

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614	
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006	
<p style="text-align: center;">Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2004-2005 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2004-2005	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Illinois State Board of Education	
Address: 100 North 1st Street Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Connie Wise Telephone: 217-782-3950 Fax: 217-524-7784 e-mail: cwise@isbe.net	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Randy J. Dunn	
Signature _____	9/25/2006 1:50 PM EST Date _____

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006

1.1. STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

The Illinois Learning Standards define what students in all Illinois public schools should know and be able to do in the seven content areas as a result of their elementary and secondary schooling. Each content standard includes five benchmarks that describe what students should know and be able to do at early elementary, late elementary, middle/junior high, early high school, and late high school.

No changes have been made to the Illinois Learning Standards since their adoption; however, educators across Illinois continually requested grade level specificity. The Performance Descriptors were developed in response, and were field-tested by teachers from throughout Illinois. The Performance Descriptors were specifically written to be used as a resource to guide instruction in the classroom—supplementing, not replacing, the Illinois Learning Standards. Essentially, the Illinois Learning Standards benchmark levels (i.e., early elementary, late elementary, middle school, early high school, and late high school) were divided into 10 developmental stages for each of the seven content areas. The first eight stages (A-H) roughly correspond to grades 1-8. The last two stages (I-J) cover early and late high school. These stages help to provide a clear vision of what students should know and be able to do after they complete pre-K to grade 12 experiences. The Performance Descriptors were released in summer 2002.

The following is quoted from the front matter of the Performance Descriptor document:

“The Performance Descriptors are classroom resources for voluntary use at the local level. They are not intended to replace the Illinois Learning Standards. Instead, they supplement them by providing sufficient detail and examples to enable teachers to establish appropriate grade-level performance expectations for students. The performance descriptors are a direct outgrowth of the state goals for learning. Whereas the benchmarks filled in detail on each of the standards at five grade-level clusters, the performance descriptors provide additional detail at each grade level.”

In summary:

- The Illinois Learning Standards contain 30 goals, 98 standards, and more than 1,000 benchmarks.
- Illinois was one of the first states to develop and adopt learning standards (1997).
- More than 270 Illinois educators, business people, and community members worked together to develop the Illinois Learning Standards.
- Input on the draft Illinois Learning Standards was provided by more than 30,000 Illinois residents.
- Teachers in Spain, Lithuania, and Bulgaria have translated the Illinois Learning Standards into their own languages for use in their classrooms.
- The Performance Descriptors and more than 900 classroom assessments aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards were field tested by 400 teachers throughout Illinois.

Comments on the Performance Descriptors, received from the teaching field in Illinois:

I just wanted drop a note of thanks to all of the people who participated in putting together these very comprehensive descriptors! It is exactly what every teacher needs in order to teach the Illinois Learning Standards effectively. I have been looking for a list such as this for a long time. Keep up the great work and thank you! —Grade 2 Teacher, Windsor Elementary in Arlington Heights School District 25

Just wanted to convey my appreciation on behalf of District #321 for the timely and “on target” support materials coming out of Springfield/ISBE. The performance descriptors and field-tested sample classroom assessments have provided the added level of support necessary to encourage our faculty to continue their efforts in creating a “standards-driven curriculum.” These tools/samples/templates are excellent and have provided a solid foundation for our local efforts. Thank you again for your strong efforts on behalf of our local school improvement initiative. —Superintendent, Pecatonica CUSD #321

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

Illinois has five state tests currently approved by USDE and designed to meet the academic performance requirements of NCLB and state law. Each test has an advisory committee of educators with expertise in the various content areas to assist in test development and administration. Standard setting for Illinois tests use a form modified Angoff technique.

ISAT—The Illinois Standards Achievement Test measures individual student achievement relative to the *Illinois Learning Standards*; results reported to parents, teachers, and schools. The standards apply to all students taking ISAT (<http://www.isbe.net/ils/>). Grades 3, 5, 8—reading & mathematics; grades 4 & 7—science.

Challenge—Content Standards: Assessment frameworks demonstrating the cognitive complexity of assessment by grade—<http://www.isbe.net/assessment/IAFIndex.htm>.

Challenge—Achievement Standards: Through the frameworks, ISAT is a direct implementation of the standards. Student performance levels—academic warning, below standards, meets, & exceeds.

