

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614	
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006	
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: ☒ Part I, 2004-2005 ☐ Part II, 2004-2005	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: New Jersey	
Address: 100 River View Plaza Trenton, NJ 08611	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Diane Schonyers	
Telephone: (609) 777-1653	
Fax: (609) 984-5901	
e-mail: diane.schonyers@doe.state.nj.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Lucille E. Davy	
Signature _____	9/21/2006 3:29 PM EST Date _____

This submission contains updated data for Section 1.4 - School and District Accountability.

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006

1.1. STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

The New Jersey State Board of Education adopted the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS) in seven areas in May 1996. Rigorous science standards were included. The science standards were revised and readopted by the State Board of Education in 2002 and now integrate knowledge and skill statements from mathematics and technology. In October 2004, the State Board of Education approved all nine NJCCS areas, splitting the 1996 Cross Content Workplace Readiness Standards into Technological Literacy and Career Education and Consumer, Family, and Life Skills. The new technology standards align more closely with the math and science standards. The science standards emphasize both science as a body of knowledge and as a way of knowing.

The New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards for Science have been evaluated by national organizations such as the Fordham Foundation and Achieve. Evaluations have been positive and they rank in the top 10% nationally.

The New Jersey State Board of Education requires a review process every five years. That process will begin in the spring of 2008. The work will insure strong P-16 alignment so that students graduate with sufficient scientific knowledge and skills to enter institutions of higher education, professional training, and the 21st century workforce.

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

STATE RESPONSE

The State of New Jersey has developed and implemented assessments aligned to state curriculum standards for Language Arts Literacy and Mathematics in grades 3, 4, 8 and 11. Additionally, the science assessment became operational in grade 4 and grade 8 in 2004 and 1999 respectively. The science assessment for grade 11 is being field tested and will become operational in the 2006-2007 school year. Each of these assessments is aligned to state curriculum standards that were developed in consultation with field educators in each content area; similarly, the development of test content for each assessment program has been conducted with substantial and ongoing involvement of local educators.

New Jersey is implementing interim operational assessments in grades 5, 6, and 7 in language arts literacy and mathematics in 2006, while developing a long-term assessment system design intended to maximize the educational value of the state's assessments, with particular emphasis on providing teachers with information and resources that can shape and improve classroom instruction. The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) expects to release a Request for Proposal (RFP) for this redesigned state assessment system in 2006. The state expects to implement the assessments covered by this RFP in stages, starting with grades 5, 6, and 7 in either 2007 or 2008.

New Jersey has had its Alternate Proficiency Assessment (APA) in place since 2002. The APA, aligned to the Core Curriculum Content Standards for Students with Severe Disabilities (CCCSSD), is a portfolio-based assessment for the small percentage of students who, for reasons of educational disability, can not access the general assessment. The APA is currently in place for grades 3, 4, 8, and 11. As new general assessments are made operational via the forthcoming RFP described above, the APA for that grade level will also go into effect. The text of the CCCSSD is available at the DOE web site at <http://www.nj.gov/njded/specialed/assess/cccssdxw.pdf>. The NJDOE is committed to ensuring assessments are designed and implemented through collaboration, as such, the NJDOE's Office of Evaluation and Assessment works with the NJDOE's Office of Special Education Programs to develop assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards, in accordance with emerging guidance from the USED.

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

STATE RESPONSE

The setting of achievement standards for all programs involves considerable advance planning, multiple reviews of standard setting plans by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and considerable involvement by committees of field educators. A separate set of content committees meet to define the proficiency descriptors (i.e., proficient, advanced proficient) while the cut scores are established over an intensive 3-4 day period, with additional review and approval by the State Board of Education.

The NJDOE, using this method of consultation, previously established performance standards for mathematics and language arts literacy at grades 4 and 8 in 1998. The grade 4 standards for language arts literacy were revised in 2000. Science standards for grade 4 were set in June 2005. Science standards for grade 8 were set in March 2000. In accordance with NCLB requirements and nationally recognized measurement standards, the performance standards for New Jersey's High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) were set in June 2002, for language arts literacy and mathematics. Standards for the grade 3 NJ ASK assessments in language arts literacy and mathematics were set in July 2004.

