

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 2008-09

WASHINGTON



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010

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) 2008-09 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 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, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

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 12, 2010, 2:34:35 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Reading/Language Arts:

No revisions or changes to the reading content standards were made. For the 2009-10 year, the state will be reviewing its reading/language arts standards for potential revision according to its revision timeline. This review will be done in close connection with consideration of the new Common Core Standards Initiative led by CCSSO and the NGA in the areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics. It is likely that changes to our reading standards will occur in the coming year.

Mathematics and Science

Standards for both areas have been revised and approved by the Washington State Board of Education.

Mathematics:

Extensive revision of the state's mathematics standards occurred starting in October 2007, with their final adoption in July 2008, no subsequent revisions or changes to content standards took place this year. The state is carefully considering the new Common Core Standards Initiative led by CCSSO and the NGA in the areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics in light of this recent revision and in the context of national progression toward common standards and assessments. While it is likely there may be changes to our mathematics standards in the coming year, we are hopeful the change will not be significant.

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 therecommendations 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. A 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 presented the revised science standards to SBE and education committees of the Senate and House of Representatives per the guiding legislation. OSPI formally

adopted the revised K-12 Science Standards following the 2009 legislative session in June 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.

1.1.2 Revisions required by state legislation will be implemented in grades 3-8 and 10 reading, and in grade 10 mathematics. The revisions are to test design to "revise the number of open-ended questions and extended responses in the statewide achievement assessment in grades 3-8 and 10 to reduce the cost and time of administering the assessment while retaining validity and reliability of the assessment and retaining assessment of critical thinking skills". The state has planned several comparability studies to analyze the test-to-standard alignment and to ensure scale consistency. The study designs have been reviewed and will be monitored by the National Technical Advisory Committee; a resubmission for peer review is anticipated in November 2010.

New math assessments for grades 3-8 which aligned to new math content standards are being planned for initial administration in Spring 2010, with standard setting set for Summer 2010.

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 4,000 characters.

1.1.4 Revisions required by state legislation will be implemented in grades 5, 8 and 10 science. The revisions are to test design to "revise the number of open-ended questions and extended responses in the statewide achievement assessment in grades 5, 8 and 10 to reduce the cost and time of administering the assessment while retaining validity and reliability of the assessment and retaining assessment of critical thinking skills". The state has planned several comparability studies to analyze the test-to-standard alignment and to ensure scale consistency. The study designs have been reviewed and will be monitored by the National Technical Advisory Committee; a resubmission for peer review is anticipated in November 2010.

New science assessments for grades 5, 8 and 10 which aligned to new science content standards are being planned for initial administration in Spring 2010, with standard setting set for Summer 2010.

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 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 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 ESEA. 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. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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	581,914	559,045	96.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	15,795	14,849	94.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	50,118		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	33,328	31,637	94.9
Hispanic	90,052	86,380	95.9
White, non-Hispanic	374,289	360,729	96.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	70,090	62,778	89.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	37,632	36,238	96.3
Economically disadvantaged students	241,562	231,244	95.7
Migratory students	13,749	13,075	95.1
Male	298,198	285,145	95.6
Female	283,548	273,862	96.6

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. 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(IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	27,031	45.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	32,503	54.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	59,534	

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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 reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	584,642		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	15,900	15,192	95.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	50,102		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	33,610	32,385	96.4
Hispanic	90,517		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	376,162		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	71,560	64,080	89.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	37,571		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	242,981	235,366	96.9
Migratory students	13,807		>97%
Male	299,483	289,264	96.6
Female	284,989		>97%

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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 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 (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	32,529	54.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27,124	45.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	59,653	

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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 science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	277,466	219,722	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,745	5,592	72.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	23,597	19,359	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	16,497	11,691	70.9
Hispanic	41,574	31,352	75.4
White, non-Hispanic	179,959	146,014	81.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,238	22,495	67.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,023	10,816	72.0
Economically disadvantaged students	108,778	83,395	76.7
Migratory students	6,552	4,716	72.0
Male	142,129	111,801	78.7
Female	135,214	107,911	79.8

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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

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 science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	10,944	49.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	11,289	50.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	22,233	

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State 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, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). 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.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,750	50,425	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,965	952	48.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,534	4,853	74.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,103	1,882	45.9
Hispanic	12,669	5,614	44.3
White, non-Hispanic	47,165	34,909	74.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,778	3,490	35.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,477	2,123	28.4
Economically disadvantaged students	34,514	17,874	51.8
Migratory students	1,846	670	36.3
Male	38,678	25,605	66.2
Female	37,066	24,818	67.0

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,635	53,971	71.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,954	1,074	55.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,514	5,128	78.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,098	2,259	55.1
Hispanic	12,650	6,609	52.2
White, non-Hispanic	47,116	36,452	77.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,703	3,309	34.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,433	2,431	32.7
Economically disadvantaged students	34,465	19,948	57.9
Migratory students	1,843	790	42.9
Male	38,595	25,940	67.2
Female	37,037	28,029	75.7

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: This is not a tested subject for 3rd grad e in Washington State.

