 7-12 assessed as beginning level
- All students in grades 7-12 assessed as intermediate level
- All students in grades 7-12 assessed as advanced level
- All students in grades 7-12 assessed as proficient/trial mainstream level

The reason for categorizing the cohorts into different grade spans is that Ohio educators and other experts in the field of second language acquisition have identified age and grade level as important factors in the rate that LEP students progress in their attainment of English communication skills.

The charts on the following pages illustrate the performance targets for each of the cohorts indicated above.

**English Language Proficiency for Limited English Proficient Students
Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO's)**

Cohort: Grades Kindergarten through Sixth Grade (K-6), Year 2002-2003

Beginning Level

School year	Percentage of LEP students in cohort at indicated proficiency levels				
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Trial Mainstream	Attain English Proficiency
2002-2003	100%				
2003-2004	30%	65%	5%		
2004-2005	10%	45%	40%	5%	
2005-2006		20%	55%	25%	
2006-2007			30%	65%	5%
2007-2008				70%	30%
2008-2009				30%	70%
2009-2010					100%

Cohort: Grades Kindergarten through Sixth Grade (K-6), Year 2002-2003

Intermediate Level

School year	Percentage of LEP students in cohort at indicated proficiency levels				
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Trial Mainstream	Attain English Proficiency
2002-2003		100%			
2003-2004		30%	65%	5%	
2004-2005		5%	45%	50%	
2005-2006			20%	75%	5%
2006-2007				50%	50%
2007-2008				20%	80%
2008-2009					100%

**English Language Proficiency for Limited English Proficient Students
Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO's)**

**Cohort: Grades Kindergarten through Sixth Grade (K-6), Year 2002-2003
Advanced Level**

School year	Percentage of LEP students in cohort at indicated proficiency levels				
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Trial Mainstream	Attain English Proficiency
2002-2003			100%		
2003-2004			30%	70%	
2004-2005			10%	90%	
2005-2006			5%	25%	70%
2006-2007				10%	90%
2007-2008					100%

**Cohort: Grades Kindergarten through Sixth Grade (K-6), Year 2002-2003
Proficient/Trial Mainstream Level**

School year	Percentage of LEP students in cohort at indicated proficiency levels				
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Trial Mainstream	Attain English Proficiency
2002-2003				100%	
2003-2004				100%	
2004-2005				30%	70%
2005-2006					100%

**English Language Proficiency for Limited English Proficient Students
Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO's)**

Cohort: Grades Seven through Twelfth Grade (7-12), Year 2002-2003

Beginning Level

School year	Percentage of LEP students in cohort at indicated proficiency levels				
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Trial Mainstream	Attain English Proficiency
2002-2003	100%				
2003-2004	50%	45%	5%		
2004-2005	15%	60%	20%	5%	
2005-2006		45%	40%	15%	
2006-2007		15%	50%	30%	5%
2007-2008			20%	65%	15%
2008-2009				55%	45%
2009-2010					100%

Cohort: Grades Seven through Twelfth Grade (7-12), Year 2002-2003

Intermediate Level

School year	Percentage of LEP students in cohort at indicated proficiency levels				
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Trial Mainstream	Attain English Proficiency
2002-2003		100%			
2003-2004		30%	65%	5%	
2004-2005		10%	85%	5%	
2005-2006			40%	55%	5%
2006-2007			10%	85%	5%
2007-2008				50%	50%
2008-2009				10%	90%
2009-2010					100%

**English Language Proficiency for Limited English Proficient Students
Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO's)**

**Cohort: Grades Seven through Twelfth Grade (7-12), Year 2002-2003
Advanced Level**

School year	Percentage of LEP students in cohort at indicated proficiency levels				
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Trial Mainstream	Attain English Proficiency
2002-2003			100%		
2003-2004			30%	70%	
2004-2005			10%	90%	
2005-2006			5%	25%	70%
2006-2007				10%	90%
2007-2008				5%	95%
2008-2009					100%

**Cohort: Grades Seven through Twelfth grade (7-12), Year 2002-2003
Proficient/Trial Mainstream Level**

School year	Percentage of LEP students in cohort at indicated proficiency levels				
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Trial Mainstream	Attain English Proficiency
2002-2003				100%	
2003-2004				100%	
2004-2005				30%	70%
2005-2006				5%	95%
2006-2007					100%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc>

A. In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is 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.

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high-poverty schools in the State in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Response: Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	82%*	78%*
2003-2004 Target	87%	84%
2004-2005 Target	92%	90%
2005-2006 Target	100%	100%

** The numbers represented for baseline data do not include those people who may be highly qualified through the use of a Master’s degree in the content area, a major with 30 or more semester hours in the content area or those who qualify using the rubric. We did not collect these items in the 2002-03 school year. All options will be included in future school years.*

B. To best understand the data provided by States, please provide the State’s definition of a highly qualified teacher below.

