

# 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 2007-08**

**WASHINGTON**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

**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 (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- 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 V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### PART I

Part I of the CSPR 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 the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **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.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

### PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, 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 pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## **GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES**

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. 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 "SY 2007-08 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 SY 2007-08 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 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:  
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

Address:  
P O Box 47200  
Olympia, WA 98504

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Anne Renschler

Telephone: 360-725-6229

Fax: 360-586-3305

e-mail: anne.renschler@k12.wa.us

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

Friday, March 13, 2009, 5:04:05 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008  
5PM EST**

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the NCLB academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reading/Language Arts:

No revisions or changes to the reading content standards were made or planned.

During the 2007 legislative session, the Washington State Legislature required several actions related to review and revision of the state's academic content standards for mathematics and science (SSHB 1906). SSHB 1906 requires the State Board of Education (SBE) to conduct an independent review of the mathematics and science standards and then for OSPI to respond to the recommendations generated from the independent review by revising the K-12 standards.

Math:

In 2008, the Washington Legislature gave authority for approval of the recently revised mathematics standards to the State Board of Education (SBE). In Senate Bill 6534 (SB 6534) the State Board of Education was directed to retain a national consultant to analyze the February 2008 version of revised mathematics standards from OSPI and make specific recommendations for changes needed to finalize the standards. The SBE retained Strategic Teaching, an external consultant, to review the standards and make recommendations for their final revision. The SBE was also directed to review the consultant's report, consult the SBE Mathematics Advisory Panel, hold a public hearing, and direct any subsequent modifications to the consultant's report and recommendations, which were then forwarded to OSPI. OSPI was then required to revise the mathematics standards to conform precisely to the SBE recommendations by July 1, 2008. On April 28, 2008, the SBE approved OSPI's adoption of the mathematics standards for Grades K-8. On July 30, 2008, the SBE approved OSPI's adoption of the mathematics standards for Grades 9-12.

Science:

Second Substitute House Bill 1906 from the 2007 legislative session and SB 6534 of the 2008 legislative session required the SBE to conduct an independent review of the science standards also required that OSPI revise the science standards based on the recommendations adopted by the SBE by December 1, 2008.

With the SBE Independent Review recommendations as a guide (presented to OSPI as final on May, 7, 2008), and in close cooperation with SBE Science Panel and staff, OSPI began the process of revising the science standards in May 2008. An request for proposals was developed and distributed soliciting support for the revision process. All respondents' applications were carefully reviewed by a team of scientists, educators, SBE and OSPI staff. Following the review process, OSPI contracted with Cary I. Sneider, Inc., which is headed by Dr. Cary Sneider, a highly qualified science consultant to assist the state with this work.

In order to gain a broad representation of viewpoints on how the science standards should be revised, a Science Standards Revision Team (SSRT) was established to assist in the revision process. This team consisted of Washington teachers of science, curriculum specialists, assessment specialists, scientists, career and technical education staff, administrators, and community science educators.

A Core Writing Team was retained by Cary I. Sneider, Inc. that consisted of university science educators and scientists from each of the three major science disciplines, a professional with experience developing standards at the state or national level, a math educator who worked on the development of the math standards, and three teachers from the Science Standards Revision Team.

Drafts of the revised standards were shared for public comment and with science stakeholders in Washington State in September and October 2008. Final revisions and edits were made during November 2008.

In December 2008, OSPI will present the revised science standards to SBE and education committees of the Senate and House of Representatives. Pending approval by the legislature, the revised standards will be adopted by the Superintendent of Public Instruction in spring 2009.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)

(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to reading assessments have been taken or are planned.

New math assessments for grades 3-8 are being planned for initial administration in Spring 2010, with standard setting set for Summer 2010.

A new math assessment for High School is being planned for initial administration in Spring 2011, with standard setting set for Summer 2011.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<p>The State Board of Education approved the science standards on 12/10/08. Washington State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science have been approved through ED's peer review process.</p>
---

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State NCLB assessments.

### 1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for NCLB mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with NCLB. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	531,128	521,944	98.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	14,408	13,979	97.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	45,287	44,855	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	29,739	29,056	97.7
Hispanic	78,505	77,232	98.4
White, non-Hispanic	350,597	344,822	98.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	60,496	58,519	96.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	34,026	33,554	98.6
Economically disadvantaged students	207,471	203,780	98.2
Migratory students	12,375	12,147	98.2
Male	272,079	266,949	98.1
Female	258,996	254,979	98.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	25,144	39.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	33,375	52.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,552	7.2

Total	63,071	
-------	--------	--

**Comments: The Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (4,552 students) in Washington State is a Portfolio. For EDEN reporting, we do not include these records. Table 1.2.1 was populated from EDEN reporting (excluding these records), but table 1.2.2 needs to record the participation of these students. The total number of participation for special education students, therefore, does not match between tables 1.2.1 and 1.2.2.**

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	531,275	522,852	98.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	14,442	14,046	97.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	45,127	44,731	99.1
Black, non-Hispanic	29,775	29,160	97.9
Hispanic	78,571	77,390	98.5
White, non-Hispanic	350,777	345,535	98.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	60,533	58,523	96.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	33,741	33,214	98.4
Economically disadvantaged students	207,603	204,151	98.3
Migratory students	12,385	12,166	98.2
Male	272,087	267,241	98.2
Female	259,131	255,595	98.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	28,230	44.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	30,293	48.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,597	7.3
Total	63,120	
<b>Comments: The Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (4,597 students) in Washington State is a Portfolio. For EDEN reporting, we do not include these records. Table 1.2.3 was populated from EDEN reporting (excluding these records), but table 1.2.4 needs to record the participation of these students. The total number of participation for special education students, therefore, does not match between tables 1.2.3 and 1.2.4.</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	227,270	215,529	94.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,028	5,533	91.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	19,337	18,647	96.4
Black, non-Hispanic	12,593	11,592	92.1
Hispanic	31,598	29,670	93.9
White, non-Hispanic	152,625	145,703	95.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	24,172	22,303	92.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,804	11,102	94.1
Economically disadvantaged students	83,128	78,040	93.9
Migratory students	5,197	4,840	93.1
Male	116,482	109,970	94.4
Female	110,743	105,547	95.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	10,168	42.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,135	50.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,737	7.2
Total	24,040	
<b>Comments: The Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (1,737 students) in Washington State is a Portfolio. For EDEN reporting, we do not include these records. Table 1.2.5 was populated from EDEN reporting (excluding these records), but table 1.2.6 needs to record the participation of these students. The total number of participation for special education students, therefore, does not match between tables 1.2.5 and 1.2.6.</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State NCLB assessments.