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.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,698	39,694	52.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,049	690	33.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,496	4,134	63.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,330	1,296	29.9
Hispanic	12,510	3,659	29.2
White, non-Hispanic	47,762	28,602	59.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,963	2,065	20.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,571	921	14.0
Economically disadvantaged students	34,145	12,228	35.8
Migratory students	1,829	399	21.8
Male	38,848	20,149	51.9
Female	36,850	19,545	53.0

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,646	54,951	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,045	1,196	58.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,472	5,090	78.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,329	2,499	57.7
Hispanic	12,504	6,767	54.1
White, non-Hispanic	47,745	37,504	78.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,914	3,223	32.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,531	1,918	29.4
Economically disadvantaged students	34,115	20,342	59.6
Migratory students	1,827	821	44.9
Male	38,788	26,578	68.5
Female	36,854	28,372	77.0

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: This is not a tested subject for _____ e in Washington State. 4th grad			

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.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,648	46,958	62.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,136	866	40.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,625	4,724	71.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,279	1,835	42.9
Hispanic	12,210	4,744	38.8
White, non-Hispanic	48,220	33,505	69.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,320	2,040	21.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,492	955	17.4
Economically disadvantaged students	32,992	15,067	45.7
Migratory students	1,763	518	29.4
Male	38,735	23,759	61.3
Female	36,910	23,198	62.8
Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).			

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 collection tool.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,595	55,634	73.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,134	1,171	54.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,589	5,233	79.4
Black, non-Hispanic	4,280	2,566	60.0
Hispanic	12,199	6,638	54.4
White, non-Hispanic	48,214	38,449	79.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,282	2,879	31.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,439	1,402	25.8
Economically disadvantaged students	32,970	19,737	59.9
Migratory students	1,761	787	44.7
Male	38,700	27,776	71.8
Female	36,890	27,854	75.5

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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 collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,514	33,884	44.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,126	519	24.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,584	3,466	52.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,270	1,045	24.5
Hispanic	12,189	2,733	22.4
White, non-Hispanic	48,173	25,210	52.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,285	1,263	13.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,445	396	7.3
Economically disadvantaged students	32,931	9,109	27.7
Migratory students	1,764	266	15.1
Male	38,680	16,567	42.8
Female	36,829	17,316	47.0

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74,952	38,389	51.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,022	625	30.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,632	4,262	64.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,167	1,201	28.8
Hispanic	11,840	3,275	27.7
White, non-Hispanic	48,251	28,069	58.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,638	1,016	11.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,792	497	10.4
Economically disadvantaged students	32,178	10,606	33.0
Migratory students	1,815	351	19.3
Male	38,326	19,514	50.9
Female	36,621	18,874	51.5

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74,940	53,624	71.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,022	1,097	54.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,615	5,265	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,181	2,447	58.5
Hispanic	11,836	6,662	56.3
White, non-Hispanic	48,249	36,725	76.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,643	2,025	23.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,765	1,368	28.7
Economically disadvantaged students	32,167	18,815	58.5
Migratory students	1,811	902	49.8
Male	38,322	25,388	66.2
Female	36,615	28,235	77.1

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: This is not a tested subject for 6th grad e in Washington State.			

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.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74,484	38,962	52.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,987	645	32.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,516	4,289	65.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,077	1,154	28.3
Hispanic	11,149	3,291	29.5
White, non-Hispanic	48,694	28,574	58.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,986	773	9.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,632	349	9.6
Economically disadvantaged students	30,619	10,450	34.1
Migratory students	1,667	411	24.7
Male	38,142	19,727	51.7
Female	36,336	19,233	52.9
Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).			

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 collection tool.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74,341	44,038	59.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,988	821	41.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,484	4,510	69.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,073	1,727	42.4
Hispanic	11,116	4,565	41.1
White, non-Hispanic	48,617	31,254	64.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,967	1,043	13.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,573	403	11.3
Economically disadvantaged students	30,567	13,367	43.7
Migratory students	1,655	568	34.3
Male	38,039	19,924	52.4
Female	36,294	24,110	66.4

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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 collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: This is not a tested subject for 7th grad e in Washington State.

