

**MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148-5023**

**Consolidated State Application
September 1, 2003 Submission**
(updated 11/17/03 and 7/1/04)

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

State Contact: Carole Thomson, Associate Commissioner
781-338-6201
cthomson@doe.mass.edu

Summary of Information Required for September 1, 2003 Submission

Table of Contents

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Goals and Performance Indicators	Page
<p><u>Performance Goal 2:</u> 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.</p> <p>2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.</p>	3
<p><u>Performance Goal 3:</u> By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.</p> <p>3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).</p> <p>3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34)).</p> <p>3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).</p>	13
<p><u>Performance Goal 4:</u> All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.</p> <p>4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.</p>	16
<p><u>Performance Goal 5:</u> All students will graduate from high school.</p> <p>5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.</p> <p>5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.</p>	17
<p>Appendix A: Massachusetts English Language Assessment Oral (MELA-O)</p>	22

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

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

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

2.1. A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

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

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

2.1. A. MASSACHUSETTS RESPONSE

Overview

The Massachusetts *English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes for English Language Learners* were adopted by the Massachusetts Board of Education in May 2003. The *Benchmarks and Outcomes* are intended to assist educators in the instruction of *Limited English Proficient (LEP)* or *English Language Learners (ELL)* students. Specifically, the purpose of the document is to:

- serve as the basis for defining the *Benchmarks and Outcomes* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/benchmark.pdf>) that will be annually assessed by the Department of Education's future Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) for LEP students as now required by state and federal law (Massachusetts Chapter 71A and *No Child Left Behind*, respectively); and
- define for all teachers of LEP students the English Language Proficiency Outcomes that indicate the extent to which an LEP student has made progress in learning English and/or has moved to a level of performance in English that permits the student's participation and achievement in academic classroom activities that are *not* tailored to limited English proficient students.

The *Massachusetts English Language Arts Curriculum Framework* serves as the primary foundation for this document. It is intended to serve as a natural progression to, rather than replacement for, this set of English language arts learning standards. The majority of English Language Proficiency Outcomes are standards or parts of standards taken from the *English Language Arts Framework*. It also draws from standards contained in the *Massachusetts Foreign Language Curriculum Framework*, and makes frequent reference to the Massachusetts English Language Assessment-Oral (MELA-O). The MELA-O is an observational assessment instrument developed by the Massachusetts Department of Education in collaboration with the Evaluation Assistance Center at George Washington University. The MELA-O will be used in the future by the Department to assess LEP students' speaking and listening skills in English. The document is also to be used in conjunction with the Commonwealth's *Curriculum Frameworks* for mathematics, science and technology/engineering, history and social science, the arts, and health to support the academic instruction of LEP students.

Language Domains and Grade Levels Addressed by ELP Benchmarks and Outcomes

Outcomes for English proficiency are organized around four language domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The document addresses Outcomes for Listening and Speaking, and Benchmarks and Outcomes for Reading and Writing.

Reading and Writing

Six General Outcomes are provided for Reading and five for Writing. Student Learning Outcomes are provided in each domain for each of the grade spans K-4, 5-6, 7-8, and 9-12.

Listening and Speaking

Listening and Speaking Outcomes include four General Outcomes. Student Learning Outcomes are indicated for three distinct levels of achievement: *Beginning to Early Intermediate*; *Early Intermediate to Intermediate*; and *Intermediate to Competent*. Listening and Speaking Outcomes are not broken down by grade span because the academic functions of language (e.g., asking for clarification, explaining cause and effect) do not change significantly as students progress from grade to grade. Many Listening and Speaking Outcomes are related to the MELA-O and the *Massachusetts Foreign Language Curriculum Framework*, rather than to the *English Language Arts Curriculum Framework*.

Each Reading and Writing Student Learning Outcome is preceded by one or more Benchmarks that describe specific skills, knowledge, and concepts that lead to attainment of the Outcome. The Reading and Writing Benchmarks and Outcomes within the grade spans reflect the increasingly complex academic material that students experience as they progress through the grades. As noted above, Reading and Writing Outcomes are drawn primarily from the learning standards contained in the *Massachusetts English Language Arts and Foreign Language Curriculum Frameworks*. The state's English Language Proficiency standards for grades 7-8 are included within the state's grade 5-8 standards for reading (see pages 34-36, 45-46, 49-51; 56-58; 63-64; and 69) and writing (pages 73-74; 78-80; 84-85; 89; and 92).