#### **1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State NCLB assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### **1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### **1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

### 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	74,728	51,396	68.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,054	1,065	51.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,351	4,946	77.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4,233	2,123	50.2
Hispanic	12,334	6,084	49.3
White, non-Hispanic	47,607	35,723	75.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,603	3,566	37.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,689	2,616	34.0
Economically disadvantaged students	32,482	17,716	54.5
Migratory students	1,783	754	42.3
Male	38,329	25,791	67.3
Female	36,399	25,605	70.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	74,543	52,809	70.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,041	1,104	54.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,303	4,825	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,224	2,382	56.4
Hispanic	12,291	6,221	50.6
White, non-Hispanic	47,535	36,732	77.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,494	3,224	34.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,578	2,299	30.3
Economically disadvantaged students	32,368	18,187	56.2
Migratory students	1,774	698	39.3
Male	38,182	25,017	65.5
Female	36,358	27,792	76.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science is not tested at this grade level</b>	i.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	74,642	40,020	53.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,120	691	32.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,453	4,122	63.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4,276	1,334	31.2
Hispanic	11,906	3,715	31.2
White, non-Hispanic	48,072	29,236	60.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,547	1,964	20.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,316	939	14.9
Economically disadvantaged students	31,454	11,508	36.6
Migratory students	1,785	454	25.4
Male	38,184	20,012	52.4
Female	36,458	20,008	54.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	74,639	53,679	71.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,119	1,159	54.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,421	5,016	78.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,276	2,516	58.8
Hispanic	11,920	6,270	52.6
White, non-Hispanic	48,081	37,406	77.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,531	3,087	32.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,265	1,860	29.7
Economically disadvantaged students	31,465	18,163	57.7
Migratory students	1,785	786	44.0
Male	38,145	25,654	67.3
Female	36,494	28,025	76.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science is not tested at this grade level</b>	i.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	74,574	45,566	61.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,050	859	41.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,588	4,713	71.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4,260	1,660	39.0
Hispanic	11,616	4,555	39.2
White, non-Hispanic	48,343	32,806	67.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,209	1,876	20.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,487	1,089	19.8
Economically disadvantaged students	31,087	13,661	43.9
Migratory students	1,847	601	32.5
Male	38,147	22,437	58.8
Female	36,425	23,129	63.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	74,545	56,035	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,047	1,214	59.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,548	5,257	80.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,254	2,617	61.5
Hispanic	11,613	6,552	56.4
White, non-Hispanic	48,373	39,115	80.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,191	2,956	32.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,409	1,614	29.8
Economically disadvantaged students	31,059	19,026	61.3
Migratory students	1,851	881	47.6
Male	38,138	27,588	72.3
Female	36,406	28,447	78.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	74,382	31,824	42.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,038	450	22.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,536	3,290	50.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,248	925	21.8
Hispanic	11,589	2,370	20.5
White, non-Hispanic	48,259	24,108	50.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,189	1,120	12.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,396	318	5.9
Economically disadvantaged students	30,979	7,433	24.0
Migratory students	1,839	268	14.6
Male	38,039	15,038	39.5
Female	36,343	16,786	46.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	73,836	36,309	49.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,053	619	30.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,375	4,044	63.4
Black, non-Hispanic	4,094	1,058	25.8
Hispanic	11,017	2,958	26.8
White, non-Hispanic	48,614	26,859	55.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,352	861	10.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,454	427	9.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29,697	9,300	31.3
Migratory students	1,739	358	20.6
Male	37,798	18,066	47.8
Female	36,037	18,242	50.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	73,769	50,304	68.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,051	1,041	50.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,347	4,930	77.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,083	2,169	53.1
Hispanic	11,006	5,523	50.2
White, non-Hispanic	48,598	35,515	73.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,354	1,753	21.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,405	1,048	23.8
Economically disadvantaged students	29,657	15,827	53.4
Migratory students	1,735	742	42.8
Male	37,749	23,744	62.9
Female	36,018	26,559	73.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science is not tested in this grade level.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	75,317	38,354	50.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,987	643	32.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,366	4,020	63.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,165	1,173	28.2
Hispanic	10,978	2,996	27.3
White, non-Hispanic	50,113	28,676	57.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,896	690	8.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,363	252	7.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28,806	9,104	31.6
Migratory students	1,785	378	21.2
Male	38,419	18,964	49.4
Female	36,896	19,390	52.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	75,256	47,321	62.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,997	888	44.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,336	4,424	69.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,153	1,963	47.3
Hispanic	10,969	4,800	43.8
White, non-Hispanic	50,097	34,182	68.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,904	1,185	15.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,319	388	11.7
Economically disadvantaged students	28,763	13,424	46.7
Migratory students	1,784	642	36.0
Male	38,392	21,912	57.1
Female	36,861	25,407	68.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7**

