

# **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 2005-2006**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006  
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

**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 are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

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

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

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

## PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 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:

- **Performance goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **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.
- **Performance goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **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 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 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: 07/31/2007

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:  
 Part I, 2005-2006                       Part II, 2005-2006

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

Address:  
P.O. Box 47200  
Olympia, WA 98504-7200

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Christine Finkle  
Telephone: 360-725-6229  
Fax: 360-586-3305  
e-mail: christine.finkle@k12.wa.us

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

Wednesday, February 28, 2007, 11:14:38

AM  
Signature

Date

## **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2005-2006**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 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**

Washington's 1993 Education Reform Act required the development of academic content standards for all students in eight core content areas which included: reading, writing, communications, mathematics, science, social studies, the arts, and health and fitness.

Academic content standards, Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs), in science have been in place in Washington since 1998. The science standards follow the same format as the reading and mathematics standards and went through the same process of development. Specific benchmark requirements on what students should know and be able to do were developed for all children at three grade spans (Elementary - Grade 5, Middle/Junior High - Grade 8, and High School - Grade 10). The standards are rigorous and require higher level thinking on the part of all students.

In the fall of 2002, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) conducted an external review of the Science EALRs. Stakeholders from across the state were involved in the revision process. LEAs and the greater community provided input into the revisions through state-wide conferences, meetings, forums, and an on-line survey. The revisions to the EALRs were completed in the Winter of 2003. With the EALR revisions complete, the development of Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) in Science for Kindergarten through Grade 10 began in the Winter of 2003. The development of challenging academic content standards (GLEs) at each grade level, Kindergarten through Grade 10, began in the Winter of 2003.

The first draft of the Science GLE document was shared at the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's (OSPI) Summer Institutes, where LEA staffs and other stakeholders provided feedback to OSPI. The process for developing the document was iterative and involved many opportunities for feedback through statewide conferences, regional education forums through Educational Service Districts (ESDs), the Washington Science Teacher's Association, higher education, and an on-line electronic survey.

During the Spring of 2004, a Bias and Fairness Review Committee reviewed the Science GLE document as did a panel of nationally-recognized science leaders from across the U.S. Feedback from both were used to inform revisions to the document.

The Curriculum Advisory Review Committee (CARC), which is made up of curriculum leaders, administrators, and teachers in LEAs, as well as curriculum leaders in ESDs and higher education, serves the purpose of providing advice to the State Superintendent on curriculum-related issues. At the Fall 2004 meeting of the CARC, the State Superintendent formally adopted the Science GLEs.

Final drafts have been made available since September 2004. Distribution of the finalized Science GLE publication and training for the LEAs in using the GLEs was initiated in January 2005 and continues.

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

#### **State Response**

The State began its standards-based assessment program in 1997, with the implementation of 4th grade Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) tests in reading, mathematics, listening, and writing. Since 1997, the development of the WASL program has progressed under the guidance of a National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC). The NTAC advises OSPI on the technical adequacy of the WASL and reviews the psychometric qualities of the assessments. The following description focuses on reading, mathematics, and science assessments.

The reading and mathematics WASLs for grade 4 were aligned to the then newly-developed Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) in those content areas. Prior to test design, the EALRs were developed by committees comprising representatives from Washington LEAs and members of the parent and business communities, reflecting the geographic and ethnic diversity of the State. After public review and subsequent revision, the EALRs were adopted by the State's Commission on Student Learning, as authorized by the Legislature. The 4th grade WASLs in reading and mathematics were designed to assess what students should know and be able to do with respect to the EALRs. As such, the test map for each content area represented the entire academic content domain of the EALRs, distributing items across those domains, which are referred to in Washington as "strands". Each strand was assessed using several item types: traditional multiple choice items, worth one-point each; short answer items, worth two-points each; and extended response items, worth four-points each. Roughly half of the points on each assessment were derived from open-ended items, designed to assess higher-order thinking skills.

WASLs in reading and mathematics were similarly implemented for grades 7 and 10 in 1998 and 1999, respectively. Science WASLs were implemented in grade 5 in 2003, and in grades 8 and 10 in 2004.

Item development for the reading, mathematics, and science WASLs proceeds across several stages, which includes substantial involvement of LEA staff. WASL items are written by committees of LEA staff under the guidance of OSPI content specialists and contractor staff. Separate "content committees", again composed of LEA staff, review each item for alignment and content appropriateness. Potential items are then reviewed by a Bias and Fairness Committee, composed of Washington citizens reflective of the state's diverse population. Once an item has passed content and bias reviews, it is embedded as a pilot item into a form of the WASL. Embedded pilot items are not counted for points, but are subjected to statistical analyses to detect bias and stability, which is reviewed by a "data committee" composed of LEA staff under the leadership of OSPI psychometric staff. Items that have passed all these reviews are added to the Washington item bank for use in a future form of the WASL.

Each year, a new form of the WASL is developed for reading, mathematics, and science. Each year's form uses items to fit the test map for that content and grade level, which describes the number of points and item types that are to be used within each strand. Items are also selected to build a test of the same overall difficulty as previous forms. Each form contains several categories of items: pilot items (as described above); operational anchor items; and regular operational items. Operational anchor items are items which have appeared on a previous year's WASL that are used to equate the test forms from year to year.

In 2006, reading and mathematics WASLs were added for grades 3, 5, 6, and 8. These assessments are aligned to Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) that have been previously adopted by OSPI.