Response: Highly Qualified Teachers—Elementary Level

- A highly qualified teacher at the elementary level (K-6) is one who holds at least a bachelor’s degree and has full state certification through a Provisional or Professional Teaching License for PreK-3, 4-9, or Provisional, Professional, or Permanent Certificate 1-8, K-8, K-3, PreK-3, 4-9, or K-12, and who meets the requirements below.
- A highly qualified teacher NEW to the profession at the elementary level, in addition to holding at least a bachelor’s degree and full state certification/licensure, must have completed:
 - the examination approved by the State Board of Education (Ohio Administrative Code 3301-24-05)
- A highly qualified teacher NOT NEW to the profession at the elementary level, in addition to holding at least a bachelor’s degree and full state certification/licensure, must have completed:
 - the examination approved by the State Board of Education (Ohio Administrative Code 3301-24-05) OR
 - the following high objective uniform state standard evaluation:
 - a graduate degree in the teaching assignment, OR
 - advanced certification defined as a professional or permanent certificate; OR

- advanced credentialing defined as National Board Certification OR
- achieve 100 points on the Ohio Highly Qualified Teacher Rubric OR
- meet the following requirements by 2006:
 1. Have an individual professional development plan approved by the local professional development committee** that includes a plan to complete by 2006 at least ninety (90) clock hours of high quality professional development(as defined in No Child Left Behind, Section 9101) well distributed over the following areas: grade appropriate academic subject matter knowledge, teaching skills, and state academic content standards.
 2. Upon completion of the 90 clock hours submit documentation to the Local Professional Development Committee that includes a description of the content of the activities, the contact hours, and documentation of attainment of learning by the teacher.
 3. Convert to a five year professional license by 2006.

***The Local Professional Development Committee (authorized by Senate Bill 230 to be established in every Ohio school district) has a membership of at least three classroom teachers, one principal, and one other employee appointed by the district superintendent. The LPDC will determine if the individual professional development plan includes appropriate professional development activities consistent with the highly qualified teacher definition and the definition of high quality professional development.*

Response: Highly Qualified Teachers—Middle & Secondary Level

- A highly qualified teacher at the middle and secondary levels (grades 7-12) is one who holds at least a bachelor's degree and holds full state certification through a Provisional or Professional teaching license for Middle Childhood 4-9, or Adolescent to Young Adult 7-12, or Provisional, Professional, or Permanent Certificate 1-8, K-8, 4-9, K-12, or 7-12, for each teaching assignment, and who meets the requirements below.
- A highly qualified teacher NEW to the profession at the middle and secondary levels (grades 7-12), in addition to holding at least a bachelor's degree and full state certification/licensure, must have completed:
 - the examination approved by the State Board of Education (Ohio Administrative Code 3301-24-0).
- A highly qualified teacher NOT NEW to the profession at the middle and secondary levels (grades 7-12), in addition to holding at least a bachelor's degree and full state certification, must have completed:

the examination approved by the State Board of Education (Ohio Administrative Code 3301-24-0) OR

- an academic major or coursework equivalent to an academic major (defined as 30 semester hours of upper level courses) in the teaching assignment OR
- a graduate degree in the teaching assignment, OR
- advanced certification defined as a professional or permanent certificate with at least 30 hours in the content area in the teaching assignment OR
- advanced credentialing defined as National Board Certification in the teaching assignment OR
- the following high objective uniform state standard evaluation:
 1. achieve 100 points on the Ohio Highly Qualified Rubric OR
 2. Have an individual professional development plan approved by the local professional development committee** that includes a plan to complete by 2006 at least ninety (90) clock hours of high quality professional development(as defined in No Child Left Behind, Section 9101) well distributed over the following areas: grade appropriate academic subject matter knowledge, teaching skills, and state academic content standards and
 3. Upon completion of the 90 clock hours submit documentation to the Local Professional Development Committee that includes a description of the content of the activities, the contact hours, and documentation of attainment of learning by the teacher.
 4. Convert to a five year professional license by 2006.