IMAGE—The Illinois Measure of Annual Growth in English measures the progress of LEP students in reading and mathematics in grades 3-8, & 11 through simplified language.

Challenge—Content Standards: Mathematics frameworks same (see above website).

Challenge—Achievement Standards: A committee of bilingual educators set ranges of IMAGE scores within which test takers have a particular likelihood of succeeding on ISAT; IMAGE performance standards—beginning, strengthening, expanding, & transitioning.

PSAE—The Prairie State Achievement Examination measures individual student achievement relative to the standards; results reported to parents, teachers, and schools. The standards apply to all students taking the PSAE. Grade 11—addresses reading, mathematics, and science.

Challenge—Content Standards: The science frameworks describe what students are supposed to know in detail by grade 11, and illustrate that the standards are rigorous and encourage teaching advanced skills.

Challenge–Achievement Standards: Through the frameworks, PSAE is a direct implementation of the standards. Student performance levels—academic warning, below standards, meets, & exceeds.

Grade 2 Assessment—Measures individual student achievement relative to standards for students in Title I-funded schools that serve grade 2 as the highest grade; results reported to parents, teachers, and schools. The mathematics standards apply to all students taking this assessment.

Subjects: Reading and mathematics.

Challenge–Achievement Standards: Two performance levels—below standards and meets standards.

IAA—The Illinois Alternate Assessment measures the individual student achievement of students with significant cognitive disabilities; results reported to parents, teachers, and schools.

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

Per the requirements set forth in 1111(b)(3), ISBE has an alternate assessment in place for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The alternate assessment uses a portfolio format to measure the proficiency of students in grades 3, 5, and 8 for reading and mathematics, and in grades 4 and 7 for science, relative to alternate achievement standards.

The portfolio is a compilation of student work collected by teachers throughout the school year. The assessment is scored on two components: link to the Illinois Learning Standards and student progress over time. The contract for the current test runs through the 2006-2007 school year.

ISBE has been working in cooperation with local educational agencies (specifically the IAA Work Group) to explore ways to assess students other than with the portfolio format. During the past year, the IAA Work Group has developed clear alternate standards that are aligned with the ISAT frameworks by content area and grade level. These alternate standards will give students access points to the Illinois Learning Standards and will be used to assess students in grades 3, 5, and 8 for reading and mathematics, and in grades 4 and 7 for science, to determine whether they are making annual progress on the Illinois Learning Standards.

The IAA Work Group is made up of educators and parents from special education, general education, and administration. The group used a wide range of resources to develop the new alternate assessment standards. A Request for Proposals for a new IAA was posted in January 2006. Training for the new test will take place before the pilot. A new test should be in place by the 2007-2008 school year.

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	618688	99.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	990	99.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	23085	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	123926	98.6
Hispanic	108771	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	356949	99.7
Students with Disabilities	88931	98.8
Limited English Proficient	42977	99.4
Economically Disadvantaged	246245	99.1
Migrant	192	99.0
Male	314987	99.3
Female	303693	99.5

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested: 4949 Percentage of Students Tested: 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	618466	99.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	990	99.1
Asian/ Pacific Islander	23048	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	123978	98.6
Hispanic	108596	99.3
White, non-Hispanic	356890	99.7
Students with Disabilities	88931	98.8
Limited English Proficient	42692	99.3
Economically Disadvantaged	246153	99.2
Migrant	194	100.0
Male	314872	99.3
Female	303589	99.5

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested: 4949 Percentage of Students Tested: 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.

1.2.2 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	83754	99.0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	5388	99.0

Illinois does not administer an alternate assessment aligned with grade-level achievement standards.

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	83746	99.0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	5390	99.0

Illinois does not administer an alternate assessment aligned with grade-level achievement standards.

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	156162	75.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	231	76.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	5802	90.1
Black, non-Hispanic	33298	54.8
Hispanic	32201	62.0
White, non-Hispanic	82850	88.6
Students with Disabilities	22511	58.2
Limited English Proficient	17934	51.2
Economically Disadvantaged	72186	60.8
Migrant	59	54.2
Male	80048	76.2
Female	76109	75.5

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested: 1775 Percentage of Students Proficient/Advanced 2004-2005 School Year: 81.2

- 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.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	156133	65.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	231	70.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	5789	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	33355	41.3
Hispanic	32151	55.5
White, non-Hispanic	82830	78.0
Students with Disabilities	22505	39.6
Limited English Proficient	17841	57.9
Economically Disadvantaged	72190	49.8
Migrant	59	47.4
Male	80036	63.2
Female	76095	68.3

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested: 1775 Percentage of Students Proficient/Advanced 2004-2005 School Year: 68.8

- 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		
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		

Illinois does not administer a state assessment of Grade 4 mathematics.