In 2001, OSPI developed the Washington Alternate Assessment System portfolio (WAAS-Portfolio). This assessment was designed for students with the most substantial cognitive disabilities. Currently, the WAAS-Portfolio is available for reading and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 and 10, and for science in grades 5, 8, and 10. The WAAS-Portfolio collects evidence across the course of the school year, and assesses student performance on a content-related learning goal that represents an extension of the grade-level GLE and on four "generalization" goals. WAAS-Portfolios are scored by trained LEA staff, under the supervision of OSPI and contractor staff.

Alignment studies for reading and mathematics WASLs have been conducted by SRI and Buros Center for Testing for grades 4, 7, and 10 and for grades 3, 5, 6, and 8, respectively. Alignment studies for the science WASL and the

WAAS-Portfolio are scheduled for the current year (2006-07). Alignment studies are available for review on the OSPI Web site. Technical reports, including validity evidence and reliability estimates, shown as entire-test reliability and conditional standard errors, are also available through the Web site.

The WASL and WAAS-Portfolio are administered in the spring of each year, with results being reported before the beginning of the following school year.

---

**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**

Standard setting for the WASL assessments in all grade levels for reading, mathematics, and science used an item mapping procedure, commonly referred to as a "modified bookmark" procedure. The WASLs use a Rasch score model for establishing the measurement scale for each assessment. Ordered-item booklets were created prior to standard setting using Rasch item difficulties.

Standards were initially set for reading and mathematics in 1997 at grade 4, in 1998 at grade 7, and in 1999 at grade 10; for science in 2003 at grade 5 and in 2004 at grades 8 and 10. Additionally, reading and mathematics standards were revisited at grades 4, 7, and 10 in 2004. The purpose of the revisiting was to assure that the standards set in the early years of the assessment program were reasonable and appropriate. Standards were set for reading and mathematics at grades 3, 5, 6, and 8 in 2006. All standard setting events followed a script and agenda reviewed and approved by the State's National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC), and were approved by the legislatively-approved governing body at the time. Currently, standards are adopted by the State Board of Education.

Each standard setting event, taking place over three to four days, was facilitated by a contracted individual, and was conducted by a panel of 20-25 for each subject area and grade level. Panels consisted of LEA staff familiar with the grade level and content area under consideration. Panels also included parent and community members. Panelists were presented with general information about the use and consequences of test scores. They also were provided with broad "Performance Level Descriptors" (PLDs) defining Basic, Proficient, and Advanced performance. Panelists elaborated upon the PLDs, describing in a more specific way the type of work students would exhibit at each performance level. Panelists then completed three rounds of item mapping, placing three bookmarks in the ordered booklets in each round. These three bookmarks define four performance levels: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. The final recommendations from the standard-setting panel were the cut scores associated with the mean theta of all panelists, using a Response Probability (RP) value of 0.67. During the standard-setting event panelists were encouraged to volunteer to participate in an "articulation committee", which convened immediately following the standard-setting. The articulation committee reviewed the entire set of standards being set at that time (for example, reading and mathematics for grades 4, 7, and 10 in 2004) for reasonableness of an entire assessment system. The recommendations of the articulation committee were submitted separately to the governing body, which was authorized to adopt the recommendations from the original panel or from the articulation committee; or to adopt standards of their own.

Commonly-accepted test equating procedures are used to maintain scale stability from year to year. Prior to each year's scores being released, approval of the equating is obtained from the NTAC.

Standards were set on the WAAS-Portfolio in 2001 for grades 4, 7, and 10 in reading and mathematics, and in for science in 2004. Standard-setting used panels of LEA staff and a body-of-work method. Standards for the reading and mathematics WAAS-Portfolio in grades 3, 5, 6, and 8 (including articulation of 4, 7, and 10) will be conducted in the 2006-07 school year.

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 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 Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

**1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration****1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	528401	98.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	14149	96.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	42509	98.90
Black, non-Hispanic	29187	97.40
Hispanic	69588	98.10
White, non-Hispanic	361066	98.30
Students with Disabilities	61994	96.20
Limited English Proficient	31890	98.20
Economically Disadvantaged	198280	98.00
Migrant	11066	98.30
Male	269333	98.00
Female	256312	98.40

**Comments:** The N of all students does not match the total Male/Female served, nor does it match the total of the 5 ethnic categories served. This is due to students in Washington State having the option of a multi-ethnic category or not responding. In addition, there are students who also choose to not indicate a gender, and this is also allowed.

- 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 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	527590	98.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	14198	97.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	42529	99.00
Black, non-Hispanic	29302	97.60
Hispanic	69695	98.30
White, non-Hispanic	361605	98.50
Students with Disabilities	62227	96.60
Limited English Proficient	31788	97.90
Economically Disadvantaged	198723	98.20
Migrant	11070	98.40
Male	269935	98.20
Female	257046	98.60

**Comments:** The N of all students does not match the total Male/Female served, nor does it match the total of the 5 ethnic categories served. This is due to students in Washington State having the option of a multi-ethnic category or not responding. In addition, there are students who also choose to not indicate a gender, and this is also allowed.

