

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Part 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 2002-2003



DUE JUNE 30, 2004

UPDATED JUNE 6, 2006

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	ii
General Instructions and Timelines	vi
Cover Page for Submission	vii
Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)	1
William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)	5
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	17
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	28
Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)	29
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) Title II, Part A)	30
Enhancing Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)	31
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)	32
Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV, Part A)	34
21 st Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)	41
Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)	42
Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) (Title VI, Part B)	45
Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)	46
Appendix	

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 Application and Report are 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:

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States submitted to the Department on December 22, 2003, requested 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 NCLB. Through the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submissions and through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States have already submitted the following 2002-2003 school year data related to the five ESEA goals.

- **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.

In Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States reported the percentage of students proficient or advanced in reading/language arts and mathematics, based on assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. States reported achievement data for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

- **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.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the following: (1) the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students; (2) English language proficiency (ELP) data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration; (3) Information on the total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s); (4) Information on the total number of students identified as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s); and (5) performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and the percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency.

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

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received "high-quality professional development;" and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

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

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year.

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

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided baseline graduation rate and dropout rate data from the 2001-2002 school year for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

This Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2002-2003 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 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.

Also, this report is limited to information that States should have available by Spring, 2004.

Consistent with these criteria, Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year does not request additional data for the programs listed below.

- Title I, Part D: Neglected or Delinquent - The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. This data will not be available in Spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report which will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.
- Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.
- Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants) – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented. Additionally, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application and in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year, States reported information related to teacher and paraprofessional quality, including the percentage of classes taught by high-qualified teachers, the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development, and the percentage of highly-qualified Title I paraprofessionals.
- Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology – The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.

- Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2003-2004 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2002-2003 school year must respond to this Part II of Consolidated State Performance Report. Reports are due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**, and should reflect data from the 2002-2003 school year. If needed, States should include for each section an explanation of the data provided (e.g., data irregularities). Throughout the report, States should use their definition of a school year, unless noted otherwise.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to conreport@ed.gov, or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

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

Daisy Greenfield
U.S. Department of Education
Room 3E307
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20202-6400

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 2.32 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) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E307, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

OMB Number: _____
Expiration Date: _____

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

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

New Jersey State Department of Education

Address:

100 River View Plaza
P. O. Box 500
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0500

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Diane Schonyers

Telephone: (609) 777-1653

Fax: (609) 984-5901

e-mail: diane.schonyers@doe.nj.state.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

William L. Librera, Ed.D.
Commissioner

Signature

Date

**I. Improving Basic Programs
Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)**

A. Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools

1. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. 247 (Based upon 502 Title I schools with 40 percent or greater poverty with testable grades.)

2. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. 297 (Based upon 502 Title I schools with 40 percent poverty with testable grades.)

B. Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State | <u>1,379</u> |
| 2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State | <u>1,121</u> |
| 3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State | <u>258</u> |

C. Title I, Part A Student Participation

1. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	22,406
Limited English Proficient	21,208
Homeless	0
Migrant	0

Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian or Alaskan Native	574
Asian	9,057
Black or African American	98,501
Hispanic or Latino	105,687
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0
White	56,947

2. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide *programs* (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level						
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0-2	11	-	70	0	81	0
Age 3-5	370	3,565	54	0	3,989	1
K	3,653	17,652	486	23	21,791	8
1	9,435	18,737	770	47	28,942	10
2	9,011	18,924	787	20	28,722	10
3	8,873	18,916	764	24	28,553	10
4	8,642	18,595	583	21	27,820	10
5	8,473	18,604	639	32	27,716	10
6	7,607	18,256	592	33	26,455	10
7	8,794	18,138	679	58	27,611	10
8	7,925	16,968	546	112	25,439	9
9	4,342	3,589	85	133	8,016	3
10	3,256	3,071	70	99	6,397	2
11	3,426	2,404	70	125	5,900	2
12	2,806	2,159	68	88	5,033	2
Ungraded	113	4,806	-	295	4,919	2
TOTALS	86,737	184,384	6,263	1,110	277,384	100

3. Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, A Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services	
Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	58,923
Reading/Language Arts	62,668
Science	4,938
Social Studies	4,593
Vocational/Career	-
Other (specify)	722 (Reading Recovery, Other academic disciplines, Homework Assistance, Higher Order Thinking Skills using Technology, English for LEP)
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	220
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	472
Other (specify)	-

C. Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

Staff Information for Title I, A Targeted Assistance Programs	
	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	83.4
Teachers	1,933.3
Teacher Aides	574.6
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	69.6
Other (specify)	0

II. William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)

A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following information:

1. Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

a. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State 30

2. Even Start Families Served

a. Total number of families served 628

b. Total number of adults participating 704

c. Total number of adults who are English language learners 397

d. Total number of children participating 957

3. Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment

a. Number of newly enrolled families 251

b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants 276

c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal Poverty level 96%

d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED 208

e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade 31%

4. Percent of families that have remained in the program

a. Less than 3 months 9.1%

b. From 4 to 6 months 14.7%

c. From 7 to 12 months 20.6%

d. More than 12 months 55.6%

B. State Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe your program's progress in meeting its performance indicators developed under section 1240 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Included are all State indicators, as developed under section 1240, including both required and optional indicators. Provide any targets set, measures used and results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For indicators with no set targets or standards, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. For indicators with more than one year of available data, please note the data in the results column and include trend information in the assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
EXAMPLE: Adult achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving and numeracy		EXAMPLE: Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)	EXAMPLE: 2001-2002: 15 out of 20 adult participants met target 2002-2003: 17 out of 20 adult participants met target	EXAMPLE: Target was not met in 2002-2003, but positive movement toward target was seen between 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.	EXAMPLE: Information on participation showed that only 50% of adult participants stayed in the program for 12 months. Participants who remained in the program for at least one full year were more likely to meet target. Of participants who remained in program for one full year, 70% met target as compared to only 40% of participants who remained in program for less than 12 months.
<u>Early Childhood</u> Participating children age 0-7 will receive developmentally appropriate early childhood	100% of Even Start child participants are provided with instruction that is developmentally appropriate and designed to ensure	Developmentally appropriate curriculum (e.g. Ages & Stages, Baby Talk Curriculum, High Scope Curriculum, and Brazelton's	100% of programs reported providing instruction that is age appropriate and designed to foster independent reading.	Target met	New Jersey is conducting additional research regarding widely accepted curricula targeted towards children from 0-4.

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
education services that will enable them to become independent readers by age 7.	that they become independent readers by age 7.	Touchpoint, Teacher & Home-Based Education (HBE) observations.			
Programs provided to early childhood participants will be developmentally appropriate and incorporate learning activities focused on age appropriate language and reading/reading readiness development.	100% of Even Start child participants are provided with instruction that is developmentally appropriate and activities that highlight language and reading/reading readiness development.	Developmentally appropriate curriculum (i.e. Ages & Stages, Baby Talk Curriculum, High Scope Curriculum, and Brazelton's Touchpoint), Teacher & HBE observations and/or activities designed for HBE and Parent and Child Interactive Time (PACIT).	100% of programs are providing instructional programs that are developmentally appropriate. Programs reported either providing supplemental learning activities or utilizing curricula that infuse learning activities that focus on age appropriate language and reading/reading readiness development.	Target met	Same as above

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
Children enrolled in the Even Start (ES) program will participate fully in the appropriate early childhood education component.	100% of Even Start child participants will maintain satisfactory attendance in age appropriate programs/activities offered through the early childhood component of the program.	Attendance Records/Logs	100 % of programs report a satisfactory attendance rate for child participants.	Target met	Attendance for school-age children is monitored by the school district and fall under the guidelines of the district’s attendance policies for satisfactory attendance. For children who are not enrolled a preschool program, attendance is determined by participation in ancillary programs/activities. For students who are enrolled in preschool, attendance is monitored by their respective preschool programs.
Children enrolled in the Even Start program will develop early literacy skills needed to allow them to move through the school curriculum continuing from preschool through grade 2 without being retained.	95% of Even Start child participants will develop the literacy skills needed to enable them to proceed to the next learning/grade level.	School records, report cards, screening assessments	98.3% promotion rate	Target met	