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.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,660	38,908	51.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,918	614	32.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,559	4,170	63.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,157	1,121	27.0
Hispanic	11,066	3,241	29.3
White, non-Hispanic	50,014	28,814	57.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,629	637	8.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,178	353	11.1
Economically disadvantaged students	29,435	9,872	33.5
Migratory students	1,701	412	24.2
Male	38,632	19,785	51.2
Female	37,025	19,123	51.6

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,650	51,363	67.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,923	960	49.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,516	4,984	76.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4,163	2,303	55.3
Hispanic	11,084	5,865	52.9
White, non-Hispanic	50,017	35,934	71.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,646	1,369	17.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,138	624	19.9
Economically disadvantaged students	29,434	15,905	54.0
Migratory students	1,709	784	45.9
Male	38,639	23,983	62.1
Female	37,010	27,380	74.0

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,485	38,931	51.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,909	565	29.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,524	3,871	59.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,144	1,173	28.3
Hispanic	11,027	2,779	25.2
White, non-Hispanic	49,943	29,540	59.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,593	720	9.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,125	169	5.4
Economically disadvantaged students	29,302	9,345	31.9
Migratory students	1,690	295	17.5
Male	38,529	19,160	49.7
Female	36,954	19,771	53.5

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,644	25,306	41.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,511	341	22.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,097	2,600	51.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,449	653	18.9
Hispanic	8,412	1,748	20.8
White, non-Hispanic	41,602	19,404	46.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,119	331	5.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,539	199	7.8
Economically disadvantaged students	21,387	5,205	24.3
Migratory students	1,351	193	14.3
Male	31,471	13,259	42.1
Female	30,158	12,046	39.9

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	55,679	44,552	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,400	939	67.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,576	3,803	83.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3,004	1,993	66.3
Hispanic	7,517	5,133	68.3
White, non-Hispanic	37,795	31,629	83.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,087	2,059	33.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,531	882	34.8
Economically disadvantaged students	19,468	13,244	68.0
Migratory students	1,260	721	57.2
Male	29,331	22,372	76.3
Female	26,337	22,171	84.2

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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 collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64,018	29,115	45.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,430	358	25.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,917	3,040	51.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,049	699	22.9
Hispanic	7,717	1,813	23.5
White, non-Hispanic	44,406	22,575	50.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,344	341	6.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,193	73	3.3
Economically disadvantaged students	19,705	5,350	27.2
Migratory students	1,203	171	14.2
Male	32,361	14,120	43.6
Female	31,654	14,995	47.4

Comments: Washington's Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards (WAAS-Portfolio) data was not accurately aggregated and reported through EDEN for 2008-2009 for CSPR Part 1 -window 1. In an attempt to correct this discrepancy during CSPR Part 1 -window 2, we believe that we have caused other discrepancies between the Participation (1.2) and Student Academic Achievement (1.3) sections in CSPR. The data in section 1.3 for students assigned a level is more reflective of Washington's participation in the state assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. We are unable to determine what caused the discrepancy in the Participation (1.2) section. This also affects the other 2008-2009 CSPR cells for participation (All Students, racial breakdowns, etc.).

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.

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 public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	2,108	880	41.8
Districts	296	91	30.7
Comments:			

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 2008-09 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 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	923	358	38.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	536	149	27.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	387	209	54.0
Comments:			

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 2008-09. 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 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
282	78	27.7
Comments:		

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School 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 <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û 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.

¹ 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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	30
Extension of the school year or school day	14
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	4
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	14
Replacement of the principal	11
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	14
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	24
Comments:	

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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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)	15
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	3
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	32
Comments:	

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.

Adams ES:
 • Increased building administration supervision due to realignment of chain of command of Central Office supervisor/evaluator in charge of elementary administrators.
 African American Acd and Aki Kurose MS:
 Required implementation of new research-based curriculum/instructional program.
 • Restructuring the internal organization of the school.
 Artz Fox ES:
 Teachers were reconfigured to meet student needs identified by data.
 Realigned PD to focus on research based best practices.
 Refocused PLCs to be strategically focused on student data & next steps in our practice.
 Coaching cycles have been developed to support teachers in their implementation of data driven differentiated instruction.
 Launched peer observations to improve individual teacher capacity & classroom instruction.
 Implemented a new math curriculum that is state identified as highly correlated to the Math Standards.
 • Staff/new principal have initiated 4 Task Force Teams to focus on the following; Calendar, Discipline, Parent & Technology.
 Barge-Lincoln ES
 • See Adams ES
 Cascade MS:
 New district-wide accountability system outlines support & expectations for all schools including those in Steps 3,4,5.
 Math and literacy frameworks.
 Increased supervision.
 Additional support such as Assistant Principal & Educational Assistant.
 Additional content coaching & professional development.
 • Priority access to data.

Davis HS

See Adams ES

- Changed administration & reorganized building level responsibilities.

Eisenhower HS:

- See Davis HS

Ellen Ochoa MS:

Use of SIA funds to hire additional certified literacy support.