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

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

Illinois does not administer a state assessment of Grade 4 reading/language arts.

- 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	160584	70.6
American Indian/Alaska Native	253	75.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	5715	88.5
Black, non-Hispanic	35324	46.2
Hispanic	30845	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	86991	83.5
Students with Disabilities	24668	41.7
Limited English Proficient	14791	46.2
Economically Disadvantaged	72058	53.7
Migrant	56	45.5
Male	82660	69.7
Female	77922	71.6

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested: 1454 Percentage of Students Proficient/Advanced 2004-2005 School Year: 73.7

- 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.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	160486	63.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	253	67.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	5705	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	35322	38.7
Hispanic	30772	57.4
White, non-Hispanic	86978	73.7
Students with Disabilities	24673	31.5
Limited English Proficient	14693	62.9
Economically Disadvantaged	71998	47.9
Migrant	56	41.1
Male	82603	61.2
Female	77881	65.0

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested: 1454 percentage of Students Proficient/Advanced 2004-2005 School Year: 64.7

- 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.

1.3.7 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		

Illinois does not administer a state assessment of Grade 6 mathematics.

- 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		

Illinois does not administer a state assessment of Grade 6 reading/language arts.

- 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		

Illinois does not administer a state assessment of Grade 7 mathematics.

- 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		

Illinois does not administer a state assessment of Grade 7 reading/language arts.

- 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	161642	53.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	248	50.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	5601	79.0
Black, non-Hispanic	33625	25.1
Hispanic	27524	36.7
White, non-Hispanic	93599	67.1
Students with Disabilities	24926	17.2
Limited English Proficient	6260	23.3
Economically Disadvantaged	64721	31.8
Migrant	41	31.7
Male	82641	53.0
Female	79001	54.1

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested: 1045 Percentage of Students Proficient/Advanced 2004-2005 School Year: 53.1

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	161559	72.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	248	72.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	5589	85.4
Black, non-Hispanic	33622	53.6
Hispanic	27480	58.0
White, non-Hispanic	93575	82.0
Students with Disabilities	24926	32.5
Limited English Proficient	6178	45.4
Economically Disadvantaged	64682	56.3
Migrant	43	52.4
Male	82599	69.9
Female	78960	74.3

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested: 1045 Percentage of Students Proficient/Advanced 2004-2005 School Year: 73.7

- 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.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	132074	52.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	249	49.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	5761	73.1
Black, non-Hispanic	20592	18.8
Hispanic	17509	29.1
White, non-Hispanic	87438	62.8
Students with Disabilities	15726	14.9
Limited English Proficient	3875	24.5
Economically Disadvantaged	34509	25.4
Migrant	34	15.6
Male	65576	53.7
Female	66497	50.4

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested: 514 Percentage of Students Proficient/Advanced 2004-2005 School Year: 47.2

- 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	132062	59.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	249	56.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	5759	70.0
Black, non-Hispanic	20592	35.2
Hispanic	17501	40.7
White, non-Hispanic	87436	67.7
Students with Disabilities	15727	18.9
Limited English Proficient	3863	42.1
Economically Disadvantaged	34512	38.0
Migrant	34	34.4
Male	65572	55.7
Female	66489	62.6

Multiracial Total Number of Students Tested: 514 Percentage of Students Proficient/Advanced 2004-2005 School Year: 54.8

- 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.

1.4 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	3884	2775	71.0

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	879	642	73.0

- 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	2388	1602	67.0

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	797	577	72.0

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

See attached file

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

Illinois and federal laws require that the Illinois State Board of Education provide technical assistance to schools and districts determined to be in academic early warning status (AEWS) and academic watch status (AWS). Beginning in 2003, to help schools and districts improve their academic performance, especially in reading and mathematics, the Illinois State Board of Education established a regional system of support. Each regional service provider (RESPRO) offers its services to the schools and districts in its region that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP), especially those in AEWS and AWS.