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
Children of limited English proficiency enrolled in the Even Start program will develop the English language skills needed to become fully proficient in English and develop literacy in the language.	100% of children participating in the ES program that are classified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) will develop English language acquisition for use in spoken and written environments.	Benchmark assessments (vary by program)	Inconclusive	N/A	Programs that service school age children who are enrolled in district-sponsored LEP programs are more likely to obtain information in this regard. Data is unavailable for non-school age LEP children and those who do not participate in a formal LEP program. Programs were unable to isolate data on this population for the 2002-2003 program year.
Staff will receive appropriate professional development and training in early childhood education, including but not limited to training in developmentally appropriate practices and early literacy and language development.	100% of Even Start staff will receive appropriate professional development and training designed to increase their effectiveness in providing instruction within a comprehensive family literacy environment.	Documentation of attendance, professional development certificates, and training materials.	100% of programs provide appropriate professional development to staff.	Target met	

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
<u>Adult Education</u> Participating adults will receive a minimum of six hours of adult education classroom instruction weekly (during the regular school year), thereby enabling them to attain their personal educational objectives.	100% of all adult participants will receive a minimum of six hours of instruction in adult education in a classroom setting on a weekly basis.	Class offerings/schedules, attendance records.	68% of all participating adults received six hours of weekly instruction.	Target not met	The result data does not take into account instruction offered in non-traditional styles including one-on-one tutorials and computer assisted instruction.
Participating adults will demonstrate improvements in literacy skill levels in reading, writing and speaking the English language, numeracy, problem solving, English language acquisition, and other literacy skills.	75% of participating adults will demonstrate improvement in literacy skill levels in reading, writing, and/or English language acquisition.	Pre and Post tests that indicate benchmark progress for adult education.	78% of adult participants that attended on a regular basis demonstrated improvement.	Target met	

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
Participating adults will receive sufficient basic education to enable them to benefit from placement in, retention in, or completion of, postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment or career advancement.	100% of participating adults that identified postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment or career advancement as a goal will be offered sufficient instruction that will enable them to achieve this goal.	Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) Basic English Skills Test (BEST)	Inconclusive	N/A	Very few programs have adult participants that fit this category. Most are in need of basic instruction in adult education, GED or ESL. Consequently, programs have inconsistent data for this population. For adult participants that complete the GED component, programs have reported providing post-secondary and/or career advancement assistance even though the adult participant may not have indicated this as a goal.
Participating adults will be provided with sufficient educational opportunities so they may receive a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.	100% of participating adults that have identified the attainment of a high school diploma or its equivalent as a goal are offered appropriate instruction/programs to enable them to achieve this goal.	Curricula/Program design (as reflected in project activity plans).	100% of programs report providing instruction as appropriate or referring out to collaborating agencies to ensure the provision of services/programs in this area.	Target met	

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
Records will show that adult education instructional staff has participated in appropriate professional development related to their field (minimum of five hours each program year).	100% of Even Start adult education staff will receive appropriate professional development and training designed to increase their effectiveness in providing instruction within a comprehensive family literacy environment.	Documentation of attendance, professional development certificates, and training materials.	100% of programs report providing staff development appropriate to their role in the program.	Target met	
<u>Parenting Skills</u> Participating parents will develop skills to enable them to help their children learn and develop literacy skills.	HBE (two visits monthly- 80% standard); Parenting Classes/Workshops (at least one monthly- 80% standard) and PACIT (at least one monthly-80% standard).	HBE logs, Parenting Skills and PACIT agendas and attendance sheets.	Data unavailable	N/A	Beginning in the 2004-2005 program year, the Parenting Education Profile (PEP) will be used to measure the effectiveness of the components identified in this indicator.

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
<u>Integration of Services</u> To maximize the services provided through the Even Start program, all required services must be fully integrated and focused on program goals.	All five components of the ES program (Early Childhood Education, Adult Education, HBE, Parenting Skills and PACIT) must be fully integrated to reflect a comprehensive family literacy program.	Records reflecting regular staff and program planning meetings across all components of the program and cooperation amongst collaborating agencies.	100% of programs report fully integrating all program components.	Target met	Ongoing training is provided to ensure that programs fully comprehend how to integrate program components effectively. In the 2002-2003 program year, at least four director's trainings and one targeted training was provided to funded programs.

C. Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State. **Information not available at this time. Please see Appendix A for justification.**

Indicator	Target <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Cohort Number of participants who have this goal	Result <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
A. Number AND Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading						
B. Number AND Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics						
C. Number AND Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition						

Indicator	Target <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Cohort <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	Result <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
D. Number AND Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED						
E. Number AND Percentage of non- school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED						
F. Number AND Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development						
G. Number AND Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of						

Indicator	Target <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Cohort <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	Result <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
reading readiness						
H. Number AND Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level						
I. Number AND Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities						

III. Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)

Please complete the following charts for the Title I, Part C program.