New Jersey developed alternate achievement standards for students with disabilities in November 2002. These were developed with the input of approximately 40 field educators convened for that purpose, abetted by the standing APA Advisory Committee, and continuous psychometric review of our TAC, comprised of nationally known measurement specialists.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**Participation of All Students in 2004-2005 State Assessments**

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

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

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

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	410466	99.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	493	99.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	29470	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	69457	98.6
Hispanic	68266	99.0
White, non-Hispanic	238291	99.5
Students with Disabilities	62747	98.3
Limited English Proficient	15042	98.7
Economically Disadvantaged	106455	99.0
Migrant	189	99.5
Male	209659	99.2
Female	200192	99.4

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

1.2.1.2 2004-2005 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	410213	99.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	489	98.6
Asian/ Pacific Islander	28937	99.2
Black, non-Hispanic	69682	98.9
Hispanic	67655	98.2
White, non-Hispanic	238555	99.6
Students with Disabilities	63022	98.7
Limited English Proficient	13881	91.1
Economically Disadvantaged	105946	98.6
Migrant	183	96.3
Male	209598	99.2
Female	200008	99.3

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

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

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

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	62747	98.3
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3643	100.0

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

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	63022	98.7
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3643	100.0

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	102389	82.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	99	73.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	7842	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	17709	66.3
Hispanic	18279	72.1
White, non-Hispanic	57585	89.4
Students with Disabilities	14791	64.4
Limited English Proficient	4763	59.1
Economically Disadvantaged	30721	68.9
Migrant	66	63.6
Male	52387	82.3
Female	49879	82.8

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	101876	83.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	99	82.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	7763	92.3
Black, non-Hispanic	17696	68.2
Hispanic	17900	70.3
White, non-Hispanic	57557	90.7
Students with Disabilities	14818	56.7
Limited English Proficient	4161	50.1
Economically Disadvantaged	30386	67.5
Migrant	64	39.7
Male	52164	79.9
Female	49599	86.8

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	104448	80.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	113	79.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	7582	92.0
Black, non-Hispanic	18175	60.4
Hispanic	18671	70.0
White, non-Hispanic	58929	88.0
Students with Disabilities	16458	55.3
Limited English Proficient	4014	51.2
Economically Disadvantaged	31470	64.9
Migrant	58	63.8
Male	53624	80.0
Female	50688	80.5

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	103846	81.6
American Indian/Alaska Native	110	81.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	7493	92.0
Black, non-Hispanic	18175	65.5
Hispanic	18260	70.8
White, non-Hispanic	58842	88.6
Students with Disabilities	16472	48.7
Limited English Proficient	3383	46.2
Economically Disadvantaged	31088	66.6
Migrant	53	56.6
Male	53339	77.0
Female	50374	86.4

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

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

New Jersey did not administer a grade 5 assessment in 2004-2005.

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

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

New Jersey did not administer a grade 5 assessment in 2004-2005.

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

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

New Jersey did not administer a grade 6 assessment in 2004-2005.

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

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

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

New Jersey did not administer a grade 6 assessment in 2004-2005.

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

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

New Jersey did not administer a grade 7 assessment in 2004-2005.

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

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

New Jersey did not administer a grade 7 assessment in 2004-2005.

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	109177	62.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	151	54.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	7106	83.4
Black, non-Hispanic	19280	30.3
Hispanic	18064	42.6
White, non-Hispanic	63586	75.4
Students with Disabilities	17907	22.6
Limited English Proficient	3405	24.2
Economically Disadvantaged	29297	26.8
Migrant	53	24.5
Male	56052	63.0
Female	53051	61.7

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	109249	72.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	153	64.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	7089	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	19342	47.8
Hispanic	18062	54.6
White, non-Hispanic	63616	83.3
Students with Disabilities	17956	28.5
Limited English Proficient	3357	19.7
Economically Disadvantaged	29333	48.7
Migrant	53	26.9
Male	56076	66.1
Female	53098	78.9

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	94064	75.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	128	66.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	6943	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	14169	46.8
Hispanic	13210	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	57982	85.3
Students with Disabilities	13542	34.1
Limited English Proficient	2908	34.6
Economically Disadvantaged	14857	51.9
Migrant	12	8.3
Male	47389	76.0
Female	46399	75.2