- 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

##### 1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 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	50008	80.70
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	4164	6.70
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	7822	12.60

**Comments:**

##### 1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 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	50108	80.50
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	4283	6.90
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	7836	12.60

**Comments:**

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 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 Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

**1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	73855	64.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2030	48.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	6177	73.10
Black, non-Hispanic	4284	46.40
Hispanic	11263	42.40
White, non-Hispanic	48625	71.50
Students with Disabilities	10021	37.80
Limited English Proficient	7176	30.30
Economically Disadvantaged	30951	49.40
Migrant	1748	33.20
Male	37883	63.50
Female	35922	66.30

**Comments:**

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	73838	68.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	2027	52.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	6172	74.20
Black, non-Hispanic	4279	54.40
Hispanic	11256	47.70
White, non-Hispanic	48615	75.40
Students with Disabilities	9947	38.80
Limited English Proficient	7145	31.40
Economically Disadvantaged	30944	54.40
Migrant	1743	37.30
Male	37869	64.90
Female	35933	73.30

**Comments:**

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	73059	58.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	2023	41.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	6088	67.90
Black, non-Hispanic	4245	36.70
Hispanic	10507	37.00
White, non-Hispanic	48832	65.50
Students with Disabilities	9952	30.50
Limited English Proficient	6098	24.00
Economically Disadvantaged	29897	42.70
Migrant	1596	31.40
Male	37420	58.10
Female	35605	60.00

**Comments:** Migrant information has been reviewed and is appropriate as reported.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	73124	80.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	2039	67.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	6086	85.60
Black, non-Hispanic	4249	68.00
Hispanic	10522	65.40
White, non-Hispanic	48849	85.30
Students with Disabilities	9972	48.70
Limited English Proficient	6082	49.70
Economically Disadvantaged	29928	70.20
Migrant	1594	57.80
Male	37474	77.50
Female	35624	84.20

**Comments:** Migrant information has been reviewed and is appropriate as reported.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	74842	55.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	2033	38.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	6087	65.30
Black, non-Hispanic	4291	33.00
Hispanic	10606	31.60
White, non-Hispanic	50462	62.70
Students with Disabilities	9484	24.40
Limited English Proficient	4309	12.50
Economically Disadvantaged	29762	38.20
Migrant	1702	24.40
Male	38142	55.50
Female	36650	56.20

**Comments:**

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	74943	75.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	2041	61.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	6094	80.10
Black, non-Hispanic	4316	63.50
Hispanic	10613	55.90
White, non-Hispanic	50522	81.50
Students with Disabilities	9505	40.30
Limited English Proficient	4299	26.80
Economically Disadvantaged	29809	62.80
Migrant	1698	46.10
Male	38236	72.50
Female	36685	79.60

**Comments:**

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	75171	48.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1980	31.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	6107	59.90
Black, non-Hispanic	4409	26.20
Hispanic	10443	25.70
White, non-Hispanic	50874	56.00
Students with Disabilities	8933	17.00
Limited English Proficient	4030	9.20
Economically Disadvantaged	29688	31.60
Migrant	1626	18.40
Male	38362	49.10
Female	36769	49.80

**Comments:**

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	75287	65.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1983	51.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	6100	71.20
Black, non-Hispanic	4441	51.10
Hispanic	10455	47.40
White, non-Hispanic	50951	72.10
Students with Disabilities	8980	29.40
Limited English Proficient	4014	19.50
Economically Disadvantaged	29740	52.20
Migrant	1623	40.50
Male	38423	61.40
Female	36837	71.90

**Comments:**

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	77495	47.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	2068	28.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	6113	58.00
Black, non-Hispanic	4352	24.70
Hispanic	10048	25.70
White, non-Hispanic	53566	54.50
Students with Disabilities	8667	14.10
Limited English Proficient	4123	11.40
Economically Disadvantaged	29356	30.60
Migrant	1619	19.80
Male	39891	46.80
Female	37572	50.20

**Comments:** Information reported has been reviewed and is accurate.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	77584	60.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	2027	45.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	6120	66.00
Black, non-Hispanic	4372	43.10
Hispanic	10059	40.60
White, non-Hispanic	53606	67.30
Students with Disabilities	8725	26.00
Limited English Proficient	4120	17.50
Economically Disadvantaged	29400	45.50
Migrant	1621	32.90
Male	39927	57.20
Female	37636	66.20

**Comments:** Information reported has been reviewed and is accurate.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	78788	48.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	2282	30.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	6121	60.10
Black, non-Hispanic	4352	22.80
Hispanic	9547	26.50
White, non-Hispanic	55163	54.80
Students with Disabilities	8326	13.10
Limited English Proficient	3367	10.80
Economically Disadvantaged	28246	31.30
Migrant	1652	20.20
Male	40741	48.70
Female	37999	49.40

**Comments:**

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	78864	69.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	2300	56.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	6121	77.70
Black, non-Hispanic	4353	54.40
Hispanic	9547	55.60
White, non-Hispanic	55206	74.30
Students with Disabilities	8402	28.60
Limited English Proficient	3367	28.20
Economically Disadvantaged	28295	57.30
Migrant	1650	48.70
Male	40787	65.50
Female	38047	75.90

**Comments:**

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	72744	50.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	1733	34.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	5816	61.10
Black, non-Hispanic	3254	25.50
Hispanic	7174	27.90
White, non-Hispanic	53544	58.20
Students with Disabilities	6611	19.40
Limited English Proficient	2787	14.30
Economically Disadvantaged	20380	33.00
Migrant	1123	14.70
Male	36894	54.50
Female	35795	51.60

**Comments:** Information reported has been reviewed and is accurate.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	73533	80.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1781	72.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	5836	86.30
Black, non-Hispanic	3292	71.10
Hispanic	7243	66.40
White, non-Hispanic	53856	88.20
Students with Disabilities	6696	46.10
Limited English Proficient	2761	38.90
Economically Disadvantaged	20607	71.20
Migrant	1141	52.20
Male	37219	81.70
Female	36284	87.20

**Comments:** Information reported has been reviewed and is accurate.

- 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 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 School Year Data	2073	1732	84.00

**Comments:** The data reported for 2004-2005 did not correctly reflect the total number of schools. The total number of schools was 2060 and, of those, 1657 made AYP. The percentage of schools that made AYP was 80.00.