Regarding federal sanctions, RESPRO priorities are to provide support and assistance to districts with schools subject to 1) restructuring and corrective action (AWS) and 2) school improvement (AEWS). As resources allow, RESPROs also serve Title I schools whose academic performance is marginal.

The RESPRO system of support includes specific activities that:

- focus on the school improvement plan (SIP) and district improvement plan (DIP);
- target proven approaches and standardized processes to specific improvement components;
- customize services to differences among regions, districts, and schools;
- coordinate programs, services, and funding;
- deploy state, regional, and local staff and resources efficiently and effectively; and
- use AYP, defined by state and federal laws, as the “bottom line” measure of effectiveness in helping schools and districts.

Proven approaches and standardized processes for specific improvement components—The RESPRO system of support emphasizes school improvement programs and processes that have a record of success. RESPROs select those that are most likely to improve the academic achievement of students when tailored to the districts and schools they serve.

Broadly, RESPROs provide districts and schools in their regions with programs and processes representing best practices in four improvement components:

1. Data analysis and SIP/DIP development.
2. Standards-aligned curriculum, instruction, and classroom assessment.
3. Teacher and administrator enhancement.
4. Student, family, and community support services.

Customization for regional and local differences among schools and districts—The RESPRO system of support is not a “one-size-fits-all” service approach for academically poor performing schools or districts. Rather, in addition to standard offerings or best practices, RESPROs offer interventions based on a data analysis and review of currently successful practices in each school or district. The analysis seeks to determine which, if any, of the four improvement components in a district or school are adequate and at what level of effectiveness.

For those schools and districts with adequate improvement initiatives in place, a RESPRO customizes its offerings to supplement and strengthen those programs and activities. To address weaknesses, RESPROs offer interventions tailored to specific needs. In some instances, a RESPRO may partner with other educational service providers or agents (e.g., universities) to provide needed services to districts or schools.

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.

Illinois and federal laws require that the Illinois State Board of Education provide technical assistance to schools and districts determined to be in academic early warning status (AEWS) and academic watch status (AWS). Beginning in 2003, to help schools and districts improve their academic performance, especially in reading and mathematics, the Illinois State Board of Education established a regional system of support. Each regional service provider (RESPRO) offers its services to the schools and districts in its region that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP), especially those in AEWS and AWS.

Regarding federal sanctions, RESPRO priorities are to provide support and assistance to districts with schools subject to 1) restructuring and corrective action (AWS) and 2) school improvement (AEWS). As resources allow, RESPROs also serve Title I schools whose academic performance is marginal.

The RESPRO system of support includes specific activities that:

- focus on the school improvement plan (SIP) and district improvement plan (DIP);
- target proven approaches and standardized processes to specific improvement components;
- customize services to differences among regions, districts, and schools;
- coordinate programs, services, and funding;
- deploy state, regional, and local staff and resources efficiently and effectively; and
- use AYP, defined by state and federal laws, as the “bottom line” measure of effectiveness in helping schools and districts.

Proven approaches and standardized processes for specific improvement components—The RESPRO system of support emphasizes school improvement programs and processes that have a record of success. RESPROs select those that are most likely to improve the academic achievement of students when tailored to the districts and schools they serve.

Broadly, RESPROs provide districts and schools in their regions with programs and processes representing best practices in four improvement components:

1. Data analysis and SIP/DIP development.
2. Standards-aligned curriculum, instruction, and classroom assessment.
3. Teacher and administrator enhancement.
4. Student, family, and community support services.

Customization for regional and local differences among schools and districts—The RESPRO system of support is not a “one-size-fits-all” service approach for academically poor performing schools or districts. Rather, in addition to standard offerings or best practices, RESPROs offer interventions based on a data analysis and review of currently successful practices in each school or district. The analysis seeks to determine which, if any, of the four improvement components in a district or school are adequate and at what level of effectiveness.

For those schools and districts with adequate improvement initiatives in place, a RESPRO customizes its offerings to supplement and strengthen those programs and activities. To address weaknesses, RESPROs offer interventions tailored to specific needs. In some instances, a RESPRO may partner with other educational service providers or agents (e.g., universities) to provide needed services to districts or schools.