Alignment of SIP with DIP.

P.D. for administrators.

- Literacy & Math Coaches.

Franklin MS:

- See Davis HS

Gault MS:

- School Closed

Granger HS:

5th grade has moved from self contained classrooms to transition.

The 7th grade teaching schedule has been re-aligned to better suit the strengths of teachers.

The Instructional Coaches are working with GMS teachers on a one/one basis.

The principal and vice principal complete walk throughs on a daily basis.

The principal and vice principal are receiving professional development in PLCs & are leading the staff in this effort.

- The counselor was replaced and Navigation 101 curriculum implemented 5th-8th grades.

Jason Lee MS:

- Continued and expansion of AVID Program.

Lewis & Clark MS:

- See Davis HS

McFarland MS:

School Improve Facilitator; Principal Mentoring through Summit HYS training, Classroom Walkthrough Training, Time Management Strategies, & Supervision and Evaluation.

- Increased administrative requirements for Professional Development on High Yield Strategies, Classroom Walkthroughs, & ELL strategies, completing & reporting classroom walkthroughs, revision of SIP to match District Improvement Plan, & staff monitoring of CWT data for use of HYS on staff.

McIlvaigh MS:

- School Closed

M L King, Jr. ES:

- See Adams ES

Mt. Adams MS:

Implements PLC's & building learning teams.

Implemented a series of action steps that included smart goals & strategies to achieve the goals.

Provided multiple interventions including after school & extended year learning opportunities.

Developed/implemented a parent involvement program that included the opportunity for extensive parental support.

Established 7-12 curriculum committees using PLC model.

Provided extensive/comprehensive staff development opportunities for all of the staff.

7-12 staff participates as members of the district SUMMIT team, do classroom walk-through, peer coach & provide leadership in the alignment of curriculum to state standards.

- The schools have moved from a top down model to one that reflects shared governance. Instructional staff are playing a greater part in all aspects of leadership in the implementation of the district's mission "Continuous Student Learning.

Mt. Baker MS:

Principal evaluation criteria re-prioritized

Coaching provided by Technical Assistance Consultant Principal

Instructional strategy implementation monitored by district/school admin. staff.

Redefinition of roles of targeted certificated staff providing capacity for add. instructional coaching positions.

School Improvement Action Plan developed based upon District and School Needs Assessment completed by outside experts.

School Improvement Action Plan developed & approved in conjunction with state, district & school staff.

School/District level data provided by outside experts Center for Educational Effect.

Instructional time in math and reading provided for targeted students during the school day.

Instructional time in math & reading provided before & after school & during the summer.

Contract with outside expertise through Summit School Improvement grant to advise school -Assignment of Technical Assistance coordinator.

Mandatory alignment of School Improvement Plan Goals with District Improvement Plan.

Additional FET in Administration for Dean of Students; Additional counselor with focus on ELL; School Improvement Facilitator;

Principal

Mentoring through Summit HYS training, Classroom Walkthrough Training, Time Management Strategies, and Supervision/ Evaluation.

Increased administrative requirements for participation in required PD on High Yield Strategies, Classroom Walkthroughs, and ELL strategies, revision of SIP to match District improvement plan, & monitoring of CWT data for use of HYS on staff.

Pasco HS:

Alignment of SIP with DIP.

P.D. for administrators.

Instructional Coaches for Content Area.

- DIA funds to support P.D. in Differentiated Instruction, Strategic Schooling, GLAD.

Quincy JHS:

Development of Title I School-wide Project.

- Researched based discipline program.

Stanton Alt:

- See Davis HS

Stevens MS:

Alignment of SIP with DIP.

Use of DIA funds to support P.D. in GLAD & Strategic Schooling.

PD for administrators.

Block Schedule for PLC meeting time.

- Literacy and Math Coaches.

Sunnyside HS:

Restructured school into Small Learning Communities and have an advisor for each student.

Implemented a new math adoption three years ago and based on the most current research by NCTM & the state standards at the time we selected Integrated Math Program.

- Become a Summit District and as part of this initiative we have focused on aligning our curriculum, instruction, and assessment

K-12.

Toppenish HS:

Required minimum of 10 hours of leaning walks by principal each week.

External instructional coach for informal/formal leaders.

Prescriptive non-negotiable for improving teaching/increasing learning.

9 High Yield Strategies.

Supervising Instruction.

During & after-school tutoring & intervention.

Family engagement in child's learning.

School/Family Compact.

Student-driven scheduling.

Advisory teachers that emphasizes personal relationships.

Full-time graduate specialist.

- Full-time graduation specialist for migrant students.

Toppenish MS:

Required min. of 10 hours of leaning walks by principal each week.

Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol.

Realigned curriculum to state standards.

Student-led conferences.