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 2005-2006 School Year Data	296	223	75.00

**Comments:**

**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 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 School Year Data	942	805	85.00

**Comments:**

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 2005-2006 School Year Data	286	213	74.00

**Comments:**

### **1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

**1.4.3.1** Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

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

Washington State provides a voluntary support system for schools and districts identified for improvement. Based on annual state assessment results, schools and districts who have not met adequate yearly progress goals for two consecutive years are provided the opportunity to participate in either school or district improvement assistance provided by the SEA.

Schools that volunteer for assistance from the SEA are provided with a three-year commitment of support, a base amount of funding to help address their professional development needs, a third party Education Audit that provides data aligned with the nine characteristics of high performing schools and an on-site facilitator to assist with building leadership needs and the development/implementation of a well-targeted school improvement plan.

As schools progress through the eight steps of the improvement process and three years of intensive support, including assessment/planning, and the development of a performance agreement between the SEA, school and school district that outlines specific commitments by each party to the improvement support process (year 1), implementation of the school improvement plan and sustainability (years 2 & 3), progress is documented through building-district-state-level monitoring to provide the data and resources necessary to make adjustments to meet ongoing needs.

Schools entering corrective action and restructuring (Steps 3, 4 and 5), are provided opportunities for additional assistance through the state, school district (primary) and other educational entities involved in the partnership of improvement for these schools (e.g. Association of Washington School Principals,((AWSP)),leadership training/coaching; Educational Service Districts,((ESD)),professional development and technical assistance; Northwest Regional Comprehensive Center,((NWRCC)),research-based best practices and other forms of technical assistance).

**1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.**

**1.4.4.1** Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

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

Washington State provides a voluntary support system for schools and districts identified for improvement. Based on annual state assessment results, schools and districts who have not met adequate yearly progress goals for two consecutive years are provided the opportunity to participate in either school or district improvement assistance provided by the SEA.

District Improvement Assistance is provided, on a voluntary basis, to all districts identified for improvement, Steps 1 & 2. The Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA), an educational partner helping to support this work, provides training on systemic issues identified at the district level (e.g. curriculum alignment, leadership, budgeting, etc.) along with the availability of district-level facilitators and research-based professional development and training opportunities.

Five classifications of districts in improvement status exist including, Step 1 - New; Step 1 - Continuing; Step 2 New; Step 2 - Continuing; and District Improvement Assistance-Plus (DIA-Plus); a competitive grant process for districts in improvement using supplemental district funds. A base amount of funding is provided to each district with potential budget enhancements tailored to the identified needs unique to the district. A partnership with a private foundation also allows, through competitive applications, additional funding for successful district applicants which demonstrate a systemic approach to improvement efforts.

**1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services**

<b>1.4.5.1 Public School Choice</b>	
	Number
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 2005-2006 school year.	27
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 2005-2006 school year.	20
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
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 2005-2006 school year.	194
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 2005-2006 school year.	29777
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
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 2005-2006 school year.	198
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 2005-2006 school year.	198
<b>Comments:</b>	

<b>1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services</b>	
	<b>Number</b>
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 2005-2006 school year.	32
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	363
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	21825
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
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 2005-2006 school year.	601
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY**

**1.5.1** In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 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.

<b>School Type</b>	<b>Total Number of Core Academic Classes</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>
<b>All Schools in State</b>	135589	129576	95.60
<b>Elementary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	6405	6269	97.90
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	6464	6418	99.30
<b>All Elementary Schools</b>	26003	25671	98.70
<b>Secondary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	26464	24105	91.10
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	15694	15204	96.90
<b>All Secondary Schools</b>	109586	103905	94.80

**Comments:** Section 1.5.1 data was updated to reflect EDEN data requirements related to classification of K-8 schools, K-12 schools and some middle level building configurations.

**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, 2006, 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 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 classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

<b>Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
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	0.65
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	0.33
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.32
<b>SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	2.86
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	1.56
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.78

**Comments:** Elementary Bilingual Education .22%

Elementary Alternative Education .10%

Secondary Alternative Education .39%

Secondary Bilingual Education .26%

Secondary Juvenile Education .13%

**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 (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
<b>Elementary Schools</b>	58.70	23.15
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Free and Reduced Lunch	
<b>Secondary Schools</b>	46.50	14.54
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Free and Reduced Lunch	

**Comments:**

### 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 2005-2006 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
2005-2006 School Year	98.80

**Comments:** As of the end of the 05-06 school year, we had 98.8% paraprofessionals meeting the NCLB Title I requirements. However, in monitoring school district progress at the beginning of the 06-07 school year to ensure that all Title I paraeducators met the requirements, school districts reported that 100% Title I paraeducators now meet the NCLB requirements. The 1.2% not meeting the requirements at the end of the 05-06 school year either met the requirements, were released from employment, or were reassigned to a non-Title I position at the beginning of the 06-07 school year.

**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
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

The State has completed the development of the ELD standards and used a two phase process in the development of the State's ELD Standards.