	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science is not tested at this grade.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	75,143	39,260	52.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,905	633	33.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,419	4,168	64.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4,267	1,209	28.3
Hispanic	10,760	3,264	30.3
White, non-Hispanic	50,275	29,209	58.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,586	633	8.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,394	331	9.8
Economically disadvantaged students	28,073	9,395	33.5
Migratory students	1,751	400	22.8
Male	38,257	19,697	51.5
Female	36,885	19,563	53.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	75,133	49,964	66.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,915	970	50.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,390	4,864	76.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,270	2,276	53.3
Hispanic	10,754	5,669	52.7
White, non-Hispanic	50,286	35,206	70.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,619	1,299	17.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,336	737	22.1
Economically disadvantaged students	28,093	14,815	52.7
Migratory students	1,747	800	45.8
Male	38,251	23,173	60.6
Female	36,881	26,791	72.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	74,881	36,379	48.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,895	553	29.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,372	3,541	55.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,250	1,085	25.5
Hispanic	10,716	2,476	23.1
White, non-Hispanic	50,136	28,014	55.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,574	632	8.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,324	136	4.1
Economically disadvantaged students	27,946	7,871	28.2
Migratory students	1,745	272	15.6
Male	38,117	18,143	47.6
Female	36,762	18,236	49.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	66,622	32,451	48.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,712	507	29.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,525	3,288	59.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,615	807	22.3
Hispanic	8,229	2,125	25.8
White, non-Hispanic	46,241	25,199	54.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,208	441	7.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,818	370	13.1
Economically disadvantaged students	21,078	6,235	29.6
Migratory students	1,418	260	18.3
Male	34,294	17,320	50.5
Female	32,317	15,128	46.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,423	52,916	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,667	1,187	71.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,207	4,523	86.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3,379	2,366	70.0
Hispanic	7,741	5,417	70.0
White, non-Hispanic	44,235	38,482	87.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,166	2,358	38.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,753	1,146	41.6
Economically disadvantaged students	20,058	14,460	72.1
Migratory students	1,351	838	62.0
Male	33,153	26,684	80.5
Female	30,264	26,227	86.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	61,574	25,635	41.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,528	368	24.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,181	2,575	49.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2,993	562	18.8
Hispanic	7,154	1,505	21.0
White, non-Hispanic	43,633	20,213	46.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,468	312	5.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,374	111	4.7
Economically disadvantaged students	18,457	4,421	24.0
Migratory students	1,242	163	13.1
Male	31,546	12,865	40.8
Female	30,018	12,768	42.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

#### 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

##### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	2,113	806	38.1
Districts	296	84	28.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	936	332	35.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	535	135	25.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	401	197	49.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
281	69	24.6
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

## 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	7
Extension of the school year or school day	6
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	5
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	7
<b>Comments: These schools, all of which are Title I, are seen as the schools with the highest need and greatest commitment to the improvement process. Noting that Washington is a voluntary system of improvement, each school must volunteer to participate once they have been identified for improvement. This current school count is a mere fraction of the total number of schools in improvement, as the bulk of identified schools are non-Title I schools (middle and high schools) so are outside of this report.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	3
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	3
<b>Comments: Please note: 0 above means Washington does not have authorizing legislation that permits or give authority at the state level to take over a school as described in the second, third and fourth restructuring actions above.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other major restructuring as reported by schools/districts: Implemented plan to incorporate grades 7-8 staff development with those of the 9-12 schools to more closely align work on math and literacy; Increased intervention opportunities through a tech-based individual's study model that included intensive one-on-one tutoring; Expanded extended day learning opportunities through 21st century program, GEAR-UP and summer school focused math program; Staff development included a focus on math strategies, data driven instruction and effective teaching practices; In house support was provided through coaching; Significantly expanded efforts to reduce absenteeism by students; Continued to implement the restructuring plan developed in the 06-07 school year; Replacement math program for struggling students; Additional resources provided (AVID, instructional coaches, ELL facilitator); Vertical alignment with other district schools - math/reading; Staff development/training -CRISS; LETRS; Homework completion emphasis; Reorganization of master schedule to accommodate implementation of AVID program and delivery of additional math and reading interventions during the school day with strategic and intensive students; ELL program significantly changed from Dual Language model to One-Way Transitional Bilingual Model; Restructured from a 5-8 grade configuration to a 5-6 and 7-8 grade configuration; Restructured in 06-07 from a 3-4 to a 2-4 grade level configuration. This configuration was completed based on overcrowding at the primary grade building; Looking at restructuring how

students are promoted K-12.

#### 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Under the Washington Accountability System and the No Child Left Behind law, school districts are expected to meet the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) performance targets. A district is identified as "needing improvement" when it has not made AYP consistent with NCLB Guidelines in two consecutive years.

As of the 07-08 school year, a total of 30 districts were identified for improvement. Of those 30 districts in improvement status, twenty three received federal funding to support their improvement efforts. In collaboration with an external partner, the Washington Association of School Administrators, training and selection of on-site facilitators assist with the implementation of the overall improvement efforts.

If a district is identified for improvement, the following actions are required.

##### Step One:

Districts in Step One are required to develop or revise a district improvement plan. The plan must be developed or revised no less than three months after being identified for improvement and implemented no later than the beginning of the next school year. The development of the plan must involve parents, school staff, and others.

The district improvement plan must:

1. Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs of the district's school(s), especially the needs of low-achieving students;
2. Define specific measurable achievement goals and targets for each student subgroup;
3. Incorporate strategies grounded in scientifically based research that will strengthen instruction in core academic subjects;
4. Include appropriate student learning activities before school, after school, during the summer, and during any extension of the school year;
5. Provide for high-quality professional development for instructional staff that focuses on improved instruction;
6. Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the district's schools; and
7. Include a determination of why the district's previous plan did not bring about the required increase in student academic achievement.

##### Step Two:

In this step, districts are required to implement the district improvement plan that was developed in Step 1.

The state must continue to ensure the district is provided with technical assistance and must take at least one of the following corrective actions, as consistent with state law:

1. Defer program funds or reduce administrative funds; or
2. Institute and fully implement a new curriculum based on state and local content and academic achievement standards that includes scientifically research-based professional development for all relevant staff.

OSPI Technical Support for District Improvement For 2008-2009 we expect to have districts in four district improvement groupings: (1) New in Step 1; (2) Continuing in Step 1; (3) New in Step 2; and (4) Continuing in Step 2.

The technical assistance provided to districts in improvement status varies to meet the needs of districts either as they are developing their improvement plans or in various stages of implementation of their plans.

Among the most common support are:

A. Providing a School System Resource Guide (SSIRG): OSPI and WASA collaborated in developing a resource planning guide that supports districts as they analyze existing systems, structures, data, research findings, and more as they develop/revise their district improvement plan. A revision to the SSIRG is planned to be completed in 2008-09.

B. Providing a Part-time, External District Improvement Facilitator: District Improvement Facilitators are experienced educators who have been successful in improving student performance and receive continuous training through a partnership with WASA throughout the year. The selection of the facilitator is a collaborative effort between OSPI and each district. The facilitator works to help build the district's capacity to support high quality, data driven, research based district improvement efforts.