General Data Reporting Information

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2002-2003. The Reporting Period for these data is September 1, 2002, to August 31, 2003.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE I. POPULATION DATA

In Table I States are to report the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 – 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	94	306	103	160	142	155	113	108	104	80	54	56	35	19	21	3	3004	4557
B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"	-	-	29	30	18	28	21	21	19	12	11	10	4	5	0	-	-	208
C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																		
1. Migrant Children who are LEP	-	20	39	126	111	111	84	71	57	49	25	31	13	8	0	546	-	1291
D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION																		
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	-	-	1	9	4	8	8	8	6	5	4	6	2	0	0	-	-	61
E. MOBILITY																		
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	64	123	34	44	28	40	35	32	26	20	14	12	5	6	0	0	1320	1803
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	26	81	33	36	34	37	25	28	25	24	8	20	8	3	3	0	965	1356

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
3.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	4	62	19	40	39	36	31	20	19	12	18	11	8	2	5	1	414	741
4.	Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months)	47	170	70	84	70	83	61	59	51	46	25	29	15	8	7	0	1206	2031

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS

Table II asks for the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school graduation <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> for migrant students has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																			
1. Dropped out of school																			
2. Obtained GED																			
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- (Note: The results of migrant students on State assessments in mathematics and reading/ language arts have been collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																			

*Please note: Date collection for Table II information was not required of subgrantees for 2002-2003. Subgrantees have been directed to begin collection of this information.

INSTRUCTION: TABLE III. G. MEP PARTICIPATION – REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR

Table III G. asks for the statewide, *unduplicated* number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Participation information is required for children who *received instructional or support services* funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. **DO NOT count migrant children served through any schoolwide programs (SWP), even if they combined MEP funds, in any row of this table.**

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count children not served. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Regular School Year Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. **DO NOT** include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received any type of referred service (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child). This is **NOT** a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP personnel.

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
G. PARTICIPATION—REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR																			
1.	Served in MEP (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in any SWPs even if MEP funds are combined)	53	133	71	96	80	95	69	62	67	54	30	39	21	11	13	1	435	1330
2.	Priority for Service	-	-	18	12	10	17	15	11	15	7	8	7	3	4	0	0	-	127
3.	Continuation of Service	0	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	7	23
4.	Any Instructional Service	1	9	48	77	64	71	45	51	39	38	17	24	13	3	10	1	4	515
5.	Reading Instruction	0	3	29	64	50	54	31	42	31	22	13	13	11	2	1	1	3	370
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	2	24	63	56	56	33	40	32	20	12	13	8	2	2	0	3	366
7.	High School Credit Accrual													0	0	0	0	0	0
8.	Any Support Service	53	133	65	80	68	88	58	56	56	42	27	36	20	10	13	1	434	1240
9.	Counseling Service	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	7
10.	Any Referred Service		0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE III. H. MEP PARTICIPATION –SUMMER/INTERSESSION TERM

Table III H. asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Participation information is required for children who *received instructional or support services* funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count children not served. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received any type of referred service (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child). This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP personnel.

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
H. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																			
1. Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	30	164	69	96	81	84	68	64	48	42	22	21	12	3	0	0		1101	1905
2. Priority for Service	-	-	25	29	18	23	20	20	13	12	6	7	2	2	0	0		-	177
3. Continuation of Service	0	2	9	14	24	24	31	16	11	9	7	2	2	1	0		6	158	
4. Any Instructional Service	1	104	67	93	78	83	67	60	43	37	20	15	8	2	0	0		543	1221
5. Reading Instruction	0	18	16	93	78	82	67	59	43	36	20	15	8	2	0	0		212	749
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	18	16	93	77	83	67	59	43	35	19	11	4	1	0	0		1	527
7. High School Credit Accrual														0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Any Support Service	30	163	68	95	81	84	68	63	48	41	22	21	12	3	0	0		1098	1897
9. Counseling Service	0	13	4	85	71	78	65	52	38	31	16	9	3	1	0	0		2	468
10. Any Referred Service	2	4	16	18	26	29	32	19	18	15	17	7	4	3	5	0		24	239

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA

Table IV asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools and who received the special services noted below according to the descriptive categories.