I. A planning committee of ESL/Bilingual educators; consultants with expertise in assessment; English Language Acquisition, ELD standards development, and OSPI Staff (assessment, reading, bilingual, and migrant) developed the process and structure for developing the ELD standards. Based on the review of the TESOL Standards, standards from other states, and research on second language acquisition, the committee made the following recommendations for the development of the ELD Standards.

- a) Follow the format of the state's Washington Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs), beginning with a specific academic content standard or "Essential Learning".
- b) Defined five proficiency levels: Beginner, Advanced Beginner, Intermediate, Advanced, and Transitional.
- c) Develop student performance expectations by grade span and language proficiency level speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension to ensure alignment to the EALRs as required by Section 1111 (b) (1) of the ESEA.
- d) Develop the standards in grade bands K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12 to reflect what students should be able to do at each language proficiency level within a grade band to meet state academic content and achievement standards.
- e) Develop the standards in grade bands K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12 to reflect language assessment bands.

II: A committee of ELL/Bilingual educators representative of districts across the state was selected to write the ELD standards. The committee was representative of various program implementation models (dual language, late exit bilingual, early exit bilingual, pullout, content based), large and small districts (rural, urban, suburban), and primary, intermediate, secondary representatives. The committee members were selected through an application process to ensure that the participants were knowledgeable in the area of second language acquisition, standards based instruction, and grade level expectations for English language learner. The writers' focus was to:

- a) Develop the ELD standards to align with the state's EALRs in reading, writing, and communication
- b) Maintain the integrity of the EALRs and Components
- c) Modify benchmark indicators to reflect the levels of English proficiency
- d) Check for consistency and articulation across grade bands and proficiency levels
- e) Develop a glossary for ELD Standards
- f) Develop an ELD feedback process

g) Develop training to accompany the release of the ELD Standards

ELD Standards Implementation Plan: During the 2002-2003 fiscal year, the state completed the initial draft of the English Language Development standards. Subsequently the ELD standards became a major focus for professional development across the state.

Operationalizing: Upon completion of the ELD standards, the standards became a major focus for professional development across the state. To ensure that the ELD standards and the accompanying Instructional Guide Templates targeted not only ESL and bilingual educators, the standards were presented at all state-sponsored trainings.

The state adopted a trainer-of-trainer model to capitalize on resources across the state and to build the capacity of districts to provide both local and regional professional development. Professional development is divided into three categories: ELD Standards, Instruction, and Assessment. The training and accompanying training materials provide ESL/Bilingual educators with common training tools to introduce and disseminate the ELD Standards across the state and to prepare educators to provide standards-based instruction to ELLs. The state utilizes teams of ESL/bilingual educators to present the ELD standards at annual OSPI sponsored trainings across the state:

OSPI Summer Institutes: Focus on strategies for developing reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills among all students; develop a strategy for modifying instructions across grade and/or English proficiency level of the student; review current educational research as to the most effective ELL models implemented in schools, as well as strategies to raise capacity within schools in order to accommodate the most effective instructional delivery models.

OSPI January Conferences and our annual Collaboration Conference (Building Linkages for Student Success), are designed to showcase and share innovative practices that invite and inspire cooperation, coordination, and collaboration across schools, neighborhoods, and communities.

Professional State Conferences: These conferences focus on teachers and other school staff who work with students struggling academically due to poverty, limited English proficiency, high mobility, learning disabilities, or limited family involvement. The goal is to provide a wide variety of research-based practices to move students towards reaching the State standards.

---

**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**

A statewide committee developed the English Language Development Standards that address the learning requirements ELL students are expected to know and to be able to demonstrate in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension as required by Section 1111 (b) (1) of the ESEA. The standards are aligned to the Washington Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs). The ELD Standards:

Follow the format of the state's Washington Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs), beginning with a specific academic content standard or "Essential Learning", and then develop student performance expectations by grade span and language proficiency level speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension to ensure alignment to the as required by Section 1111 (b) (1) of the ESEA.

Define five proficiency levels: Beginner, Advanced Beginner, Intermediate, Advanced, and Transitional. The EALRs are scaffolded with the ELD Standards to include what students should be able to do at each language proficiency level within a grade band to meet state academic content and achievement standards.

Develop the standards in Grade bands K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12 to reflect language assessment bands

â€¢ Develop the ELD standards to align with the state's EALRs in reading, writing, and communication

â€¢ Maintain the integrity of the EALRs and Components

â€¢ Modify benchmark indicators to reflect the levels of English proficiency

â€¢ Check for consistency and articulation across grade bands and proficiency levels

â€¢ Develop a glossary for ELD Standards

â€¢ Develop ELD feedback process

â€¢ Develop training to accompany the release of the ELD Standards

During the 2002-2003 fiscal year, the state completed the initial draft of the English Language Development (ELD) standards that are aligned to the state reading, writing, and communication standards. After a review of the feedback from the field, the ELD standards were revised in the Spring of 2004, and released in the Fall of 2004. As the State completed the Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) in reading, writing and communications, the ELD standards were refined to articulate the GLE.

In October 2004, recruited a statewide committee to develop the ELD instructional guide templates that accompany the ELD standards. Because the Washington Assessment of Student Learning requires a high level of reading, the reading ELD standards form the foundation for the ELD instructional templates. The instructional guides integrate the language and vocabulary associated with the content areas into the reading standards and links the ELD Standards to the State's academic content standards.