C. Providing or Arranging for Professional Development: Additional resources for professional development to expand capacity of district and school personnel to sustain continuous improvement focused on improvement of instruction may be provided to meet the needs of districts.

D. Provide for a District Educational On-Site Review: Districts can request an Educational On-Site Review which would be completed by a

team of peer educators and experts. The district's strengths and challenges are identified and recommendations for improvement are developed and provided to the district.

E. Providing Identified Expertise: Additional resources and expertise OSPI could provide is determined on a case-by-case basis for each district, but could include such support as expertise in working with diverse student populations (e.g., special education, English language F. Providing limited grant money. Districts may apply for two levels of grant support to assist in implementing one or more of the technical assistance opportunities listed A-E above.

We continue to learn from our collective efforts. We know that support from OSPI needs to emphasize internal capacity building in districts. To that end, our support systems and procedures will evolve over time.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	20
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	53
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments: Of the 53 districts supported in their improvement efforts with Federal Title I, 4% Set-aside 1003(a) funds, all participated in the activities outlined in 1.4.5.2 above. There is no authorizing language in Washington Law that enables any other actions to be taken with Districts. At this juncture, the state chooses to support improvement activities without resorting to the potential reduction of federal funds (withholding) that support their most vulnerable students and could potentially impact the students with greatest need.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	12	9
Schools	103	74
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	12/10/08
---	----------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

##### 1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
- Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
- Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
- Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2006-07. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	16,067	15,826
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	4,724	4,830
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	29.4	30.5
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	7,804	7,955
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	48.6	50.3
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	52	
<b>Comments: This data taken from the Washington Report Card data system. The enrollment count date is our October 1, 2008 on the grades tested in each school building receiving funds for SY 2007-08. Our statewide assessment occurs in the spring. [Data is verified and the information we provided is correct.]</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

##### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	7
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	2
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	43
<b>Comments: As proficiency levels increase annually, schools identified for improvement, having the greatest need and volunteering for School Improvement Assistance, will continue to have greater difficulty making adequate yearly progress (AYP), and will have even greater difficulty making AYP for two consecutive years and depart from improvement status.</b>	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
6 = Combo 1	1-4) All aspects listed below are integral parts of the School Improvement Assistance program; 5) Use of an external school-based facilitator/coach has been highly effective, resulting in leadership development, leadership team training and continuity. All support for 07-08 was provided through 1003(a) funds.	52	3	7	A	
6 = Combo 1						
<b>Comments:</b>						

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p> <p>4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies</p>

comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

#### 1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The development and enhancement of a state-wide model for improvement in all schools, for all kids (regardless of improvement status) is the ever emerging goal. The creation of teacher trust and support for improvement at the building level, augmented by district level leadership and support for improvement funding and commensurate activity, has been vital to this voluntary system.

Through Summer institutes and annual Winter conferences, designed to communicate ideas and concrete examples through specific content strands, focused on demonstrated best practices/improvement activities (e.g. data use/development including the four domains of building level demographics, perception, student learning and achievement and contextual; Math and Reading best practices; professional learning community/peer review activities; classroom walk through demonstrations/training; formative and summative assessment tools, etc) has been key to the growing understanding and embracing of the improvement movement.

Districts receive individualized assistance through the provision of external facilitation designed to raise critical questions, promote reflection and enhance goal setting with focused action steps that impact their identified needs. Districts receive training by a host of external partners along with opportunities to engage in peer reviews and regional networking to share ideas and best practices. Districts are encouraged to engage all schools in their improvement efforts to promote systemic change and ground level cultural shifts that impact the individual teacher expectations and further encourage beliefs that all kids can learn and become proficient.

Schools participate through leadership teams and individual leader trainings provided by educational partners, supported by private industry and charitable foundations, that help create an enhanced awareness of techniques that help create an enriched tapestry of educational experiences leading to increased achievement by all kids.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

##### 1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

**Comments: LEA, through assurances and performance agreements, allow the SEA to hold back a portion of the 95% to secure contracts that provide direct services and other training to assist with individualized improvement efforts at the school and district level intended to promote and ensure sustainability beyond the available grant window.**

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The use of 1003(g) funds in 07-08 was limited to the development of a Request for Proposals and subsequent solicitation for third party consultants/partners in the initial development of the five major systemic components (Leadership, Data, Needs Assessment, Instruction and Formative Assessment). Selection of contractors, negotiation of contracts and initial planning meetings were conducted. No activity for this budget in evaluation of technical assistance for 07-08.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A combination of State funds and Foundation funds helped support the ongoing improvement efforts. A focus on non-Title I schools, especially those secondary schools identified for improvement, was supported with similar tools and training opportunities as provided in the regular SIA model, along with a direct content coaching model to help improve graduation rates and reduce the achievement gap for all kids.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

## 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

#### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	54,982
Applied to transfer	613
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	512

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	Yes
<b>Comments: The number 512 is accurate for the number of students that transferred to another school under the Title I PSC provision. The previous number of 54982 represents the number of students that were eligible. (The number of eligible students (35061) that was reported in our original submission of the CSPR did not include data from three of our larger districts.)</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 505,210
<b>Comments: The amount represents the funds set aside for public school choice.</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	46
<b>Comments: Of the 46 schools in Washington that were unable to provide PSC, 8 were districts that had only one school at the particular grade level that was required to offer choice, 24 had all of the schools at a particular grade level in improvement, and the remaining 14 had no parents interested in pursuing the PSC option. Many of the districts that fall into the single school category and the no choice category are remote districts and have no access to neighboring districts.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQs about public school choice:

a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?*

An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.<sup>3</sup>

b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.*

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	36,729
Applied for supplemental educational services	1,304
Received supplemental educational services	940
<b>Comments: ED Facts submitted the wrong information regarding the number of students receiving SES. 940 is the correct number. (The number of eligible students (35130) that was reported in our original submission of the CSPR did not include correct data from one of our larger districts.)</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 878,105
<b>Comments: This amount represents the funds set aside for supplemental educational services.</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