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. 109
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. 272 How many of these schools were charter schools? 1
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 986
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. 503878

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. 2245

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. 70486

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. 129

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 90320

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. 281858

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. 6952

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	146280	143619	98.2
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	21981	20640	93.9
Low-Poverty Schools	35827	35751	99.8
All Elementary Schools	108245	106468	98.4
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	9338	8573	91.8
Low-Poverty Schools	13120	13089	99.8
All Secondary Schools	38035	37151	97.7

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

Illinois does not collect this information.

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>64.8%</u>	Less than <u>15.2%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.	
Secondary Schools	More than <u>39.6%</u>	Less than <u>13.0%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Low-income students come from families receiving public aid, live in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, are supported in foster homes with public funds, or are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches.	

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	83.0

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

Illinois is part of the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment Consortium and has adopted (Spring 2004) English Language Proficiency Standards for ELL learners (K-12). The K-12 English language proficiency (ELP) standards represent an amalgam of the thinking of educators of English language learners participating in the WIDA Consortium.

Throughout school year 2004-2005, regional workshops and multiple technical assistance sessions were held to assist school districts with implementation of the English Language proficiency standards. Paper copies and CDs were distributed to every Illinois local school district. In addition, the Illinois State Board of Education posted the Illinois English language proficiency standards on the agency website to ensure that every classroom teacher has access to these standards at all times.

All four domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) overlay those associated with academic achievement (the content areas of language arts/reading, mathematics, science, and social studies). The FY05 school year represents the first full academic year that the Illinois English language proficiency standards have been implemented by local educational agency personnel.

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

Each English language proficiency standard addresses a specific context for language acquisition (social and instructional settings, as well as language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) and is divided into four grade-level clusters: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Overall, the English language proficiency standards center on the language needed and used by English language learners to succeed in school.

English Language Proficiency Standard 1:
English language learners communicate in English for SOCIAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL purposes within the school setting.

English Language Proficiency Standard 2:
English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of LANGUAGE ARTS.

English Language Proficiency Standard 3:
English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of MATHEMATICS.

English Language Proficiency Standard 4:
English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of SCIENCE.

English Language Proficiency Standard 5:
English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of SOCIAL STUDIES.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

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

- An independent alignment study
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

Other Evidence of Alignment: Bridge Study

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

The Illinois State Board of Education, along with other members of the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment Consortium, have determined that ACCESS for ELLs™ will be the statewide assessment instrument for the mandated annual assessment of English language proficiency.

ACCESS for ELLs™ is a standards-based, criterion-referenced English language proficiency test designed to measure English language learners' social and academic proficiency in English. It assesses social and instructional English, as well as the language associated with language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies within the school context across the language domains. It was developed based on the English language proficiency standards for the classroom framework, which in turn incorporates state academic content standards.

Beginning in school year 2005-2006, each Illinois K-12 student identified as ELL must be assessed annually with ACCESS for ELLs™.

In Illinois, teachers must be trained and must pass a test to become certified in ACCESS for ELLs™; only those certified can administer the 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 (3)		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 (4)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (5)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (7)	
All local assessments-IPT, LAS, LPTS, MACII, other	245375	192764	78.6	34537	30.4	38508	33.9	40672	35.8		

This table has two sources of data--the Bilingual Education Program Delivery Report and the Student Performance Report. Columns 2 and 3 are from the Program Delivery Report; columns 4-6 are from the spring 2005 assessments of students served or enrolled in bilingual education programs. The sum of columns 4-6 is not equal to column 3 because some students moved or were withdrawn by parents before the spring assessments. Illinois assessments measure only three levels of proficiency.

- (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	126092	80.6
2. Polish	6525	4.2
3. Arabic	2597	1.7
4. Urdu	2135	1.4
5. Cantonese (Chinese)	1623	1.0
6. Korean	1610	1.0
7. Pilipino (Tagalog)	1248	0.8
8. Gujarati	1183	0.8
9. Vietnamese	1115	0.7
10. Lithuanian	887	0.6

- 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)			
IDEA Proficiency Test	23964	95.5	3179	16.9	9540	50.8	6062	32.3			2130	8.9
Language Assessment Scale	35413	91.4	6017	23.3	9389	36.4	10391	40.3			3776	10.7
Language Proficiency Test Series	81085	99.9	24489	42.2	15215	26.2	18358	31.6			5911	7.3
Maculaitis II	149700	96.4	33856	30.9	36828	33.6	38767	35.4			12880	8.6

No duplication of students. Student number is based on composite scores at each level. Columns 3-5 include only assessments of four domains on the same test. Column 2 percentages are all LEP students who received bilingual education program services. Column 7 percentages are based on the total number of LEP students in Title III programs assessed from the four state-approved tests (column 2). Illinois assessments measure only three levels of proficiency (therefore no Level 4 information).