Performance Level Descriptors

In addition to benchmarks and outcomes, the document provides descriptors of student proficiency in English for each language domain. Descriptors are presented separately by grade span (K-2; 3-4; 5-6; 7-8; and 9-12) and are grouped by proficiency level. There are four proficiency levels: *Beginning*, *Early Intermediate*, *Intermediate*, and *Transitioning*. No descriptors are provided for the lowest proficiency level, *Beginning*. Student performance at the Beginning level, by definition, does not yet show the knowledge and skills associated with *Early Intermediate* achievement.

The Relationship of ELP Benchmarks and Outcomes to Academic Content and Achievement Standards

The document has been written to support teachers' integration of English language instruction with academic instruction. Accordingly, three central themes are found throughout the document's specific Benchmarks and Outcomes:

Vocabulary is Integral to Language Development

Vocabulary is an essential element in the development of each of the language domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Whether an LEP student is just beginning to learn English, or is moving toward *Transitioning*, vocabulary is fundamental to accessing English, as well as to gaining knowledge and understanding in English language arts, mathematics, science and technology/engineering, and history and social science. The development of vocabulary and related skills is therefore emphasized throughout the document.

Oral Language Plays an Essential Role in the Development of Academic English Proficiency
 Activities that include oral interaction can be used to promote acquisition of academic English and provide critical opportunities for comprehension of academic content.

English Language Acquisition must be linked to Learning in Other Academic Subjects
 Educators charged with the instruction of limited English proficient students face a number of challenges. Foremost among them is that of teaching students to understand, speak, read, and write English while ensuring that they also receive rich and rigorous instruction in English language arts, mathematics, science and technology/engineering, history and social science, and other areas. Academic content learning need not be delayed or weakened while limited English proficient students acquire English since language acquisition is enhanced and supported when integrated into academic instruction and activities.

State Participation Rates for Enrolled LEP Students: Spring 2003

The table below shows the participation rates for the state's LEP students for spring 2003 tests in reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

State Participation Rates for Enrolled LEP Students by Grade and Subdomain: Spring 2003

Grade	Subdomain Tested			
	Reading	Writing	Speaking	Listening
K				
1				
2				
3	95%	95%	64%	64%
4	100%	100%	74%	74%
5	99%	99%	65%	65%
6	100%	100%	65%	65%
7	98%	98%	64%	64%
8	100%	100%	69%	69%
9	88%	88%	56%	56%
10	97%	97%	56%	56%
11	86%	86%	56%	56%
12	40%	40%	25%	25%

There are several points of explanation needed for the 2003 participation rates.

- The Massachusetts Department of Education did not mandate the Language Assessment Scales Reading and Writing test for students in kindergarten through grade 2. MADOE could consider administering the LAS R/W test to students at grade 2.
- Districts were required to administer the MELA-O to students to the extent to which districts had capacity (sufficient numbers of certified MELA-O administrators).
- To the extent that capacity would allow as noted in 2 above, districts were required to administer the MELA-O in *all* grades, including kindergarten through grade 2. However MELA-O scores were collected from schools using the LAS R/W answer sheet so that MELA-O scores were only collected for students in grades 3-12.

2.1. B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

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

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

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

Table 1. English Language Proficiency Baseline Data for 2002-2003 School Year

ELP Assessment(s) (1)*	Total number of LEP Identified by Districts Gr. 3-12 (2)	Total number of LEP Assessed Gr. 3-12 (3)	Number and Percentage <i>Not Yet Approaching Proficient</i> (4)	Number and Percentage <i>Approaching Proficient</i> (Approaching Transitioning) (5)	Number and Percentage at <i>Proficient</i> (Transitioning) (6)
LAS- Reading*	38,123	31,192	6,019 19%	8,423 27%	16,750 54%
LAS- Writing*	38,123	31,192	8,201 26%	9,812 31%	13,179 42%
MELA-O Speaking and Listening*	38,123	20,540	5,705 28%	6,367 31%	8,468 41%

*See Table 2 below for description of these instruments.

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

In Spring 2003, the Massachusetts Department of Education mandated that all students identified and reported by districts as Limited English Proficient (LEP) be tested as shown in Table 2.