### 1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	133,671	132,031	98.8	1,640	1.2
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	6,416	6,381	99.5	35	0.5
Low-poverty schools	6,094	6,070	99.6	24	0.4
All elementary schools	25,243	25,151	99.6	92	0.4
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	24,163	23,558	97.5	605	2.5
Low-poverty schools	19,293	19,137	99.2	156	0.8
All secondary schools	108,428	106,880	98.6	1,548	1.4
<b>Comments:</b>					

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Washington State counts full-day self-contained classroom as one class.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/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.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded 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]*
- c. *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% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the 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. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *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.*
- f. *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 the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

**1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified**

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.**

	Percentage
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
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	56.0
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	38.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	6.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Alternative Education Program teachers who do not meet HQT requirements -1% Bilingual/ESL Program teachers who do not meet HQT requirements -5%

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
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)	59.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	27.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	14.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Alternative Education Program teachers who do not meet HQT requirements -11% Bilingual/ESL Program teachers who do not meet HQT requirements -2% Juvenile Institution teachers who do not meet HQT requirements -1%

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	60.9	23.1
Poverty metric used	free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	50.0	15.3
Poverty metric used	free and reduced lunch	
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four 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.*
- b. *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 through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

#### Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
No	Two-way immersion	NA
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish/Russian
No	Heritage language	NA
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
No	Content-based ESL	
No	Pull-out ESL	
No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	94,011
<b>Comments:</b> The state has a highly mobile ELL population which accounts for the difference in the number of students served verses the number of students tested during the February/March testing window. All students served regardless of time in program are captured in the LEP data and counted as students served. Of the 94,011 students served, 13,781 or 15% were enrolled for less than 90 school days.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	84,704
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	58,612
Russian	4,633
Vietnamese	3,296
Ukrainian	2,574
Somali	1,901

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	81,691
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,346
Total	85,037
<b>Comments: The state has a highly mobile ELL population which accounts for the difference in the number of students served verses the number of students tested during the February/March testing window. All students served regardless of time in program are captured in the LEP data and counted as students served. Of the 94,011 students served, 13,781 or 15% were enrolled for less than 90 school days. Of the 3,346 students reported as not tested, 2 percent (1,908) did not have a valid test score and were not included in the tested total and 1,438 were not present or enrolled during the testing window. The total number of students tested during the Feb/March testing window and during the May make-up window including those with invalid test scores = 84,517. The number reflected in this table are those reported during the Feb/March testing window. The students count as reported for funding during the February/March Testing window was 80,906.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	14,266
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	16.8
<b>Comments: The Title III proficient number was entered instead of the "ALL" English Proficient students. The percentage reflects the number of all LEP students tested and not on the number targeted to exit as submitted in the CSPR. (Number Targeted to Exit = 18560; 45% Target = 8352; Level 4 = 14266; Percent Proficient = 0.77) The percent of "All" LEP students reaching language proficiency on the State LEP assessment is 77%. Calculations have been checked for 1.6.3.2.2 and are correct as reflected by the number of students targeted to meet the AMAO 1 and 2 determinations for Title III Participants.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	78,509
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,067
Total	81,576
<b>Comments: Of the 3,067 students reported as not tested, 1 percent (1,868) did not have a valid test score and were not included in the tested total. 1,199 were absent or not enrolled during the testing window. The total number of students tested during the Feb/March testing window and during the May make-up window including those with invalid test scores = 84,517. The number reflected in this table are those tested during the Feb/March testing window. The average students count reported for funding during the February/March Testing window was 80,906. The difference between students served and students tested reflects the mobil nature of the ELL population.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

#### Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	45,293	80.0
ELP attainment	13,874	77.0
<b>Comments: Numbers reported are based on the AMAO Cohort targets submitted by the State the Consolidated State Plan. AMAO 1-Progress is calculated based on match student data. Kindergarten students and new to program students with only data point are not included in this calculation. AMAO 2-Attainment is calculated based on the number of students who are scheduled to transition by a determined exit year.</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

#### 1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments: The State does not assess students in their native language.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
NA
<b>Comments: The State does not assess students in their native language.</b>

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
NA
<b>Comments:</b> NAThe State does not assess students in their native language.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
NA
<b>Comments:</b> The State does not assess students in their native language.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

#### 1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

#### **Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
9,938	12,959	22,897
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### **Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
8,215	3,518	42.8	4,697
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
8,178	5,602	68.5	2,576
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,344	1,065	24.5	3,279
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

#### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

**Note: Do not** include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	140
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	77
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	130
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	133
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	85
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	54
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	6
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments: Of the 140 LEA that received Title III funding, 125 (89%) met both AMAO 1 and 2. As the State uniform bar goals increase, meeting the AMAO 3 target creates a greater challenge for students who have not reached proficiency in English.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

**Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each** State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

#### **Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = 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. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).**
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.**

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
15,142	5,799	34

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.**

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	990
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	7,775

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

### 1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

#### **Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
2. **# Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. **Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.**
4. **Total = Number of all participants in PD activities.**

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	83	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	38	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	34	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	15	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	22	
Other (Explain in comment box)	40	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	76	8,761
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	99	2,752
PD provided to principals	62	543
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	55	395
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	72	3,183
PD provided to community based organization personnel	31	777
<b>Total</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>16,411</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Multicultural Education Parent Involvement ELL with Disabilities Dual Language Training Spanish to facilitate communication with parents

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

#### **Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).**
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.**
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.**

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
06/07/07	07/01/07	30
<b>Comments: The issued preliminary funding amount to allow districts to apply before receiving the actual grant award. See steps below.</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the 2007-08 school year, the State implemented a process that:

- Established new timelines and due dates for grant applications and reimbursements.
- Made program applications and preliminary allocation available by May 1st.
- Implemented a substantially approvable status process to allow district to begin

incurring costs as early as July 1st, or any time thereafter, depending upon their needs.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	72.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	48.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	60.6
Hispanic	60.4
White, non-Hispanic	75.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	54.7
Limited English proficient	55.4
Economically disadvantaged	61.9
Migratory students	61.2
Male	69.1
Female	76.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate? 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.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? 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.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	11.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.7
Black, non-Hispanic	8.4
Hispanic	8.1
White, non-Hispanic	4.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7.0
Limited English proficient	8.5
Economically disadvantaged	7.1
Migratory students	7.9
Male	6.2
Female	4.9
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