In the first column of Table IV, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children. In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide.

TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA		
I. STUDENT ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 144	b. 1568
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 0	b. 0

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. J. MEP PROJECT DATA – TYPE OF MEP PROJECT

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs that were supported with MEP funds in any row of this table.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
J. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 0*	b. -
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 15	b. 1394
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 23	b. 1804
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 7	b. 2775

*No data was submitted for this because our subgrantees do not provide services during the school day during the regular school year. Migrant students attend school in the districts in which they reside.

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. K. MEP PROJECT DATA – KEY MEP PERSONNEL

For each school term, enter the number of *full-time-equivalent* staff whose salaries are paid by the MEP. Report FTE units by job classification. Define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. For example, one regular term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days, one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs that combined MEP funds/services with those of other programs.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
K. KEY MEP PERSONNEL	REGULAR-TERM FTE 1 FTE = <u>180</u> Days	SUMMER-TERM /INTERSESSION FTE 1 FTE = <u>33</u> Days
1. State Director	a. *	b.
2. Teachers	a. 4.5	b. 51.6
3. Counselors	a. .4	b. 1.1
4. All Paraprofessionals	a. 3.5	b. 135.6
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	a. **	b. 5
6. Recruiters	a. 6.7	b. 25.0
7. Records Transfer Staff	a. 1.4	b. 2.0

*No data was entered because the office director position is not being currently charged to the MEP

**Data was not required to be collected by the two subgrantees. However, the northern region provided its employment of five qualified paraprofessionals during its summer program.

**IV. Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth
Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)**

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. These data will not be available in Spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report which will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.

**V. Comprehensive School Reform
(Title I, Part F)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

VI. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) (Title II, Part A)

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following teacher quality information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development;” and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

**VII. Enhancing Education through Technology
(Title II, Part D)**

The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.

VIII. English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)

States are not required to report any additional data for the 2002-2003 school year in this Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report. States reported data for the 2002-2003 school year for the Title III program in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application. Specifically, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application, States reported the information listed below.

1. A description of the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describing 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).

2. English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. ELP baseline data included 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.

A. The ELP baseline data included 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.

B. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State was 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.

3. Information on the 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).

4. Information on the 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)).

5. 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. In September 2003, States provided 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

Through the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year and future years and through the Biennial Performance Report for Title III, States will be required to report information similar to that reported for the September 2003 Consolidated State Application.

**IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act
(Title IV, Part A)**

General Instructions

Words that appear underlined throughout (for example, "physical fighting") should be defined in accordance with State policy or based on the instrument the State uses to collect the information. States are asked to submit their definition of these terms.

If your State does not collect data in the same format requested on this form, the State may provide data from a similar question. If that occurs, please include a footnote for those data that explains the differences between the data requested on the form and the data the State is able to supply.

A. In the following chart, please identify each of your State indicators as submitted by the State in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application and provide the following:

- a. the instrument or data source used to measure the indicator
- b. the frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection
- c. 2002-2003 baseline data
- d. targets for the years in which your State has established targets

A. 1 State Performance Indicators for Title IV, A - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection and year of most recent collection	2002-2003 Baseline	Targets
30-day use rate: Alcohol Grade 10	2001 NJ-YRBS** 2003 NJ-SHS***	Biannual 2003	56.6%	2003-2004 43.7%
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
30-day use rate: Alcohol Grade 12	2001 NJ-YRBS* 2003 NJ-SHS**	Biannual 2003	63.3%	2003-2004 63.6%
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
30-day use rate: Marijuana Grade 10	2001 NJ-YRBS* 2003 NJ-SHS**	Biannual 2003	21.7%	2003-2004 17.4%
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
30-day use rate: Marijuana Grade 12	2001 NJ-YRBS* 2003 NJ-SHS**	Biannual 2003	29.3%	2003-2004 33.8%
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
Incidents of substance abuse on school grounds	EVVRS***	Annual 2002-03	2,754	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
Age of First Use: Alcohol % <= age 14	2001 NJ-YRBS* 2003 NJ-SHS**	Biannual 2003	61.7%	2003-2004 54.8%
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
Age of First Use: Marijuana % <= age 14	2001 NJ-YRBS* 2003 NJ-SHS**	Biannual 2003	29%	2003-2004 18.7%
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007

Age of First Use: Tobacco % <= age 14	2001 NJ-YRBS* 2003 NJ-SHS**	Biannual 2003	38.7%	2003-2004 28.2%
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
Incidents of violence on school grounds	EVVRS***	Annual	13,915	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
Weapons incidents on school grounds	EVVRS***	Annual	1,533	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007

A.2 Provide an explanation of the data provided in the table (A.1).