Massachusetts has not previously mandated nor has plans to require the administration of standardized paper and pencil tests for students in kindergarten through grade 2. Instead, the Department requires the administration of the MELA-O (speaking and listening) for these young students. The Department could consider requiring districts to administer developmentally appropriate assessments to children in kindergarten through grade 2 should this be required.

Table 2. Spring 2003 English Proficiency Tests for Limited English Proficient Students

Language Domain Tested	Instrument	Grades Tested	Test Administration Schedule
Reading and Writing	Language Assessment Scales – Reading and Writing (LAS-R/W) published by CTB McGraw Hill.	3-12	April 28-May 5, 2003
Speaking and Listening	Massachusetts English Language Assessment-Oral (MELA-O) developed by the Department of Education and the Evaluation Assistance Center, George Washington University.	K-12	April 7-May 2, 2003

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

Massachusetts requires that districts determine LEP status locally with an instrument of their choice. The Department has suggested several tests for this purpose.

Table 3. Assessments used by Massachusetts Districts to Identify Students as LEP

Mode	Test	Grades Tested
Reading	LAS R(Language Assessment Scales-Reading) IDEA	Grades 2-12 Grades 2-12
Writing	LAS W(Language Assessment Scales-Writing) IDEA	Grades 2-12 Grades 2-12
Speaking/Listening	MELA-O IDEA Bilingual Syntax Measure I Bilingual Syntax Measure II Bilingual Verbal Ability Test IPT(Idea Proficiency Test)	All Grades All Grades PK-2 Grades 3-6 All Grades All Grades

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

- See Table 1 above.

MELA-O Training

The Department is expanding MELA-O training in 2003-2004 to promote the capacity at the district level so that all LEP students (K-12) will be tested in the MELA-O in Spring 2004. Also, we plan to closely monitor participation rates at the district level in 2004, especially at the high school level.

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

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

- The test score range or cut scores for each of the State’s ELP assessments
- A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State’s definition of “proficient” in English.

2.1. C. MASSACHUSETTS RESPONSE

A student is defined as proficient or, in Massachusetts terminology “transitioning,” if he/she scores at least 80 points on the LAS Reading and MELA-O *and* 64 points on the LAS Writing test.

Table 4. Cut Score Ranges for Performance Levels used to Report 2003 English Proficiency Assessment Results

	Cut Score Ranges for English Proficiency Assessments			
	Total Cut Score Range	Range for Not Yet Approaching Proficient	Range for Approaching Proficient	Range for Proficient (Transitioning)
Reading	0-100	0-59	60-79	80 ≤
Writing	0-100	0-58	59-63	64 ≤
MELA-O	0-100	0-59	60-79	80 ≤

Table 5. Score Point Distribution for 2003 LAS Reading and Writing Tests

Grade	Reading					Writing	
	Reading Synonyms	Reading Fluency (Comprehension)	Reading Antonyms	Reading Mechanics & Usage	Reading for Information (Comprehension)	Writing (Describe a picture)	Writing (Prompt)
Grade 3	10 pts. 22%	10 pts. 22%	10 pts. 22%	15 pts. 33%	NA	15 pts. 33%	30 pts. 66%
Grades 4 - 6	10 22%	10 22%	10 22%	15 33%	NA	15 27%	40 73%
Grades 7 – 12	10 18%	10 18%	10 18%	15 27%	10 18%	15 25%	45 75%

Points are summed for the four/five reading categories and the two writing categories to create separate reading and writing raw scores. Subscores are converted into separate standard scores that range from 0 to 100 points.

MELA-O

MELA-O scores are generated based upon the rubric provided in Appendix A.

MELA-O scores are weighted equally upon two components:

- ❑ Comprehension/Listening; and
- ❑ Production/Speaking.

The maximum score for each component (5 points) was multiplied by 10 to create a standard score point range for the MELA-0 that was parallel to the standard score point range reported for the LAS Reading and Writing (0-100).

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

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

2.1. C. MASSACHUSETTS RESPONSE

For the performance to be judged as "Making Progress" a student must over the course of a school year;

1. Be proficient or transitioning on the LAS Writing test or gain at least five points when scores are compared to the previous spring.

AND

2. Be proficient or transitioning on the LAS Reading test or gain at least 20 points when scores are compared to the previous spring.

AND

3. Be proficient or transitioning on the MELA-O (Listening and Speaking) exam or gain at least 20 points when scores are compared to the previous spring.