*What is a dropout? A dropout is 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.*

## 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	266	266
LEAs with subgrants	29	29
Total	295	295
<b>Comments: We had a 100% return rate on our data collection. Some of the grantee districts reported above were members of multi-district consortia and not the lead grantee district.</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

#### 1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	275	252
K	876	408
1	993	515
2	1,064	530
3	985	466
4	963	447
5	921	423
6	846	441
7	807	384
8	809	419
9	990	535
10	829	500
11	790	460
12	1,054	606
Ungraded	66	16
Total	12,268	6,402
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	3,560	1,746
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	7,259	3,810
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	659	368
Hotels/Motels	790	478
Total	12,268	6,402
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	221
K	375
1	470
2	484
3	438
4	416
5	395
6	395
7	358
8	387
9	480
10	454
11	418
12	544
Ungraded	N<10
Total	5,844
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1,135
Migratory children/youth	242
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	802
Limited English proficient students	409
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	12
Expedited evaluations	6
Staff professional development and awareness	24
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	22
Transportation	22
Early childhood programs	11
Assistance with participation in school programs	19
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	14
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	20
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	21
Coordination between schools and agencies	28
Counseling	10
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	13
Clothing to meet a school requirement	18
School supplies	26
Referral to other programs and services	23
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	16
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	3
School Selection	6
Transportation	12
School records	3
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	7

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Responses to "Other" centered on identification. 3 grantees cited "early identification" as a barrier. An additional grantee cited "identification", and a 5th cited "quick identification so students could get supports as early as possible." Another grantee listed "family stability" as a barrier. Finally, one grantee stated: "Food services regulations and state law are unclear on cost. Unfunded mandate."

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for NCLB.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	292	165
4	314	199
5	306	165
6	318	166
7	283	98
8	293	130
High School	525	269
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	297	161
4	327	113
5	307	99
6	317	85
7	285	72
8	297	68
High School	594	95
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

**Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.**

### FAQs on Child Count:

*How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.*

*How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)*

### 1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,113
K	2,136
1	2,359
2	2,264
3	2,114
4	2,091
5	2,138
6	2,012
7	2,088
8	2,043
9	2,302
10	2,019
11	1,603
12	1,469
Ungraded	19
Out-of-school	9,056
Total	36,826
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The difference between 2006-07 (37,375) and 2007-08 (36,826) was less than 10 percent (-1.46%).

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	34
K	288
1	331
2	291
3	319
4	260
5	199
6	200
7	122
8	53
9	186
10	236
11	208
12	121
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,848</b>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 2 summer school count increase of 383 (+15.53%) from 2006-07 student enrollments in Washington State was for a variety of reasons. The elementary grade levels increased to reflect the on-going need local educational agencies have to sustain or accelerate academic growth during summer. There were also more migrant students enrolled in migrant-funded summer programs in grades 9-12 as students continue to access credit-retrieval courses and meet the state high school graduation requirements. While there was an increase between 2006-07 and 2007-08 Category 2 enrollments, the overall percentage of migrant students participating in migrant-funded summer school programs is a relatively small population (7.7 percent) as compared to regular school year. And while the participation for 2007-08 increased, it is still below the 2005-06 enrollment levels. Of the 2,848 migrant students who were enrolled in summer programs, 1,660 were only enrolled in summer and were not enrolled during the regular school year (07-08).

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Migrant Student Information System (MSIS), operated under a contract with the Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program (MEP), maintains a database for the explicit collection of data for students served by Washington State's Migrant Education Program. Records clerks at the local educational agency (LEA) enter information directly into the MSIS via the Internet or by sending their documentation to the Migrant Student Data and Recruitment (MSDR) office for entry into the MSIS. MSDR staff identify and enroll eligible migrant students in non-project districts (districts where migrant student reside, but do not receive program funds) while local school personnel identify and enroll eligible migrant students in project school LEAs (that receive a subgrant). The MSIS also generated these same child counts for the previous reporting period and utilizes the same system to generate Category 1 and 2 counts.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Q: How was child count data collected?

A: Staff at each project LEA are required to report student enrollment and movement information into MSIS once their attendance has been verified. Additionally, most project LEAs report immunization, assessment, and credit accrual information. For those students attending non-project districts, staff at the MSDR office enter their mobility and enrollment information into MSIS after their attendance has been verified. All LEAs have secured Internet access to the MSIS allowing for immediate data collection once students are identified as qualifying for the MEP. In addition, program staff conduct on-going (active) Identification and Recruitment to locate eligible families throughout the enrollment period (September 1 -August 31).

Q: What data were collected?

A: If the student is newly identified as being eligible for the MEP, a Certificate of Eligibility is completed. The certificate contains student data, parent data, qualifying move data and school enrollment information, all of which is entered into MSIS.

The student data includes the names of eligible children, gender, birth data, birth verification, multiple birth information, race, and birth place (city, state, country). The parent data includes Father/Guardian, Mother/Guardian, birth mother's maiden name, street address, mailing address (if different), city, state, zip, phone number, and home language. The qualifying move data includes whether the child moved with or to join a parent/guardian or moved on his/her own, the relationship of the student/s to the qualifying worker, the name of the qualifying worker, from (city, municipio, state, country), to city and state, qualifying activity and crop, whether the move was agricultural or fishing related, and the qualifying arrival date. The school enrollment information includes the name of the school district, building, enrollment date, grade level, academic and assessment information (where applicable), and health information.

If the student was not new to the MSIS or to the LEA and had an eligible qualifying move within the previous 36 months, then an enrollment is processed for the student. The enrollment contained the student unique ID number, student name, district ID, building ID, enrollment date, and grade level. All newly-identified migrant children and/or their parent/guardian are interviewed face-to-face by a home visitor/recruiter before the child is deemed eligible for the MEP and before the child is enrolled in the MSDR database.

Q: What activities are conducted to collect the data?

A: At the beginning of every school year, LEA records clerks are asked to enroll their returning students by completing a preprinted form in MSIS containing a list of the previous year's students. Identification and Recruitment state and local staff are also interviewing and enrolling eligible migrant students on an on-going basis throughout the enrollment period (September 1-August 31).The state's migrant student database system allows authorized program managers and staff an opportunity to review enrollment efforts on a continuous basis and map local and state trends as needed. At the end of the Category 1 and Category 2 enrollment periods, a final report is provided to the state for reporting and analyzing purposes.