* 2001 New Jersey Youth Risk Behavior Survey was conducted in the spring of 2001. Its data are weighted and thus, represent all high school students in the state; it is the source of the (2002-2003) baseline data.

** 2003 New Jersey Student Health Survey was conducted in the spring of 2003. Its data are unweighted and thus represent only the all high school students in the survey sample; it is the source of the (2003-2004) Target data.

*** EVVRS: Electronic Violence and Vandalism Reporting System, a unit-record Internet-based incident reporting system.

B. In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students. States should use their definition of elementary, middle, and high school and provide those definitions in the report.

1. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	262	47
Middle	3179	225
High School	4604	239

2. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	141	52
Middle	537	165
High School	544	162

3. The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	3	3
Middle	88	47
High School	506	147

4. The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	13	8
Middle	300	106
High School	2201	243

Definition of Terms

Out-of-School Suspensions

1. Physical Fighting

Mutual engagement in a physical confrontation that may result in bodily injury to either party. Does not include verbal confrontations or a minor confrontation such as a shoving match. All participants should be classified as offenders. One needs to consider age and developmentally appropriate behavior before using this category.

2. Weapons

Having on one's person or in one's locker or vehicle any weapon (other than a firearm). A weapon is any instrument readily capable of lethal use or of inflicting bodily injury that includes, but is not limited to, knives, clubs or other bludgeons, chains, sling shots, leather bands studded with metal filings and razor blades. This category also includes stun guns and any device which projects, releases or emits tear gas or any other substance (e.g., pepper spray) intended to produce temporary discomfort or permanent injury through being vaporized or otherwise dispensed in the air. Components that can readily be assembled into a weapon also apply. An incident of possession, if not reported on the EVVRS, may, of course, still be reported in the district's disciplinary record system.

If Assault with Other Weapon is checked, Possession of Other Weapon cannot be checked. Consider age and developmentally appropriate behavior before using this category.

3. Type of School:

An elementary school is defined as any school that ends at grade 6 or below; a middle school is any school that ends in the 7 through 9 grade range, and a high school is defined as any school that ends at grade 10 or above. Charter schools are included and are categorized in the same manner.

C. Describe the outcomes of the State’s efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts.

New Jersey has undertaken the following efforts to inform and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts.

- State Statutes and Regulations – Parent involvement is required in a variety of ways under the following state statutes and regulations:

N.J.S.A. 18A:40A-16, N.J.S.A. 18A:40A-17 and N.J.A.C. 6A:16-3.1(a)6 – Pursuant to these statutes and the regulation (Appendix B), local boards of education are required to offer substance abuse education programs to the parents or legal guardians of public school students according to the requirements established in the authorizing statutes and at times and places convenient to the parents and guardians of enrolled students.

N.J.S.A. 18A:37-15 et seq. – Pursuant to this statute (Appendix C), local boards of education are required to adopt policies prohibiting harassment, intimidation and bullying on school property, at a school-sponsored function or on a school bus. The school districts are also required to attempt to adopt the policy through a process that includes representation of parents and guardians and other school and community representatives.

N.J.S.A. 18A:17-46 – Pursuant to this statute (Appendix D), chief school administrators (CSAs) are required to hold annual public hearings at which time the CSAs report to the board of education all acts of violence and vandalism which occurred during the previous school year. The public hearings provide parents and other community members with the opportunity to learn about and comment on local school violence and vandalism issues.

N.J.A.C. 6A:16-7 – Pursuant to these Intervention and Referral Services (I&RS) regulations (Appendix E), school districts are required to establish and implement a coordinated system in each school building for the planning and delivery of intervention and referral services designed to assist students who are experiencing learning, behavior or health difficulties and to assist staff who have difficulties in addressing students’ learning, behavior or health needs. Pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:16-7.2(a) 6 under the I&RS regulations, I&RS teams are required to “Actively involve parents or guardians in the development and implementation of intervention and referral services action plans.”