The five-point gain expected in Writing is not necessarily smaller, nor larger than the 20-point gain expected in the other tests. Rather, it is a function of the rubrics used to score the test, which result in a highly compressed distribution of writing test scores between 56 and 70 points.

Performance Level Descriptors

Performance level descriptors were not developed for the English Language Proficiency Tests used in 2003.

The Department has developed *English Language Proficiency* level descriptors by language subdomain and grade span for our future Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment that will become operational in the 2004/2005 school year. These descriptors are included in the state's recently adopted *Benchmarks and Outcomes for English Language Learners*.

Students' progress in reading and writing for 2003-2004 will be based upon performance on the LAS R/W test administered in Spring 2003 compared to performance on the Spring 2004 LAS R/W test. All LEP students in grades 3-12 who were not tested in Spring 2003 are required to be tested on the LAS R/W in Fall 2003. Also, all grade 3 LEP students will be required to be tested on the LAS R/W in Fall 2003 since no baseline data is available for these students. Performance of students tested in Fall 2003 will serve as the baseline against which performance in Spring 2004 will be compared.

(<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/2003/news/0919lep.html>)

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

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

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

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

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

2.1. C. MASSACHUSETTS RESPONSE

Instead of using a cohort, performance targets for 2004 were calculated based upon performance in 2003. "Not Yet Approaching Proficient" and "Approaching Proficient" were defined based upon a conjunctive model as shown below.

Performance in 2003	Minimum Standard Score Points (All grades)		
	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Writing</i>	<i>Listening</i>
<i>Cohert 1: Not Yet Approaching Proficient</i>	59	58	59
<i>Cohert 2: Approaching Proficient</i>	60	59	60
<i>Cohert 3: Proficient (Transitioning)</i>	80≤	64≤	80≤

English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

Table 6.2004 Performance targets for Cohort 1: Students whose performance was “Not Yet Approaching Proficient” in 2003

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	70%	2%
2004-2005 School Year	75%	4%
2005-2006 School Year	80%	6%
2006-2007 School Year	85%	8%
2007-2008 School Year	90%	10%

*Massachusetts is developing customized assessments for Reading and Writing that will be administered for the first time during the 2004/2005 school year. Following the first operational administration in 2005, Massachusetts will review its standards for “Progressing” and “Proficient.”

Table 7.2004 Performance targets for Cohort 2: Students whose performance was “ Approaching Proficient (Transitioning)” in 2003

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	70%	70%
2004-2005 School Year	75%	72%
2005-2006 School Year	80%	74%
2006-2007 School Year	85%	78%
2007-2008 School Year	90%	80%

*Massachusetts is developing customized assessments for Reading and Writing that will be administered for the first time during the 2004/2005 school year. Following the first operational administration in 2005, Massachusetts will review its standards for “Progressing” and “Proficient.”

In defining annual measurable achievement objectives, the Department of Education opted not to rely upon a traditional “cohort” of students defined by students’ chronological age or assigned grade level due to the wide variability of performance within these classifications. Instead, the Department opted to establish non-traditional “cohorts” that are based strictly upon actual student performance.

The three cohorts of students that have been used by the Department in the establishment of its AMAOs are as follows:

- Cohort 1: Not Yet Approaching Proficient
- Cohort 2: Approaching Proficient
- Cohort 3: Proficient (Transitioning)

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1:

The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

3.1. A. In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

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

3.1. A. Massachusetts Response:

Note:

At the time of the September 1, 2003 report, the Massachusetts Department of Education was not able to provide valid data for the following indicators:

- percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers,
- percentage of teachers who are receiving high quality professional development, and
- percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who are qualified.

In 2003-04, the Department implemented a new data collection process that provided the baseline and target data for these indicators. This information was sent to the United States Department of Education on May 27, 2004, as required, and has been incorporated in the charts below.

Highly-Qualified Teachers

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	NA	NA
2003-2004 Target	94%	88%
2004-2005 Target	96.5%	92%
2005-2006 Target	100%	100%

The data represents full-time equivalency (FTE) of teachers, rather than a percentage of classes. Massachusetts believes that the FTE is a more comparable indicator across districts and schools, where numerous variations in scheduling and definitions of class exist.