Critical book study groups.

Realignment with Performance Expectations for Math.

Reading/Math education leadership teams.

PLC leaders.

Family engagement in child's learning

Prescriptive non-negotiable for improving teaching & increasing learning

- External instructional coach for informal & formal leaders

White Swan HS:

Due to the relatively small enrollment in both buildings planned and structured activities that include the whole staff are more cost effective & provide greater continuity in the implementation of new strategies.

Othello HS:

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District 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 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- 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.

² 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.

All districts receiving Title I funds and identified for a step of improvement were provided an opportunity to participate in the District Improvement Assistance program. 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. If that happens the following actions are required.

District Improvement Assistance

Districts in Step One of improvement (not making Adequate Yearly Progress for two consecutive years) are required to develop or revise a district improvement plan and implement within 90 days from the date of AYP notification. The development of the plan must involve parents, school staff, and others.

The district improvement plan must:

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

In Step 2 of District Improvement, districts are required to take corrective action as defined by the state.

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:

- Defer program funds or reduce administrative funds; or
- 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 a total of 57 districts were identified for improvement. Districts were identified in four district improvement groupings: (1) New in Step 1, a total of 27 districts; (2) Continuing in Step 1, a total of 6 districts; (3) New in Step 2, a total of 6 districts; and (4) Continuing in Step 2, a total of 18 districts.

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 supports 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 learners), funding and expertise to implement research-based practices and programs, and funding for team collaboration time.

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.

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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	14
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	10
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	4
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	1
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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 SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	56	53
Schools	237	181
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	10/30/09
---	----------

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 2008-09.

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 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
 - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	29,668	16,067
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	8,951	4,724
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	30.2	29.4
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	29,270	16,067
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	15,758	7,804
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 2008-09	53.8	48.6
Comments:		

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

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 2008-09 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 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	1
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	84
Comments:	

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.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
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.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy (s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
6 = Combo 1	1-4)All aspects listed below are integral parts of the School Improvement Assistance program; 5)Use of a external school-based facilitator/coach as well as a district level facilitator focusing on systemic improvement has been highly effective, resulting in leadership development at the school and district level thru leadership team training, creating continuity and sustainability. Support for 08-09 was provided through 1003(a) & 1003(g) funds. Serving feeder schools to Title I is also provided.	189	0	50	A	

Comments:

--

Column 1 Response Options Box

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.

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.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

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.

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.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies 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.

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.

Purpose and Background

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 nurturing and subsequent growth of teacher trust and strengthened support for improvement at the building level, is paramount. This trust and support must be augmented and sustained by district level leadership and support for improvement funding and commensurate activity. This leadership has been vital for sustained growth in achievement in a voluntary system.

Foundational Professional Development

Through Summer Institutes and annual Winter conferences, designed to communicate ideas and concrete examples through specific content strands, focused on demonstrated best practices and existing, impactful improvement activities and strategies, (e.g. data use and development including the four domains of building level demographics, perception data, student learning and achievement data and contextual data; identified math and reading best practices; professional learning community and other peer review strategies and activities; classroom walkthrough demonstrations and trainings; the use of formative and summative assessment tools) has been key to the growth in understanding, valuing and embracing the improvement movement in our districts, at our schools.

Technical Assistance

Districts receive individualized assistance through the provision of third party, contracted, external facilitation, purposefully designed to raise critical questions, promote reflection and enhance goal-setting with attainable, focused action steps that impact their identified needs. Districts receive training by a host of external partners (e.g. Principal's Association, Superintendent's Association, School Board Association, Teacher's Association and a host of other private contractors) along with a variety of 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 help promote systemic change and ground-level cultural shifts that can impact individual teacher and learner expectations and further encourage belief that all kids can learn and achieve proficiency on all assessments.

Schools participate through leadership teams and individual leader trainings provided by educational partners, supported by private industry and charitable foundations, that assist with the creation of an enhanced awareness of techniques that help in the development of an enriched tapestry of educational experiences leading to increased achievement by all kids, in all socioeconomic settings, with diverse cultural and life-experiential backgrounds.

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) 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.

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

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 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2008-09 the SEA used approximately 1% of the 5% available for Admin (\$80,787) to assist selected districts with the development and startup of the Summit Initiative. The balance of the 5% was held back to be carried forward for use in the next fiscal year.

Purpose and Background All Summit districts, through the use of 1003(g) SIG funds, are provided technical assistance to assist in the development of district knowledge, skills and capacity to lead and support consistent, sustained and dramatic increases in student achievement in all district schools. The following student achievement goals drive our work:

-All Summit District students, regardless of ethnicity, economic level, language, or special education, meet or exceed state standards in reading, writing, and mathematics. -All Summit District students graduate and are ready for college and career.