Upon the completion of this work, the statewide committee developed a training component that integrates the ELD standards and the instructional guides. A State trainer-of-trainer model was instituted as an initial dissemination of the committee's work. The instructional guides, along with their trainer of trainer's efforts, are an effective linkage to the State's content standards.

**1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments**

**1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:**

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

**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:**

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

**STATE RESPONSE**

1. To select an English language proficiency assessment, the state issued an RFP and required vendors to submit an alignment of their assessment to the State's ELD standards. Following the selection of the Stanford English Language Proficiency (SLEP) assessment, a committee of Washington State educators conducted an evaluation of Harcourt's alignment between SELP Form A and the State's ELD standards. The committee identified gaps and recommended augmentation of the SELP form A in the Reading, Writing, and Speaking subtests. To accurately measure the Washington State ELD standards in the Washington Language Proficiency Test (WLPT-II), the items in the Harcourt English language proficiency item bank were reviewed to match the instructional standards for each grade span. The state implemented a full administration of the new (WLPT-II) in school year 2005-06.

~~â€~~ The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;

The state has in place legislation (RCW 28A.180.040) that requires every school district board of directors to:

- a) Make available to each eligible pupil transitional bilingual instruction to achieve competency in English, in accordance with rules of the superintendent of public instruction.
- b) Determine, by administration of an English test approved by the superintendent of public instruction the number of eligible pupils enrolled in the school district at the beginning of a school year and thereafter during the year as necessary in individual cases.
- c) Before the conclusion of each school year, measure each eligible pupil's improvement in learning the English language by means of a test approved by the superintendent of public instruction

~~â€~~ The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;

The 2006 WLPT-II operational test (Form A) was developed for four grade spans (K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12) and in four modalities (Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing (comprehension embedded in the reading and listening subtest)) to assess the English language proficiency of ELL students in kindergarten through grade 12. The test was developed in accordance with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (American Educational Research Association, 1999) and Washington State ELD standards.

The state selected a two-phase process in developing the Washington Language Proficiency Test-II (WLPT-II). Phase one included the use of English Language Proficiency items from the Harcourt item bank and the use of custom items. For the first phase, the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test (SELP) Form A was selected as the foundation for the custom form. Based on identified gaps in the SLEP, Washington teachers were recruited to participate in writing new items that were used to augment the test for the 2006 administration. These items were reviewed by ELD specialist for content and bias before being included in the 2005-06 test administration. After the 2006 administration, the augmentation items were reviewed by a data review committee. Based on the performance

of each item with the Washington ELL students, an augmentation item was included or dropped from the 2006 operational items scored.

â€ Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.).

### Test Development

The 2006 WLPT-II operational test (Form A) was developed for four grade spans (K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12) and in four modalities (Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing with comprehension embedded in the reading and listening subtest) to assess the English language proficiency of ELL students in kindergarten through grade 12. The test was developed in accordance with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (American Educational Research Association, 1999) and Washington State ELD standards.

### Test Specifications by Modality by Grade Span

The WLPT-II modalities of Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, and comprehension are assessed through several different general item types: multiple-choice, constructed-response, short-response, and extended-response items. The total number of items per grade span varies.

### GRADE SPANS NUMBER OF ITEMS

Primary (grade span K-2) 84

Elementary (grade span 3-5) 83

Middle Grades (grade span 6-8) 92

High School (grade span 9-12) 94

Item Development: To create a fully aligned assessment for English language learners for the 2006 test administration, field-tested English language proficiency (ELP) items were used and new items were developed. The ELP item bank includes items developed for the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test (SELP) forms. The 2006 WLPT-II operational test (WLPT-II Form A) was developed from SELP Test Form A. The 2007 WLPT-II (WLPT-II Form B) will be developed from SELP Form B, and the 2008 WLPT-II (WLPT-II Form C) will be developed from SELP Form C.

Item writers who are specialists in the education of English language learners originally submitted items in the bank. Assessment specialists reviewed the items created and in accordance with the item specifications, the assessment specialists ensured the following:

â€ Item soundness

â€ Freedom of item bias

â€ Appropriateness of topic, vocabulary, and language structure for each grade span

â€ Match to the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) standards and individual state ESL standards.

ELL educators rigorously reviewed each test question. Only those test questions judged to be of acceptable quality and fair to students were approved for inclusion in the item bank. The test questions were also sampled in classrooms with ELLs to ensure that the directions were clear and easy-to-follow and reliable indicators of student achievement. Although the tests are challenging for students, the questions, graphics, and stories engage students and reflect the kinds of activities in which they are involved on a daily basis. This helps to assure that the tests will measure the learning of each individual student and provide meaningful information about his or her English language proficiency.



<b>1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State</b>		
<b>2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs</b>		
<b>Language</b>	<b>Number of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>	<b>Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>
1. Spanish	55777	73.00
2. Russian	5364	7.00
3. Ukrainian	3359	4.00
4. Vietnamese	3149	4.00
5. Korean	1807	2.00
6. Somali	1507	2.00
7. Tagalog	1301	2.00
8. Arabic	1201	2.00
9. Punjabi	933	1.00
10. Cambodian	930	1.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

- 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 1.6.3.2.



#### 1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

##### Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

##### Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities
- **# of immigrant subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students  
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
22895	4180	41

##### Comments:

**STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)**

Of the 160 districts that reported Immigrant counts, 60 districts reported an increase in immigrant population. There is a shift in districts with low numbers of ELL students reporting an increase in the immigrant population.