Records clerks in Washington State enroll migrant students in the MSIS via the Internet after receiving confirmation from the home visitor/recruiter that the student was physically residing within their district boundaries. For every new student a COE is completed and the student is enrolled in the MSIS. For other eligible students that are still eligible under the 36-month eligibility period, an enrollment is processed using the existing COE data. If these students make a more recent qualifying move, then a new COE is completed and the qualifying arrival date is updated in the MSIS database. Students are only included on this form if they have made a qualifying move within the last three years and if they are eligible to receive MEP funded services. The form is preprinted by the MSDR office and only MEP eligible students under the 36-month eligibility criteria will appear on this form. All students whose 36-month eligibility has ended are automatically terminated in the MSIS and will not appear on this enrollment form. If a student is incorrectly enrolled, LEA staff notifies MSDR support staff and request a deletion of the incorrect enrollment. That enrollment record is then completely deleted from the MSIS.

Q: When were data collect for use in the student information system?

A: Throughout the year, if new students are identified or if students leave and subsequently return to the LEA, records clerks process these enrollments as they occur.

Student identification and enrollment data is collected throughout the school year by LEA records clerks, if students are identified as residing within their school district boundaries. School districts operating a summer migrant program process (during their summer program) an enrollment in the MSIS for those students attending summer school.

Data for Category 2 counts is collected and maintained utilizing the same procedures as Category 1.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for

child

count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data is inputted into the student information system for child count purposes by the local educational agency's records clerk who

processes all enrollments directly into the MSIS SQL database through online MSDR web pages throughout the enrollment period

School district staff may update enrollments by accessing and updating the specific record directly through the Internet or by mailing data to the MSDR Office. Updates occur when a migrant student is new to the local district, has made a more-recent qualifying move, or has changes to the data collection components listed in Part 1 of this Section.

Data is organized by designating a unique student identification number. When an enrollment is processed, it is tied to the student ID number, thus making it possible to query the MSIS database for a specific number of students who had an enrollment during a specified time frame. Data may be sorted for state reporting and management purposes utilizing the unique student ID number and the various data elements collected.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count is collected using the same system and procedures as the Category 1 count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Q: How is each child count calculated for ...

\*Children who were between age 3 and 21;

\*Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);

Category 1: The Category 1 count is an amalgamation of two student datasets \*The first dataset is comprised of students between the ages of 3 and 21 who have a qualifying move within 36 months of their school enrollment date. Calculations based on the enrollment date, birth date and qualifying arrival date fields ensure only those students enrolled and eligible for this reporting period are counted. \*The second dataset is comprised of students between the ages of 3 and 21 who were identified by LEA or MSDR staff as having made a qualifying move into and resided within the State during the child count reporting period, but were not enrolled by any LEA during the same period. These are considered out-of-school students. Once their presence in a local education agency was verified, an out-of-school enrollment was processed for this reporting period. \*When a child who has been enrolled as a two-year-old turns three (3) and becomes eligible, she/he will appear on a "Students Turning Three" report available to LEAs through the Migrant Student Information System. LEAs then verify that the students on the list are still residing within their district, and after the verification process is complete, an enrollment is processed for each resident three year old child. At no time is a two-year-old automatically enrolled as a three-year-old. \*When a student graduates from school, their LEA will process a withdrawal for that student in MSIS as well as enter a termination code indicating that the child has been terminated due to graduation.

Category 2 \*The only summer services for which a child is counted are those that are funded in whole or part with MEP during the summer term. \*All student graduates of the regular school year are terminated upon graduation from high school and are no longer eligible for MEP service. Since these students are terminated from the database, they are not counted for the summer Category 2 report. \*All students that end their eligibility and are still attending school and being served with MEP funds are withdrawn from eligible status and enrolled in an end-of-eligibility (EOE) status and are eligible for services until the end of the term, including summer school, but are not counted in the Category 2 count. Secondary students who are being served through credit accrual only and are in the EOE status and may be served, but are not included in the Category 2 count. The EOE status is only used to count those students that receive services under the "Continuation of Services" provision and are included in the Consolidated State Performance Report Part II.

\*The query used to extract students for Category 2 purposes uses a birth date factor of 3-21 year olds only -when a child turns three years of age, an enrollment is processed in the MSDR after verifying that the child is still residing within the district.

\*Students whose eligibility has expired during the regular school year are not included in Category 2 counts. These students can only be enrolled in the MSDR using the EOE status and are excluded from the Category 2 count.

\*Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);

If the local educational agency processed an enrollment for a student during the reporting period, and the student made a qualifying move within 36 months of the reporting period, the student was counted. Using an out-of-school ID, LEAs enroll in the MSIS all students residing in their districts who are MEP eligible and not attending school. (It should be noted that local educational agencies receive monthly building lists or may view via the Internet student enrollments to ensure only students who were residing in their school district are actually enrolled. In addition, in order for a student move to be a qualifying move, the student must have resided in the destination at which qualifying employment was sought for at least 48 hours.)

\*Children who, in the case of Category 2, received a MEP funded service during the summer or inter-session term;

All children enrolled in summer/intersession programs that received a MEP funded service were counted. Only those students that are enrolled in a migrant summer school (funded in whole or in part with MEP funds) are counted in the Category 2 count. Records clerks are required to report which migrant students are receiving migrant funded services into the MSIS. All our MEP summer schools start after the end of the spring term and end before the start of the fall term. End-of-Year Summer Reports of migrant students served in summer programs are reviewed by MEP staff. State staff reviews the report to ensure they are within the size and scope of the approved application submitted and that the information on student services was reported to MSIS. On-site reviews of summer projects by MEP staff specifically include verifying eligibility of migrant students.