As Summit districts accept the challenge of raising achievement for all students to new heights, educators assist in the development and field testing of improvement strategies which are intended to develop and expand the knowledge base, tools, and training to support a systems approach that can, with sufficient funding, be scaled statewide.

In alignment with the research-based characteristics of improving districts (Characteristics of Improved School Districts: Themes from Research, Shannon, G.S. & Bylsma, P. October 2004), the Summit District Improvement Initiative targets specific outcomes within the themes of:

-Effective Leadership -Quality Teaching and Learning

-Support for System wide Improvement -Clear and Collaborative Relationships receiving Title I funds and identified for a step of improvement were provided an opportunity to participate in the District Improvement Assistance program. 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. If that happens the following actions are required.

Foundational Professional Development

Support for enabling effective classroom instruction centers around engaging teachers and educational leaders in ongoing reflection around instructional practice and next-steps implementation for improved student learning. Foundational professional development for instructional leaders in year one will focus on high-yield instructional strategies (See Marzano's Classroom Instruction that Works) and the application of a Classroom Walkthrough Process. These areas of study will be advanced through face-to-face training in the district setting, coaching at the school level, and the availability of online support tools. Online resources include expert commentary, classroom video examples, teacher commentary, student work samples, and planning templates available in an online professional development library. The regular collection of classroom data is enabled through handheld technologies.

While instructional leaders -principals, coaches, and teacher leaders -will facilitate professional learning at every district school, the timing and delivery of these components will vary based on current district and school practices and needs. School faculty will be supported in understanding and implementing high yield strategies regularly and routinely in classroom instruction. Further, faculty will examine their own school data on classroom practices and work collaboratively to strengthen pedagogy across the school setting.

Needs Assessment & Action Planning

The Needs Assessment has two components -one of data collection and analysis and the other connecting findings to action plans for district improvement. Data collection will begin spring of 2009, with the completion of a classroom observation study and collection of perception surveys of staff, parents, and secondary students. In the summer months, analyses of high school course offerings and course taking patterns (transcript analyses), college attendance and persistence by district graduates will be completed. Student achievement and growth data will be compiled following the official release of 2009 WASL scores. The compilation of district data will be completed on a time line that allows for all of it to be summarized during the district's Needs Assessment visit.

In a specified week in the fall, a Summit Needs Assessment Team will conduct a one-week onsite district review. The external team will share compiled data with district stakeholders, review district documents, conduct focus groups and interviews. The week will close as team members present findings and recommendations to a district stakeholder team. District participants will identify and prioritize recommendations for district action. In weeks following the identification of priorities, Needs Assessment Team members will facilitate action planning sessions with relevant district staff as identified by the Superintendent.

Resulting District action plans will drive subsequent efforts in the district to accelerate achievement for all students. District goals and plans will be entered in an online tool; the tool then supports ongoing implementation and monitoring of district efforts. Based on

school-level data and district priorities, school improvement plans will be developed or adjusted to align the efforts of all district stakeholders in a common Technical Assistance

The implementation of effective instruction, assessment and intervention systems in reading and mathematics is essential to enabling all students to achieve at high levels. Within the context of district action plans, OSPI staff will provide technical assistance in the content areas of reading and mathematics and in meeting the needs of English Language Learners. Specific areas of focus will depend on district context relative to implementation of state standards, aligned instructional materials, assessment and intervention systems. Ongoing training for key district staff in accessing, using, and analyzing data will supplement content-specific activities.

District-and school-based technical assistance contractors will be assigned as well. These experienced, exemplary educators will work in an ongoing capacity with district personnel, supporting the effective implementation of Initiative strategies in leadership, instruction, data analysis, assessment, intervention, and the alignment of district and school improvement plans.

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

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 2008-09 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.

Purpose and Background

With the assistance of the State Legislature and a Private Foundation, Washington's voluntary School and District Improvement efforts were augmented with the availability of partner matching funds for the 08-09 school year. This additional funding of \$2,000,000 was provided through a Legislative Budget Proviso for Focused Assistance funding along with a match amount from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to further the Improvement Initiatives at both the District and School level.

Funding Emphasis Focused Assistance funding was provided to assist with the school based needs assessment (Education Audit) for schools in their first year of the School Improvement Assistance program. These funds also supported buildings that were not Title I through building based grant funds as well as contracts for facilitation, professional development, leadership training for teachers and principals and other training as well as goods and services to help support the development, implementation and sustainability of the improvement efforts.

Private Foundation funding provided support for Technical Assistance Contractors working in all Summit District Improvement Initiative districts at the school and district level. These contractors provided up to 60 -80 days of service in the district to support building and district level improvement initiatives that were coordinated and aligned with both levels.