In school year 2004-05, the immigrant population with greater than 300 students arrived from Mexico 9810, Ukraine 2183, Russia 1165, South Korea 941, the Philippines 750, Vietnam 714, China 533, Germany 527, Canada 415, India 399, Japan 335, Somalia 317, Macau 312, Ethiopia 311, and Moldova 302.

In school-year 2005-06, , the immigrant population with greater than 300 students arrived from Mexico 10,215 , Russia 1062, Korea 843, the Philippines 769, China 552, Germany 534, India 492, Canada 426, Japan 361, Moldova 361, and Ethiopia 335.

Immigrant students are concentrated in the urban districts in Western Washington and in the larger districts in Eastern Washington where housing is more affordable.

**1.6.5 Definition of Proficient**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), 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**

The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments; The State recruited English language development specialists to participate in the standard-setting and to make recommendations on performance cut scores for the WLPT-II. A Bookmark approach (Hambleton, 1998; Morgan & Perie, 2004, Mitzel, Lewis, & Green, 2001) was adopted with four standard-setting committees for Primary, Elementary, Middle and High School grade levels setting three cuts on the overall test to distinguish among four performance levels: Beginning/Advanced Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced, and Transitional.

Following standard setting, a vertical articulation session was conducted to review the recommended cut scores and to provide the coherence of the cut scores across all of the grades. The cut scores suggested by the vertical articulation committee and the standard-setting committees were provided for OSPI to make the final decisions on the cut points for the WLPT-II assessment.

The table below outlines the final cut scores adopted by the State for the 2006 administration of the WLPT-II and includes the total raw score, scale score, and theta metric. There are three cut points that differentiate four performance levels.

Grade Raw Score Scale Score Theta

I A T I A T I A T

K 28 58 74 510 566 594 -2.5964 -1.0485 -0.2746

1 36 70 90 527 587 628 -2.1265 -0.4681 0.6652

2 45 79 98 544 604 651 -1.6566 0.0018 1.3009

3 29 63 88 560 619 670 -1.2144 0.4164 1.8261

4 36 71 94 573 634 688 -0.8550 0.8310 2.3236

5 42 77 98 584 645 703 -0.5510 1.1351 2.7382

6 39 74 100 595 654 712 -0.2469 1.3838 2.9870

7 43 79 103 602 663 722 -0.0535 1.6326 3.2634

8 47 82 105 609 669 729 0.1400 1.7984 3.4569

9 40 76 104 614 673 731 0.2782 1.9090 3.5121

10 41 78 105 616 676 734 0.3335 1.9919 3.5951

11 42 78 106 617 676 737 0.3611 1.9919 3.6780

12 42 79 107 617 678 740 0.3611 2.0472 3.7609

Note: I - Intermediate, A - Advanced, T - Transitional

---

**1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), 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**

Because the State has implemented the Washington Language Proficiency-II test that is aligned with the English Development Content Standards, a bridging study was conducted to measure student gain for AMAO-I.

There has been no change to the definition of "making progress", however, because the State implemented the new Washington Language Proficiency Test-II (WLPT-II) during the 2005-06 school year, "making progress" is based on the bridging of the 2004-05 WLPT-I with the WLPT-II that was administered during the 2005-06 school-year. The assessment department conferred with the State's Technical Advisory Committee to explore the best method for bridging the two assessments.

The analysis of both assessment found that the performance level descriptions between the two different tests are comparable and each performance level (levels 1, 2, 3, and 4) in both tests required the same ability. To ensure the bridging demonstrated the most reasonable evidence of student performance on two different assessments the following method was used.

To bridge the two assessments, the State created 8 levels from the original 4 levels. That is Level1, Level2, Level3, and Level4 became 1Low, 1High, 2Low, 2 High, 3Low, 3High, 4Low, 4High.

Level 1 1 low - 1 high

Level 2 2 low - 2 high

Level 3 3 low - 3 high

Level 4 4 low -4 high

Scale scores were used to determine the appropriate level. The median scale score in each level determined the cut for the L/H (Low/High) point.

The 1 through 8 levels for the 2005 (WLPT-I) were compared to the Composite levels 1 through 8 levels in the 2006 (WLPT-II) to determine if growth was made. Any positive change from 2005 to 2006 in level was considered Growth. If the level remained the same or declined, it was considered No Growth.

Eg:

1H, or "2" in the 1 through 8 scale in 2005 changed to 2L or "3" in the 1 through 8 scale in 2006 -- this is considered Growth. (3-2=1, which is positive = Growth)

1H, or "2" in the 1 through 8 scale in 2005 stayed at 1H or "2" in the 1 through 8 scale in 2006 -- this is considered No Growth. (2-2=0, which is no change = No Growth)

1H, or "2" in the 1 through 8 scale in 2005 changed to 1L or "1" in the 1 through 8 scale in 2006 -- this is considered No Growth. 1-2=-1, which is negative = No Growth).

The State has on file all data and documentation of the process used to bridge the 2004-05 WLPT- I to the 2005-06



**1.6.7 Definition of Cohort**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

**STATE RESPONSE**

No changes has been made to the State's definition of Cohort.

**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? Yes

**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	
2005-2006 School Year	% 66.00	# 25024	% 90.00	# 34190	% 35.00	# 3853	% 70.00	# 13929

**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.

All students were evaluated with the same instrument.