***The Local Professional Development Committee (authorized by Senate Bill 230 to be established in every Ohio school district) has a membership of at least three classroom teachers, one principal, and one other employee appointed by the district superintendent. The LPDC will determine if the individual professional development plan includes appropriate professional development activities consistent with the highly qualified teacher definition and the definition of high quality professional development.*

Response: Highly Qualified Teachers—Alternative License

A highly qualified teacher with an Alternative Educator license (as prescribed in Ohio Administrative Code 3301-24-10, valid for teaching the subject area named on the license in grades seven through twelve) is one who holds at least a bachelor's degree with a major or its equivalent in the teaching assignment and

- has passed the prescribed content area examination (Praxis II content area test);

- is making satisfactory progress in completing program requirements for an alternate route to the teaching profession, including the completion of six semester hours (or the equivalent) of professional education coursework within the past five years with a GPA of 2.5, from a college or university approved to prepare teachers, as follows: three hours in teaching methods, including field experience, and three hours in developmental characteristics of adolescent youths; and
- is participating in a structured mentoring program provided by the employing school district which includes assistance in acquiring knowledge of the school curriculum, classroom management, and improvement of instructional skills.

Teachers Who Do Not Meet Requirements for Highly Qualified Teachers include but are not limited to:

- Teachers with Conditional permits
- Teachers with Long-term Substitute licenses
- Teachers with Temporary Licenses
- Teachers with Short-term Substitute licenses
- Teachers working out-of-field under the Ohio House Bill 196 provision
- Teachers teaching outside their field of licensure/certification

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34).)

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIguidance2002.doc>

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development” in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive “high-quality professional development” through the 2005-2006 school year. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

Response: Percentage of Teachers Receiving high-Quality Professional Development

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	See below
2003-2004 Target	
2004-2005 Target	
2005-2006 Target	

Response: Baseline data related to state sponsored professional development that meets the federal definition will be obtained as follows:

- The number of teachers participating in State Institute for Reading Improvement in 2002.
- The number of teachers participating in Ohio Mathematics Academy Program in 2002.

Additionally a survey is being created to gather data related to HQPD offered at the regional and district level from the Regional Service Providers and Educational Service Centers. The survey data combined with the state-sponsored professional development data will give a more complete picture of district level, high quality professional development. The survey will be sent out during the second week of September. Compilation of the professional development data will be available by the end of September.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 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/offices/OESE/SASA/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Response: Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	4.52%*
2003-2004 Target	25%
2004-2005 Target	50%
2005-2006 Target	100%

**The numbers represented in this calculation do not include those paraprofessional who have taken a statewide or local assessment.*

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

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

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>.

For baseline data, please provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

Response: Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	0
2004-2005 Target	0
2005-2006 Target	0
2006-2007 Target	0
2007-2008 Target	0
2008-2009 Target	0
2009-2010 Target	0
2010-2011 Target	0
2011-2012 Target	0
2012-2013 Target	0
2013-2014 Target	0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: “The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.” However, 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 the school year, 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.

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. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, we ask that the information you submit in this September 1, 2003, consolidated State application reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State’s accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the State graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

Response: Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE*

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	82.8
African American/Black	60.8
American Indian/Native Alaskan	64.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	90.3
Hispanic	66.1
White	87.0
Other	80.5
Students with Disabilities	77.8
Students without Disabilities	N/A
Limited English Proficient	79.5
Economically Disadvantaged	80.9 (02-03)
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	N/A
Migrant	72.7 (02-03)
Male	80.0
Female	85.7

**Based on unverified data that may vary from final data to be reported in accordance with National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data*

Response: PERFORMANCE TARGETS: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
African American/Black	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
Hispanic	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
White	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
Other	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
Students with Disabilities	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
Students without Disabilities	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
Limited English Proficient	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
Economically Disadvantaged	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
Migrant	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
Male	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0
Female	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	73.6	82.3	82.3	91.0	91.0

**Based on unverified data that may vary from final data to be reported in accordance with National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data*

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

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 charts, please provide baseline data and targets 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. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

Response: BASELINE DATA: DROPOUT RATE *

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	3.7%
African American/Black	7.7%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	9.2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.1%
Hispanic	6.8%
White	3.0%
Other (Multi-racial)	4.7%
Students with Disabilities	N/A
Students without Disabilities	N/A
Limited English Proficient	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	N/A
Migrant	N/A
Male	4.2%
Female	3.2%

**Based on unverified data that may vary from final data to be reported in accordance with National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data*

Response: PERFORMANCE TARGETS: DROPOUT RATE *

Student Dropouts	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
All Students	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
African American/Black	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Hispanic	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
White	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Other	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Students with Disabilities	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Students without Disabilities	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Limited English Proficient	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Economically Disadvantaged	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Migrant	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Male	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Female	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.0%	2.0%

**Based on unverified data that may vary from final data to be reported in accordance with National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data*