3.1. A. Massachusetts Definition of a Highly Qualified Teacher.

In order to meet the highly qualified definition as described in NCLB, Massachusetts teachers must possess a valid Massachusetts license (preliminary, initial, or professional) and demonstrate subject matter competency in the areas they teach. In Massachusetts, NCLB subject matter competence requirements are applied differently to those who teach at different levels based on current licensure requirements. This information is elaborated upon in the Department's draft policy document: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/nclb/news03/0210policy.html>

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

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term "high-quality professional development" means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA.

3.2. Massachusetts Response:

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	NA
2003-2004 Target	70%
2004-2005 Target	75%
2005-2006 Target	80%

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

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

3.3. Massachusetts Response:

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	46%
2003-2004 Target	60%
2004-2005 Target	77%
2005-2006 Target	100%

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

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

4.1. Massachusetts Response:

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	0
2004-2005 Target	<= 5
2005-2006 Target	<= 4
2006-2007 Target	<= 3
2007-2008 Target	<= 2
2008-2009 Target	0
2009-2010 Target	0
2010-2011 Target	0
2011-2012 Target	0
2012-2013 Target	0
2013-2014 Target	0

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

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: "The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data." However, section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

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

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

5.1. Massachusetts Response:

At its December 2002 meeting, the Massachusetts Board of Education approved modifying the Massachusetts School and District Accountability System to include graduation rates as an additional performance indicator for high schools. The Department will begin reporting graduation rates using the NCLB definition in the 2005-2006 school year, using Student Information Management System (SIMS) data, which the Department began to collect in 2001.

The rate will be calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{\# Graduates (with regular diploma) who completed high school in four years}}{\text{\# Graduates (same as above) + \# of 9th grade dropouts/retentions + \# 10th grade dropouts/retentions + \# 11th grade dropouts/retentions + \# 12th grade dropouts/retentions + \# students who complete 12th grade without a regular diploma}}$$

The data for each class will be tracked going forward from 9th grade. Dropouts are defined as students who leave school prior to graduation for reasons other than transfer to another school. Students who are retained in grade, and thus leave their original class, will not count toward the number of graduates, but will be included in the denominator as members of the original class.

MA DOE will use the 12th grade "competency determination" (CD) attainment rate as the interim measure, until our new student information management system has sufficient data to

calculate a graduation rate. Starting with the class of 2003, Massachusetts requires students to earn a competency determination before graduating from a public high school. The CD attainment rate will be calculated by dividing the number of students at the end of 12th grade with a CD by the number of students who were enrolled on October 1 of 12th grade (minus the students who transfer out).

The 2002-2003 baseline for this interim graduation rate measure is shown below. Since this is the first year of implementation of our new competency determination requirement, 2001-2002 data are not available.

Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	94.1%
African American/Black	84.6%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	93.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	94.8%
Hispanic	80.5%
White	96.3%
Students with Disabilities	78.5%
Students without Disabilities	96.2%
Limited English Proficient	78%
Economically Disadvantaged	85.4%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	95.7%
Migrant	68.9%(n=45)
Male	93.5%
Female	94.7%

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	94.1%	94.6%	95.2%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
African American/Black	84.6%	86.0%	87.4%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
American Indian/Native Alaskan	93.7%	94.3%	94.8%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Asian/Pacific Islander	94.8%	95.3%	95.7%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Hispanic	80.5%	82.3%	84.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
White	96.3%	96.6%	97.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Students with Disabilities	78.5%	80.5%	82.4%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Students without Disabilities	96.2%	96.5%	96.9%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Limited English Proficient	78.0%	80.0%	82.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Economically Disadvantaged	85.4%	86.7%	88.1%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	95.7%	96.1%	96.5%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Migrant	68.9%	71.7%	74.6%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Male	93.5%	94.1%	94.7%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Female	94.7%	95.2%	95.7%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

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

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

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

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

5.2. Massachusetts Response:

The Department implemented a Student Information Management System (SIMS) in the 2001-02 school year. In prior years, the dropout data were collected in the aggregate from schools and districts. With the SIMS, the Department began to collect student-level dropout data. Over time, the change in collection method will very likely increase the accuracy and the comprehensiveness of the data.