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

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	95003	83.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	129	80.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	6962	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	14469	65.6
Hispanic	13390	66.4
White, non-Hispanic	58393	91.0
Students with Disabilities	13825	43.4
Limited English Proficient	7696	22.5
Economically Disadvantaged	15103	62.9
Migrant	13	23.1
Male	47859	79.9
Female	46862	86.7

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	2172	1350	62.2

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	615	471	76.6

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

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	1339	756	56.5

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	461	326	70.7

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

See attached file

Please note that the schools identified in the attached file without NCES codes are new schools or have been reconfigured and as a result, NJ has not issued NCES codes.

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

New Jersey districts and schools apply for their federal entitlement funds using the NCLB Consolidated Subgrant Application. To assist them in this effort, the NJDOE issues an annual *NCLB Reference Manual* and provides county-based technical assistance trainings. The consolidated application consists of two components: an electronic fiscal system, the Entitlement Web-Enabled Grant (EWEG), and a parallel paper program application that includes an annual comprehensive needs assessment and program plan.

For Title I schools that have been identified as in need of improvement, additional components of the parallel application must be completed. This includes a school level comprehensive needs assessment and a school improvement plan.

<http://www.nj.gov/njded/grants/entitlement/nclb/nclb06ppappforms2.doc>

A governance plan must be completed, for schools identified in year 5 (planning to restructure). <http://www.nj.gov/njded/title1/accountability/restructure.doc>

The district is responsible for completing a plan describing how they will support their low-performing schools.

The NCLB application is completed by the district and schools that are in need of improvement and submitted to the county or Abbott office for review and approval. As part of this process, county and Abbott staff are available to provide technical assistance as needed to districts and schools.

Technical assistance is provided to schools and districts in need of improvement to aid them in the parental notification process, public school choice option and supplemental educational services (SES) requirements. This technical assistance is provided directly by NJDOE staff. The Title I Office staff provides guidance to the field offices as well as directly to schools, districts and SES providers.

The Title I Office provides on-going formal and informal assistance to districts and schools. The Title I Office has developed five training modules that are available to districts and schools. These modules can be presented live by the county/Abbott offices or accessed on-line. The five modules cover the following topics: Title I Program Manager, School Improvement, Accountability, Parental Involvement, and Teacher Training.

<http://www.nj.gov/njded/title1/tech/>

Additionally, the Title I office issues policy letters, sample parental notification letters, a Supplemental Educational Services Toolkit, and maintains a comprehensive Title I Web site.

<http://www.nj.gov/njded/title1/>

Since February 2004, the Title I office has met bimonthly with its committee of practitioners, The NCLB School Improvement Committee, to inform the development of policy relating to the NCLB provisions for schools in need of improvement. The Committee is composed of representatives from districts in need of improvement and high performing districts, members of the state's education associations and bargaining units, representatives from institutions of higher education and staff from the various divisions within the New Jersey Department of Education.

The Title I Office School Support Teams work with the Title I schools that have been identified as in need of improvement for 4 consecutive years (corrective action) and some in year 3 of improvement. The school support team process in New Jersey is called Collaborative Assessment and Planning for Achievement (CAPA).

<http://www.nj.gov/njded/capa/>. With the input of the NCLB School Improvement Committee, the Title I office devoted a percentage of its school improvement allocation for CAPA visits.

This enabled CAPA teams to service a greater number of Year 3 schools.

The CAPA process, adapted from Kentucky's Scholastic Audit, is designed to assist schools by conducting a comprehensive review and needs assessment of all facets of a school's operation. District functioning is also evaluated. At the conclusion of a week-long on-site visit by the CAPA school support team, the CAPA team issues a report that identifies findings and recommendations. The school and district are provided support from the county/Abbott staff to review, analyze and prioritize the findings and recommendations. The school/district then update the NCLB Consolidated Application and school improvement plan, incorporating their plans for addressing the identified issues. The prioritized issues are specified and an action plan is developed that includes student achievement data benchmarks and targets, as well as a plan of action using scientifically based research models.

To assist districts with schools entering Year 5, the NJDOE sponsored a series of technical assistance sessions. On September 27, 2005 districts were invited to participate in an information session on the legislative requirements for Year 5 schools and the planning process to identify an appropriate restructuring option for affected schools. The session included a presentation on the implementation of restructuring efforts across the nat

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.