Both funding sources provided capacity to work with the external education partners and affiliated community based support groups to help integrate the school improvement initiatives within the community context of educational practices. Sustaining and growing this partnership is critical to the long-term sustainability of improvement practices at both the school and district levels and will ultimately strengthen the support for and collaboration with all partners dedicated to a high quality and positive educational experience for all children.

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

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 to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	119,418
Applied to transfer	1,518
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,226

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 under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 986,510

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 to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA 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	36

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? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school 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.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

³ 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	49,573
Applied for supplemental educational services	2,575
Received supplemental educational services	2,258
Comments:	

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	\$ 3,224,721
Comments:	

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 the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, 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.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	132,606	129,836	97.9	2,770	2.1
All elementary classes	25,790	25,622	99.4	168	0.6
All secondary classes	106,816	104,214	97.6	2,602	2.4

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.

The state counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals ONE class.

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 is 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 the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.*

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

In the tables 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
Elementary School Classes	
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	49.0
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	51.0
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)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

	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)	60.8
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	39.2
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)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, 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).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	6,712	6,655	99.2
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	6,098	6,072	99.6
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	23,880	22,849	95.7
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	20,541	20,125	98.0

1.5.4 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	63.7	26.6
Poverty metric used	Free Reduced Lunch Rate	
Secondary schools	52.4	19.9
Poverty metric used	Free Reduced Lunch Rate	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(vii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.**
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/Russian
No	Two-way immersion	
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish/Russian
Yes	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
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.

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 who meet the LEP definition under 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 under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	92,673
Comments: All ELL are reported, regardless of the time enrolled in the Transitional Biligual Program.	

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 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.	87,714
Comments:	

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; Castilian	60,897
Russian	4,469
Vietnamese	3,707
Ukrainian	2,402
Somali	2,230

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the 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	84,144
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,800
Total	85,944
Comments: The state has a highly mobile population and the difference in the numbers reported in 1.6.2.1 and the numbers reported in 1.6.3.1.1 is directly attributed to this factor. Approximately 14.7% of students enrolled have been in the program for less than 90 days.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	14,513
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	17.2
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	82,443
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,749
Total	84,192
Comments: 1.6.3.2.1 -The state has a high mobile population and the difference in the numbers reported in 1.6.2.2 and the numbers reported in 1.6.3.2. is directly attributed to this factor. Approximately 14.7% of students enrolled have been in the program for less than 90 days.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	21,909

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, 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. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	45,944	63.3	40,933	70.00
ELP attainment	14,286	19.7	8,276	10.00

Comments: The ticket number for this TA is 109728. The automatic calculation generated by the EDEN system shows the making progress results at 63.3% while internal calculation generate 78.8%. The following numbers are used to calculate the Making Progress percentage. Total number submitted for Making Progress (AMAO 1) 58,294 100% Making Progress 45,944 79% Did Not Make Progress 12,350 21% Making Progress Calculation 45,944 /58,294 =78.8% Making Progress Target 70%

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
Comments: The state does not provide assessments for math in native language,	

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 ESEA accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
NA
Comments: The state does not provide assessments for math in native language,

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 ESEA accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
NA
Comments: Not applicable

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 ESEA accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
NA
Comments: Not applicable

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) 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 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
13,943	10,483	24,426
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of 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 of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,625	7,121	48.7	7,504
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report the number of 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 1.6.3.6.3 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
14,470	10,585	73.2	3,885
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP 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 total 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
4,304	1,070	24.9	3,234
Comments:			

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	138
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	76
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	121
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	117
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	97
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	19
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	54
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	10
Comments:	

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>
Comments: The state has met AMAO 1 making progress and AMAO 2 attainment.	

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.	
Comments:	

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 schools 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 under 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 Language Instruction Educational Program (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
14,539	2,412	23

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.

Not Applicable

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 under 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.	1,120
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	2,140

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.

* 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 Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet 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 activities reported.
4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	139	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	48	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	53	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	24	
Other (Explain in comment box)	25	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	123	16,380
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	111	3,986
PD provided to principals	80	843
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	81	1,256
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	111	7,828
PD provided to community based organization personnel	16	114
Total		30,407

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts in the other category provided training in the following areas:

- Partnering for success with parents.
- ESL classes.
- Spanish language classes for teachers to facilitate communication with Spanish speaking parents.
- Multicultural Education

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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
6/7/08	7/10/08	30
Comments:		

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.

This process was continued during the 2008-09 funding period.

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	
Comments: Blank equals 0.	