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

#### Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

#### TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

#### Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

<b>1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants</b>			
	<b>2005-2006</b>		
	<b>AMAO TARGET</b>	<b>ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS</b>	
	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>MAKING PROGRESS</b>	66.00	17181	90.00
<b>DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS</b>		2553	
<b>ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>	35.00	3853	70.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		23587	

**Explanation of data for Table**

**Check the answer to the following question.**

Are monitored\* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"?  Yes  No

\* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

**1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards**

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

<b>Title III Subgrantee Information</b>	
	<b>2005-2006</b>
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	130
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>making progress</b>	127
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>attaining</b> English proficiency	116
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>AYP</b>	73
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	57
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	111
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	127
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet <b>any</b> AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the <b>State</b> meet <b>all</b> three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

**Comments:**

\* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

**1.6.11** On the following tables for 2005-2006, 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 2005-2006 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	1369	65.80
4	1544	83.50
5	522	58.20
6	402	56.60
7	375	48.80
8	316	63.30
H.S.	534	75.00

**Comments:** 10th grade 534 75%

11th grade 10 32%

12th grade 3 60.0%

**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	1247	60.00
4	911	49.30
5	282	31.40
6	202	28.50
7	259	33.70
8	148	29.70
H.S.	256	71.20

**Comments:** 10th 250 35.1

11th 5 16.1

12th 1 20.0

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

**1.7.1** 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 2006-2007 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
2006-2007 School Year	0

**Comments:**

## 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 2004-2005 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.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	79.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	60.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	85.20
Black, non-Hispanic	68.40
Hispanic	67.40
White, non-Hispanic	82.10
Students with Disabilities	73.10
Limited English Proficient	75.20
Economically Disadvantaged	72.10
Migrant	
Male	76.40
Female	82.40

**Comments:** Graduation data for migrant students are not available in Washington State at this time. The data was not collected for the 2004-05 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.

### 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 2004-2005 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.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	4.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.20
Black, non-Hispanic	6.70
Hispanic	8.00
White, non-Hispanic	4.00
Students with Disabilities	5.40
Limited English Proficient	6.30
Economically Disadvantaged	6.20
Migrant	
Male	5.30
Female	4.10

**Comments:** Dropout data for migrant students are not available in Washington State at this time. The data was not collected for the 2004-05 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.

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

**1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM**

**1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").**

**STATE RESPONSE**

A school year is defined as 180 instructional days as per RCW 28A.150.220(3).

**1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:**

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	280	277
LEAs with Subgrants	16	16

**Comments:** Data from McKinney-Vento funded Educational Service Districts was not included as they do not provide direct service to students.

**1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	679	332
1	826	361
2	830	345
3	818	329
4	743	328
5	677	283
6	700	312
7	681	322
8	710	299
9	870	385
10	641	283
11	652	371
12	784	381

**Comments:**

**1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth**

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>without</b> subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>with</b> subgrants
Shelters	1896	1223
Doubled-up	5239	2041
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	306	248
Hotels/Motels	751	281
Unknown	1147	316

**Comments:** We have reported the numbers provided to us by local districts. The number reported by grade is not an exact match to the number reported by primary nighttime residence due to the way some districts reported their numbers. I have notified my USDE program manager about this issue. 2.20.07

\* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

**1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**

**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	328
1	350
2	336
3	325
4	323
5	270
6	307
7	316
8	292
9	378
10	278
11	358
12	368

**Comments:** Pre-K: 199

Other: 6

**1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children**

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006
139

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths**

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

**Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006**

764

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served**

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

**Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)**

445

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

<b>Educational and school related activities and services</b>	<b>Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services</b>
Special Education (IDEA)	622
English Language Learners (ELL)	314
Gifted and Talented	25
Vocational Education	299

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services**

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

<b>Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program</b>	<b>Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	10
Expedited evaluations	7
Staff professional development and awareness	14
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	15
Transportation	13
Early childhood programs	8
Assistance with participation in school programs	14
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	13
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	14
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	14
Coordination between schools and agencies	16
Counseling	6
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	9
Clothing to meet a school requirement	12
School supplies	14
Referral to other programs and services	14
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	11
Other (optional)	3

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

<b>Barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	5
School selection	5
Transportation	7
School records	4
Immunizations or other medical records	1
Other enrollment issues	4

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)**

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

<b>List other barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Some school secretarial staff needs to be consistent with identification process.	1
Student attendance/parent involvement	1
Transportation costs continue to be a major concern	1

**Comments: Immediate access to food services, communication issues and lack of necessary funding to improve all aspects for this unique population: 1.**



**1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

**Reading Assessment:**

<b>School Grade Levels *</b>	<b>a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)</b>	<b>b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.</b>	<b>c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.</b>
Grade 3	N/A	0	0
Grade 4	Yes	244	148
Grade 5	N/A	0	0
Grade 6	N/A	0	0
Grade 7	Yes	251	76
Grade 8	N/A	0	0
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	188	70
Grade 11	N/A	0	0
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

**Comments:****Mathematics Assessment:**

<b>School Grade Levels *</b>	<b>a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)</b>	<b>b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.</b>	<b>c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.</b>
Grade 3	N/A	0	0
Grade 4	Yes	244	102
Grade 5	N/A	0	0
Grade 6	N/A	0	0
Grade 7	Yes	252	46
Grade 8	N/A	0	0
Grade 9	N/A	0	0
Grade 10	Yes	189	30
Grade 11	N/A	0	0
Grade 12	N/A	0	0

**Comments:**

\* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.