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

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

See attached file

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

Districts in need of improvement were identified in August 2005. These districts were notified by mail advising them of their status and the NCLB requirements of parental notification, fiscal reallocation of Title I funds and the submission of a district improvement plan.

In September 2005, statewide technical assistance sessions were held for the identified districts. During these sessions, the NCLB requirements were reviewed and the NJDOE solicited feedback from the identified districts to determine the type and scope of the districts' technical assistance needs.

Submission of a district improvement plan is included as part of the NCLB Consolidated Application. This plan is due for submission and review by the county/Abbott staff who provide guidance to districts as they complete their improvement plans.

Districts were required to implement their improvement plans no later than the beginning of the 2005-2006 school year. NJDOE staff meet with districts on a quarterly basis to continue to provide assistance and support.

Districts that have schools that have undergone a CAPA visit are required to work with the school and incorporate CAPA recommendations that are district level relevant. These recommendations are incorporated into the Consolidated Application.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. ____

2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. ____ How many of these schools were charter schools? ____

3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. ____

4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. ____

Optional Information :

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

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

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

Data is not currently available and will be sent under a separate cover.

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services

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

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

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

Optional Information :

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

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

Data is not currently available and will be sent under a separate cover.

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

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

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	341358	319234	93.5
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	58487	49636	84.9
Low-Poverty Schools	44559	42735	95.9
All Elementary Schools	211573	195664	92.5
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	18386	16700	90.8
Low-Poverty Schools	38483	37202	96.7
All Secondary Schools	129785	123570	95.2

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

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

How is a teacher defined?

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

How is a class defined?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	3.0
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	13.0
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.6
d) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	2.0
e) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	16.0
f) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.4
g) Other (please explain)	63.0

The category of "Other" represents the percentage of classes in: (1) arts, (2) world languages, (3) special education (resource replacement), (4) English Second Language (ESL), (5) English basic skills, and (6) math basic skills, that are being taught by teachers that are not highly qualified.

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

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Elementary Schools	More than <u>47.1%</u>	Less than <u>5.4%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch.	
Secondary Schools	More than <u>47.1%</u>	Less than <u>5.4%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch.	

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Data is not currently available and will be sent under a separate cover.

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

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

Developed ☒ Yes ☐ No

Approved, adopted, sanctioned ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) revised its ELP Standards in 2004 to conform with the requirements of Title III of the NCLB Act. In the fall, 2005, the NJDOE joined the WIDA consortium.

The WIDA consortium is a consortium of ten partner states, established through a federal grant to design and implement high standards and equitable educational opportunities for English language learners.

A formal alignment study has been conducted by the WIDA consortium to determine the degree of alignment between the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content and ELP standards and the standards developed by the WIDA consortium. During 2006-2007, regional workshops will be held to inform school district personnel about New Jersey's WIDA-aligned ELP standards and provide assistance in developing district curriculum that is aligned to the standards.

WIDA is providing the NJDOE with valuable expertise and support necessary to: 1) develop a comprehensive system of standards-based instruction and assessment for English Language Learners (ELLs) and 2) comply with the NCLB requirements relating to standards, assessments and accountability. In addition, the WIDA consortium offers opportunities for teachers and administrators from consortium states to be active participants in the ongoing development and improvement of the ELP standards, assessments and future assessments of academic achievement. Moreover, the consortium offers an on-line web-based courses for K-12 teachers; professional development in implementing the ELP standards, designing instruction and curriculum, classroom assessment, and better assessments of academic achievement; WIDA informational website, and a variety of supports for states and districts in the consortium.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

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

STATE RESPONSE

As stated in 1.6.1.1, New Jersey has aligned the state adopted English proficiency standards to the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards in language arts and mathematics. In the spring/summer of 2006, New Jersey's ELP standards will be aligned to the WIDA standards.

The state is currently in the process of assisting school district personnel develop district curriculum in accordance with these aligned standards. During the 2006-2007 school year, regional workshops will be held to inform school district personnel about New Jersey's WIDA-aligned ELP standards and provide assistance in developing district curriculum that is aligned to the standards.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113(b)(2) is spring 2006 . Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:

- An independent alignment study No
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

Conducted by the WIDA consortium.