\*Children once per age/grade level for each child count category; Using the unique student ID number, a computer-generated program allows MSDR staff to prepare a statewide student-count report which contains the statewide student total of all eligible migrant students identified and enrolled in the MSDR during the eligible period. A manual quality control process is also in place to ensure that students who may have more than one ID number are merged into one record. A query is run to extract a list of students that have possible matches of the following information: student's first name, last name, parent information, birth date, birth city, state and country. If the student has enough matching information, a manual review of the student list is done and the data is merged into one record with the other records being deleted. All staff that is involved in creating and updating these records is contacted to ensure that the record kept is the one to be used for all future reporting of data. By using a unique student ID for each migrant student, the system ensures that a student is counted only once, regardless of the number of enrollments the student may have generated throughout the year.

Q: How are individual records organized into a dataset (i.e., by grade, OSY, COS, etc.)?

Based on the data elements collected for each record created for an enrolled migrant student datasets can be queried and reports created for various groups of migrant students including Out-of-School Youth and Continuation of Services.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 2 is collected using the same system as Category 1.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All educational staff responsible for making eligibility determinations are trained by state MSDR staff to make eligibility determinations of migrant students and how to accurately complete COEs. All new home visitors are trained by MSDR staff on eligibility criteria, eligibility rulings, finding the migrant families, and COE completion. In addition to the new home visitor training, training is available at our state MEP conference and at our regional network meetings, and additional one-to-one basis depending on need. In addition, technical assistance is provided over the phone or via email throughout the year as needed. LEA and other agency staff complete and submit all COEs to the MSDR office. State MEP staff review COEs as submitted to their office for accuracy and verify students meet MEP eligibility criteria. State MSDR staff complete COEs in many areas of the state. Their COEs are reviewed by other MSDR staff for accuracy and to verify students meet MEP eligibility criteria. Only those students whose names have been included on the COE may be enrolled in MSIS. Each year, a random sampling is done of all students enrolled in the MSIS, including those families identified by MSDR staff. This listing of families is then contacted for re-interviews by a third party consultant who has been trained on MEP eligibility criteria. The consultant reviews the COEs for these families and reports their findings to the staff MEP state staff.

In addition, the following are practices that our state uses to ensure the proper identification or verification of the eligibility of each child included in the child count:

\*The SEA has a standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form and process that is used statewide.

\*Student eligibility is based on a personal face-to-face interview with a parent, guardian or other responsible adult.

\*All COEs are reviewed by MSDR staff to ensure accuracy. Incomplete or otherwise questionable ones are returned to the local educational agency home visitor/recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification. A listing of commonly found

errors and guidance for reducing the errors is created by MSDR and distributed to local school districts to provide additional assistance.

These commonly found errors are also highlighted in the MSDR newsletter and used as examples in statewide trainings.

\*The SEA provides recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook) that is updated periodically based on eligibility clarifications or additional guidance from the Office of Migrant Education as well as the federal register (non-regulatory guidance).

\*SEA staff reviews student attendance, enrollment, days enrolled, days present and withdrawal date at summer/inter-session projects.

\*The SEA has both local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions.

\*The SEA periodically evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revises the procedures.

\*Written procedures are provided to summer/inter-session personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data.

\*Records/data entry personnel are provided training at least annually on how to review summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for childcount purposes.

\*State level recruiters each have randomly selected COEs reviewed for accuracy and validity.

\*Randomly selected COEs are further examined by the Quality Assurance Coordinator, and the families re-interviewed to certify valid identification and eligibility standards are met.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the reporting period, half of the LEA home visitors or recruiters who completed a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) had COEs reviewed by a third party re-interviewer through an on-site family interview. In the coming year, the other half of the LEAs will be re-interviewed.

Utilizing a random COE selection feature on MSIS, the re-interviewer (a veteran recruiter of over 20 years experience in ID&R) selected COEs completed within the past 30 days for every LEA home visitor or recruiter to be reviewed. Approximately 65 home visitors/recruiters had their COEs reviewed. At least three COEs were selected for every home visitor or recruiter, with the first two selected as the primary re-interview families. If, for any unexpected reason, one of the two primary families was unavailable, the third family selected was re-interviewed. The re-interviewer used a standard re-interview instrument which verified the eligibility criteria of the Migrant Education Program.

Of the approximately 7,625 COE completed during the reporting period, a total of 136 COEs were selected for review through a third party with 128 COEs being found eligible. All COE data and associated enrollments for the families found to be in-eligible were deleted from the MSIS.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEA staff have the ability to view their enrollments through the MSIS building list report. This allows them to verify enrollments (by building Student record merges are conducted only by staff within the MSDR office. All members of the MSDR staff who undertake this activity collectively have over 35 years of MSIS data consolidating experience. As all data collected via the MSIS is student focused, staff ensures students have only one record by running a Merge Report which queries the system pulling out students whose data is very similar. Any student records that need to be combined are then merged into one record and the second record is archived and completely independent from other valid records.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED? The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the months of January, February, and May, state staff contact LOAs receiving migrant to review reporting practices and confirm accuracy of submitted data. Any students who were incorrectly identified as being eligible for services are deleted from the Migrant Student Information System. A hard copy of the COE found to be ineligible is filed with supporting notations. In addition, per the ED approved consolidated federal program four-year monitoring cycle, the State Educational Agency conducts a consolidated program review of the required compliance items for the Migrant Education Program and reviews a sampling of Certificates of Eligibility to ensure they are completely accurately and that local school district listings of migrant students served matches those listed in the MSIS database. This activity is carried out to ensure enrollments are correctly processed. In addition, state staff compare the approved school district grant application to MSIS produced End-of-Year reports to ensure the district is implementing and serving migrant students within the size and scope of the approved application. State office staff also compare reported numbers with previous reported numbers, and rectify counts or ensure reasons for the changes. If any discrepancies occur, state staff follow-up with the LEA.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MSDR has implemented a third party review practice as part of its Standard Operating Procedures and strongly encourages the local district home visitors/recruiters to accompany the reviewer on such reviews as a way to ensure accuracy and consistency in the interview and eligibility process. In addition, MSDR will incorporate additional interviewing scenarios into the home visitor/recruiter training activities to assist recruitment staff with eligibility determinations as commonly occurring errors are identified. The trainings will note how the error occurred and how it should be corrected. This information is also shared through the regularly distributed newsletter and as part of the statewide trainings (e.g., annual conference and spring academies).

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on

which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Washington State does not have any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.