- No Child Left Behind Advisory Council – The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) has established an advisory council to consult on all matters pertaining to the No Child Left Behind Act. The Council includes parent representation from two local school districts.
- Unsafe School Choice Option Policy – In accordance with the federal Unsafe School Choice Option (USCO) requirement (Title IX, Part E, Subpart 2, Section 9532 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001),

the NJDOE developed its USCO Policy, in part, in consultation with the NCLB Advisory Council, which, as explained above, includes parent representation.

- NCLB Consolidated Formula Subgrant Application – The NJDOE’s application to LEAs for NCLB funds, which includes Title IV-A, requires parent participation in the following ways:

- *Statement of Assurances and Certification Form* – Each CSA is required to sign a separate statement of assurances for the use of Title IV-A funds (Appendix F) that includes an assurance that “Appropriate persons, including parents ... have been involved in timely and meaningful consultation at all stages of the design, development and administration of all programs, services or activities funded under Title IV, Part A, including efforts to fulfill the principles of effectiveness, pursuant to section 4115(a) and 20 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.”

- *Participants in Consultation & Collaboration in the Application Development Form* – LEAs are required to provide the names of parents, as well as others, participating in the development of the NCLB application on this form (Appendix G).

- *Coordination of Programs & Participation Form* – On this form (Appendix H), LEAs are required to provide narratives on 1) how they will provide on-going consultation with the application participants throughout the project period; and 2) the mechanisms to be used to provide effective notice to the community of the intention to submit an application for Title IV-A funds.

- Children We Share: Partners in Student Discipline and Development (Phase I)

1. Under this Title IV-funded project, assistance was provided to schools through a collaborative effort among NJDOE and The College of New Jersey, with support provided by the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association, to effectively engage parents and families in promoting positive youth development, with particular attention given to discipline issues. The project included the development and dissemination of a guidebook and companion program in CD-ROM format, as well as a videotape program (Appendix I), to school districts designed to provide relevant research, strategies and materials to use with parents in promoting positive youth development, and the provision of a principals’ institute supporting use of the materials developed under the project.

**X. 21st Century Community Learning Centers
(Title IV, Part B)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

XI. Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)

A. Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

The New Jersey Department of Education utilized State-level Title V, Part A funds in the following ways:

1. Supporting the Office of Charter Schools in the start-up of charter schools, providing professional development to existing charter schools, and in the establishment of an effective and network of support for all charter schools in the state
2. Recognition and professional development programs for Best Practices and Star School awardees (programs and schools) in the identification of, and planning for replication of exemplary and innovative programs state-wide.
3. Salaries for personnel working with districts on implementation of the Core Curriculum Content Standards, student services, charter schools, innovative programs and the delivery of professional development

B. The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including: (1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2002-2003 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area ¹	Number of LEAs that used 20% or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: Student Achievement in Reading and Math	338	*	373,838
Area 2: Teacher Quality	168	*	226,828
Area 3: Safe and Drug Free Schools	74	*	55,797
Area 4: Increase Access for all Students	133	*	108,132
Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).			

***AYP was not calculated for LEAS in 2002-2003.**

Please note the following:

- **Number of LEA Allocations = 591**
- **Number of LEAs that responded, from which the data was analyzed = 555**
- **Number of LEAs which did not respond = 36**

¹ In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)

B.1 Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2002-2003, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. 0

B.2 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2002-2003.

 *

***AYP was not calculated for LEAs in 2002-2003.**

**XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)
(Title VI, Part B)**

A. Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2002-2003 school year.

LEAs contract directly with USDE for this project and consequently report on activities and uses of funds to USDE.

B. Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)

1. LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2002-2003 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	4
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	4
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	4
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	4
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	4
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	4

2. Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Programs as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

Based on the 2000 census data, no schools were eligible.

XIII. Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)

A. State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2002-2003 school year? No

B. Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds

Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2002-2003 school year.
11 districts applied

In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	1	\$10,289
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	2	\$22,911
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	3	\$16,105
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	1	\$5,000
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	8	\$137,525

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>FROM</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>FROM</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	7	\$95,600
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	\$0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	3	\$67,004
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	3	\$29,226

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.