- (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>58412</u>
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	<u>14628</u>
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	<u>85</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

Assessments/Proficient Targets

Idea Proficiency Test_23%
Language Assessment Scale_25%
Language Proficiency Test Series_22%
MACULAITIS II_14%

"Proficient" is a composite score, computed by taking a weighted percentage of proficient students in each domain (listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension). In computing a composite score for each state-approved local assessment, each domain is variably weighted. Based on the data, writing appears to be the most difficult domain for students to attain the "proficient level"; hence, this domain is given the highest weight. Weights assigned for each domain: Oral = 0.15, Reading = 0.30, Writing = 0.35, and Comprehension = 0.20.

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

In school year 2004-2005, Illinois used the scores attained by LEP students from the four commercially available, State-approved language proficiency tests—Language Assessment Scale (LAS), Idea Proficiency Test (IPT), Language Proficiency Test Series (LPTS), and Maculaitis II (MACII)—to determine the progress that LEP students had made in English:

1. A student is said to make progress when his/her test score increases by at least one unit over two successive administrations of comparable testing instruments.
2. A school district is said to make progress if 85 percent of its students make progress as described under #1 above.
3. AMAO progress of school districts is computed only when complete data of at least 30 students are available.

With implementation in January 2006 of the new English language proficiency statewide assessment, ACCESS for ELLs™, 2004-2005 was the last school year that Illinois allowed LEAs to use these four tests to measure the English language proficiency of LEP students.

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

There was a limited amount of English proficiency data available from school districts when baseline data were collected in 2003. Because of this, Illinois decided to construct a "cohort" that consists only of students taking comparative assessments for two consecutive years--2004 and 2005. Progress made in the English language by LEP students in Illinois is determined from such a cohort.

With ACCESS for ELLs™ and the advent of the Illinois Student Identification System, it is now possible to track students' performance in the English language across time. We anticipate extracting a cohort for longitudinal study from the 2006 ACCESS for ELLs™ assessment administration.

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	85.0		70.3	50993			35.7	40326

Illinois did not establish target numbers for school year 2004-2005. Illinois uses four state-approved tests. Targets are set for each individual test, but not for aggregate numbers; the four tests are not comparable.

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	85.0		70.0	50070			35.4	38767

Illinois did not establish target numbers for 2004-2005. Illinois uses four state-approved tests. Targets are set for each individual test, but not for aggregate numbers; the four tests are not comparable.

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

	Number:
Number of Title III subgrantees	197
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	120
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	73

Note: The AMAO of four school districts could not be determined because of insufficient data needed for calculation. 120 meeting + 73 not meeting + 4 unable to be determined = 197 subgrantees.

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	571	58.0
4		
5	2556	53.2
6		
7		
8	743	35.0
H.S.	157	17.2

Illinois does not administer state reading/language arts assessments for Grade 4, Grade 6, or Grade 7.

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	798	79.8
4		
5	3379	70.4
6		
7		
8	551	25.8
H.S.	237	25.9

Illinois does not administer state mathematics assessments for Grade 4, Grade 6, or Grade 7.

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

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

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2005-2006 School Year	0

1.8 Graduation and Dropout Rates

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

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

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

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

High School Graduates		Graduation Rate	
		03-04	
Student Group		School Year	
All Students		86.6	
American Indian/Alaska Native		76.6	
Asian/Pacific Islander		91.9	
Black, non-Hispanic		74.0	
Hispanic		75.9	
White, non-Hispanic		91.8	
Students with Disabilities		75.8	
Limited English Proficient		57.9	
Economically Disadvantaged		71.1	
Migrant		25.0	
Male		84.3	
Female		88.8	

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.

1.8.2 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 Student Group	Dropout Rate 03-04 School Year
All Students	5.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	5.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.5
Black, non-Hispanic	9.7
Hispanic	8.3
White, non-Hispanic	3.5
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	5.9
Female	4.8

Information for Students with Disabilities, Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged, and Migrant will become available beginning with the 2004-2005 school year.

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.