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 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	54.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	85.3
Black, non-Hispanic	68.2
Hispanic	69.5
White, non-Hispanic	79.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	69.0
Limited English proficient	65.0
Economically disadvantaged	67.3
Migratory students	70.4
Male	74.2
Female	80.0

Comments: The graduation rate for Children with Disabilities reported for the 2006-07 school year (54.7%) was reported incorrectly. The Children with Disabilities graduation rate for the 2006-07 school year, calculated using the approved methodology within the Washington State accountability plan, was 68.8%. The error is the difference between the on-time rate (54.7%) and the extended rate (68.8%). Washington is approved to use the extended rate for AYP.

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 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	11.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.0
Black, non-Hispanic	9.0
Hispanic	7.9
White, non-Hispanic	4.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6.8
Limited English proficient	10.2
Economically disadvantaged	7.6
Migratory students	7.6
Male	6.3
Female	5.0
Comments:	

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	256	256
LEAs with subgrants	39	39
Total	295	295
Comments:		

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)	283	216
K	892	613
1	959	669
2	1,005	679
3	999	623
4	931	619
5	910	618
6	873	539
7	791	540
8	848	562
9	1,005	716
10	759	617
11	825	633
12	1,186	793
Ungraded	50	27
Total	12,316	8,464
Comments:		

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	3,263	2,197
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	7,631	5,260
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	690	486
Hotels/Motels	732	521
Total	12,316	8,464
Comments:		

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)	232
K	576
1	624
2	642
3	579
4	576
5	579
6	503
7	502
8	531
9	677
10	576
11	589
12	742
Ungraded	54
Total	7,982
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups 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	1,243
Migratory children/youth	452
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,081
Limited English proficient students	661
Comments:	

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	20
Expedited evaluations	13
Staff professional development and awareness	32
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	32
Transportation	31
Early childhood programs	16
Assistance with participation in school programs	33
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	22
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	25
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	29
Coordination between schools and agencies	34
Counseling	18
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	22
Clothing to meet a school requirement	25
School supplies	31
Referral to other programs and services	34
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	16
Other (optional – in comment box below)	5
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Access and referral.
 School fees (ASB Cards, camp fees, etc.)
 Advocacy, information.
 Case management, housing, employment, child care.

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	8
School Selection	5
Transportation	15
School records	9
Immunizations	7
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	10

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Quick identification so that students and their families can get identified for educational support and connection to community resources.
 Collaboration with other districts.
 Obtaining a green card or work permit.
 Lack of shelter closer than 60 miles away/lack of affordable housing in the county. Lack of housing/shelters in the community.
 Unidentified as homeless.
 We struggle to provide.
 Shortage of funds, interpretation differences, economic crisis.

Early identification.

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 ESEA 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 ESEA.

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	364	173
4	370	212
5	396	236
6	320	159
7	320	121
8	343	166
High School	581	374
Comments:		

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 ESEA 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	358	166
4	394	118
5	398	169
6	321	96
7	325	86
8	339	88
High School	605	153
Comments:		

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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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 under 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	967
K	2,055
1	2,222
2	2,337
3	2,181
4	2,125
5	2,037
6	2,065
7	1,946
8	1,970
9	2,379
10	2,038
11	1,754
12	1,555
Ungraded	11
Out-of-school	9,725
Total	37,367
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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 2007-08 (36,826) and 08-09 (37,367) is less than 10 percent.

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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	99
K	297
1	342
2	308
3	330
4	245
5	188
6	160
7	113
8	40
9	152
10	160
11	240
12	89
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	2,763
Comments:	

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.

The difference between 2007-08 (2,848) and 08-09 (2,763) was less than 10 percent.

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.

Q: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period?

A: The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program maintains a database (Migrant Student Information System) under contract with the Migrant Student Data and Recruitment (MSDR) office 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 MSDR office for entry into the MSIS. In addition, MSDR staff identify and enroll eligible migrant students in non-project districts (districts where a migrant student resides but do not receive program funds) while local school personnel identify and enroll eligible migrant students in project school LEAs (that receive a subgrant).

Q: Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)?

A: Yes.

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, municipality, 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.

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 Migrant 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 (September 1-August 31). If a school district does not have Internet capabilities, the data is mailed to the MSDR office where support staff enter the data into the MSIS database. 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 Category 2 count is collected using the same system and procedures as the Category 1 count.

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.

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.

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.

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 reinterviewed. The re-interviewer used a standard re-interview instrument which verified the eligibility criteria of the Migrant Education Program.

Of the approximately 8332 COEs completed during the reporting period, a total of 116 COEs were selected for review through a third party with 112 COEs being found eligible. All COE data and associated enrollments for the families found to be in-eligible were deleted from the MSIS.

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 and by student) are processed correctly and to compare MSIS data with LEA data. Additionally, users have the ability to view the

Enrollment Summary Comparison Report on a daily basis. Not only can LEA staff use this report to verify MSIS enrollment counts, but it also gives them an opportunity to compare this year's counts to those of last year. 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.

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.

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).

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.