BASELINE DATA: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Rate
Student Group	2000-01* Baseline
All Students	3.5
African American/Black	6.1
American Indian/Native Alaskan	3.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.9
Hispanic	8.0
White	2.6
Other	NA
Students with Disabilities	NA
Students without Disabilities	NA
Limited English Proficient	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	NA
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	NA
Migrant	NA
Male	4.1
Female	2.8

* 2001-02 data are not likely to be as accurate, due to new data collection system, so baseline was set with prior year's data.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5
African American/Black	6.0	5.8	5.6	5.4	5.2	4.8	4.4	4.0	3.6	3.2	2.8	2.5
American Indian/Native Alaskan	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.8	2.6	2.5
Hispanic	7.8	7.6	7.4	7.2	7.0	6.6	6.2	5.6	5.0	4.4	3.5	2.5
White	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Other	NA	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	2.5
Students with Disabilities	NA	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	2.5
Students without Disabilities	NA	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	2.5
Limited English Proficient	NA	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	2.5
Economically Disadvantaged	NA	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	2.5
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	NA	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	2.5
Migrant	NA	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	2.5
Male	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.1	2.9	2.7	2.5
Female	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5

APPENDIX A

MASSACHUSETTS ENGLISH LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT – ORAL (MELA-O)¹

Final Version September 1994

The MELA-O is an observation scale that facilitates the assessment of English language proficiency of English Language learners in grades K-12. The MELA-O is a 6-point scale to be used as part of a comprehensive English Language assessment system. Placement and programming decisions should be based on results of both the MELA-O and assessment in other language modalities (i.e., writing and reading).

Directions: For each of the domains and subdomains below, mark an “X” across the box that best describes a student’s abilities. Use black ink for the fall observation of MELA-O and red ink for the spring observation. Use the Student Information Summary form on the reverse side to report the results of each observation.

		LEVEL 0	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 5
COMPREHENSION		No demonstrated proficiency	Recognizes simple questions and commands; responds to more complex utterances with inappropriate or inaudible responses	Understands interpersonal conversation when spoken to slowly and with frequent repetitions; acknowledgement may be non-verbal, in the native language or target language	Understands/is capable of responding to most interpersonal and classroom discussions and interaction when frequent clarifications are given	Understand nearly all interpersonal and classroom discussions, although occasional repetitions may be necessary	Understands interpersonal conversations and classroom discussions
	FLUENCY	No demonstrated proficiency	Speech is limited to an exchange of fixed verbal formulae (e.g. commonly used sentences and phrases) or single word utterances	Uses familiar sentences with reasonable ease; long pauses or silence are common and gestures are often used to illustrate meaning	Begins to create more novel sentences; speech in interpersonal and classroom discussions is frequently interrupted by a search for the correct manner or expression	Speech in interpersonal and classroom discussions is generally fluent, with occasional lapses while the student searches for the correct manner of expression	Speech in interpersonal conversation and in classroom discussions is approximately that of a native speaker of the same age
PRODUCTION	VOCABULARY	No demonstrated proficiency	Has limited command of isolated vocabulary for common objects and activities but comprehensibility is often difficult	Has command of words for common objectives/activities but choice of words is often inappropriate for the situation/context; comprehensibility remains difficult	Has adequate vocabulary to permit somewhat limited discussion of interpersonal and classroom topics; usually comprehensible	Flow of speech is rarely interrupted by inadequate vocabulary; is capable of rephrasing ideas and thoughts to express meaning	Use of vocabulary and idioms approximates that of a native speaker of the same age
	PRONUNCIATION	No demonstrated proficiency	Seldom intelligible and is strongly influenced by the primary language, including intonation and word stress; must repeat to be understood	Sometimes intelligible and is frequently influenced by the primary language and must repeat utterances to be understood	Usually speaks intelligibly though with some sounds still influenced by the primary language; frequently uses non-native intonation patterns	Always intelligible with occasional inappropriate intonation patterns; slight influence of the primary language may still be observed	Pronunciation and intonation approximates that of a native speaker of the same age
	GRAMMAR	No demonstrated proficiency	Can produce only memorized grammar and word order forms	Often uses basic grammar patterns correctly for simple familiar phrases and sentences	Uses basic grammar correctly; uses complex language structures that are often incorrect	May make grammatical errors; however, they do not obscure meaning	Grammatical usage approximates that of a native speaker of the same age

¹ The MELA-O is the result of a collaborative effort between the Evaluation Assistance Center (EAC) East at the George Washington University and the Massachusetts Assessment Advisory Group (MAAG). The instrument is based on the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Guidelines and modeled on the Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM) developed by the San Jose (CA) Unified School District (1985) and the Student Oral Proficiency Rating (SOPR) designed by Development Associates (1987).