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

- The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
- The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
- ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
- Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

New Jersey is administering ACCESS for ELLs™ from March 15 through June 1, 2006 for all Title III schools. Non-Title III schools have the option to use ACCESS for ELLs™ or to continue to use our other assessments for 2006 only. By 2007, **all** schools in New Jersey will be required to use ACCESS for ELLs™ for their annual assessment. ACCESS for ELLs™ addresses the five domains of language proficiency and is based on the ELP standards of the WIDA consortium states. In order to ensure consistency between New Jersey's ELP standards and the WIDA standards, on which ACCESS for ELLs is based, a special study aligning New Jersey standards to the WIDA standards will be conducted during 2006.

The WIDA consortium conducts field testing and routinely calculates reliability on operational forms to assure that the tests are valid and reliable. Specialists in English language learning were involved in the design and construction of the test; teachers are involved in the item writing and review; special studies are conducted by the WIDA consortium to study validity issues. All these activities together ensure a fair, valid and reliable test.

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

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

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

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State											
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency							
		Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)	(4)	Number and Percentage at Level 2 (5)	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (6)	Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (7)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (8)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (9)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (10)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (11)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (12)
LAS, MAC II, IPT	54317	41812	100.0	3322	8.0	7964	19.0	12630	30.2	17896	42.8

LAS-Language Assessment Scales; MAC II-Maculaitis II Test of English Language Proficiency; IPT-Idea Proficiency Test.

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

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State

2004-2005 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number and Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State	
1. Spanish	41667	68.0
2. Portuguese	1502	2.0
3. Korean	1501	2.0
4. Haitian Creole French	1250	2.0
5. Gujarati	1192	2.0
6. Arabic	1184	2.0
7. Polish	976	2.0
8. Mandarin	972	2.0
9. Urdu	717	1.0
10. Tagalog	473	1.0

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

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III													
Name of ELP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency								Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (7)		
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)				
LAS, MAC II, IPT	51955	100.0	3176	6.0	7713	15.0	12119	23.0	17093	33.0	14686	28.0	

LAS-Language Assessment Scales; MAC II-Maculaitis II Test of English Language Proficiency; IPT-Idea Proficiency Test. Please note that students scored at level 5 on the spring 2005 test. However, they participated in Title III programs during the 2004-2005 school year and are therefore reported here. The data for level 5 is as follows: Number of students = 11,854/Percentage of students = 23%.

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

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111©:

1.6.4.1	Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2004-2005	<u>43968</u>
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	<u>21820</u>
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	<u>68</u>

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have been made.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have been made.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

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

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have been made.

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

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

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

 X Yes No

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	55.0	20416	65.0	23986	55.0	29874	97.0	52442

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

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

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

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	55.0	19703	64.0	22986	55.0	28575	96.5	50163

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

	Number:
Number of Title III subgrantees	320
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	257
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	63

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

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	1565	79.4
4	1470	74.0
5		
6		
7		
8	466	48.4
H.S.	409	52.2

New Jersey will test in grades 5, 6 and 7 beginning in 2006.

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	1620	82.3
4	1496	75.3
5		
6		
7		
8	441	45.8
H.S.	425	52.1

New Jersey will test in grades 5, 6 and 7 beginning in 2006.

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2005-2006 School Year	4

1.8 Graduation and Dropout Rates

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

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

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

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

High School Graduates		Graduation Rate	
Student Group		03-04	School Year
All Students		90.6	
American Indian/Alaska Native		78.9	
Asian/Pacific Islander		97.0	
Black, non-Hispanic		81.2	
Hispanic		82.0	
White, non-Hispanic		94.7	
Students with Disabilities			
Limited English Proficient			
Economically Disadvantaged			
Migrant			
Male		89.3	
Female		91.8	

Graduation rate is not currently collected for the following student subgroups: Students with Disabilities, Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged and Migrant.

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

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

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

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

Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	1.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	5.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3.5
Hispanic	3.9
White, non-Hispanic	1.1
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	2.2
Female	1.6

Dropout rate is not currently collected for the following student subgroups: Students with Disabilities, Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged and Migrant.

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