

**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 2009-10**

**WASHINGTON**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

**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) 2009-10 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 2013-2014, 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 2005-2006, 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 ED Facts 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report  For  State Formula Grant Programs  under the  Elementary And Secondary Education Act  as amended by the  No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction		
Address: PO 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): Bob Harmon		
		Wednesday, March 16, 2011, 4:38:52 PM
Signature _____		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2009-10**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010  
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 2010-11 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 in 2009-10. 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 the recommendations adopted by the SBE by December 1, 2008.

With the SBE Independent Review recommendations as a guide (presented to OSPI as final on May, 7, 2008), and in close cooperation with SBE Science Panel and staff, OSPI began the process of revising the science standards in May 2008. 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.

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

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

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, reading/language arts and/or 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 the most 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.

Revisions required by state legislation were implemented in grades 3-8 and 10 reading, and in grade 10 mathematics. Revisions were made that reduced 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 held several comparability studies that analyzed the test-to-standardize alignment and to ensure scale consistency. The study designs were reviewed and were monitored by the National Technical Advisory Committee; a resubmission for peer review was held November 2010.

New math assessments for grades 3-8 which aligned to new math content standards were administered in Spring 2010, and standards were set Summer 2010.

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

**1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities****1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)</b>
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	20.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	80.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development**

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Used for Purpose (yes/no)</b>
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 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	547,853		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	13,575	12,971	95.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	48,849		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	30,979	29,668	95.8
Hispanic	87,775	85,068	96.9
White, non-Hispanic	348,080		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	73,446	70,251	95.6
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	35,763	33,698	94.2
Economically disadvantaged students	239,747	232,501	97.0
Migratory students	11,265	10,816	96.0
Male	281,362	272,747	96.9
Female	265,992		>97
<b>Comments:</b> Data has been verified.			

### 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 ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	48,549	69.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	17,769	25.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,933	5.6
Total	70,251	
<b>Comments:</b> Data has been corrected		

### 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	547,850		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	13,575	13,021	95.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	48,849	47,323	96.9
Black, non-Hispanic	30,983	29,782	96.1
Hispanic	87,775		>97
White, non-Hispanic	348,074		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	73,442	70,362	95.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	35,763	33,294	93.1
Economically disadvantaged students	239,742		>97
Migratory students	11,265	10,816	96.0
Male	281,360		>97
Female	265,991		>97
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified.			

### 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 ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	61,413	87.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,000	7.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,949	5.6
Total	70,362	
<b>Comments:</b> Data has been corrected		

### 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	236,817	222,374	93.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,867	5,257	89.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	21,069	19,931	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	13,597	12,385	91.1
Hispanic	36,159	33,503	92.7
White, non-Hispanic	153,155	144,996	94.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	29,729	27,197	91.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,295	10,946	89.0
Economically disadvantaged students	98,239	91,391	93.0
Migratory students	4,616	4,238	91.8
Male	121,672	113,837	93.6
Female	114,930	108,397	94.3
<b>Comments:</b> This data has been verified.			

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 ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	19,854	73.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,827	21.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,516	5.6
Total	27,197	
<b>Comments:</b> Data has been entered		

### 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**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,574	47,554	62.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,795	754	42.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,812	5,051	74.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,103	1,835	44.7
Hispanic	13,357	5,620	42.1
White, non-Hispanic	46,817	32,007	68.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,404	4,024	35.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,853	2,229	28.4
Economically disadvantaged students	36,492	17,708	48.5
Migratory students	1,738	618	35.6
Male	39,250	24,248	61.8
Female	37,245	23,270	62.5
<b>Comments:</b> Data is accurate			

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,486	55,195	72.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,793	1,004	56.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,766	5,309	78.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4,102	2,399	58.5
Hispanic	13,341	6,895	51.7
White, non-Hispanic	46,795	36,851	78.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,381	4,569	40.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,783	2,325	29.9
Economically disadvantaged students	36,444	21,582	59.2
Migratory students	1,733	723	41.7
Male	39,206	26,803	68.4
Female	37,201	28,343	76.2
<b>Comments:</b> Data is accurate			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,106	41,740	54.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,910	691	36.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,719	4,506	67.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,278	1,410	33.0
Hispanic	12,875	4,276	33.2
White, non-Hispanic	48,138	29,158	60.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,754	3,217	27.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,183	1,055	17.1
Economically disadvantaged students	35,945	14,093	39.2
Migratory students	1,591	385	24.2
Male	39,492	21,446	54.3
Female	37,549	20,275	54.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,049	51,310	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,905	966	50.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,678	4,820	72.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4,273	2,102	49.2
Hispanic	12,874	5,830	45.3
White, non-Hispanic	48,140	35,457	73.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,739	3,971	33.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,121	1,119	18.3
Economically disadvantaged students	35,924	18,801	52.3
Migratory students	1,586	581	36.6
Male	39,446	24,983	63.3
Female	37,538	26,300	70.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,024	41,663	54.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,955	684	35.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,639	4,532	68.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,454	1,544	34.7
Hispanic	12,729	4,329	34.0
White, non-Hispanic	48,606	29,213	60.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,284	2,577	22.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,182	858	16.6
Economically disadvantaged students	35,548	14,012	39.4
Migratory students	1,560	399	25.6
Male	39,673	21,110	53.2
Female	37,285	20,538	55.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,953	53,327	69.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,953	1,008	51.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,591	5,004	75.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4,448	2,383	53.6
Hispanic	12,712	6,151	48.4
White, non-Hispanic	48,611	36,938	76.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,284	3,734	33.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,116	892	17.4
Economically disadvantaged students	35,511	19,719	55.5
Migratory students	1,553	566	36.4
Male	39,618	26,370	66.6
Female	37,269	26,926	72.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 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	76,891	26,275	34.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,952	356	18.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,591	2,739	41.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,447	708	15.9
Hispanic	12,709	1,933	15.2
White, non-Hispanic	48,561	19,682	40.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,265	1,581	14.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,124	185	3.6
Economically disadvantaged students	35,477	7,138	20.1
Migratory students	1,554	141	9.1
Male	39,598	12,978	32.8
Female	37,227	13,285	35.7
Comments:			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,449	40,036	52.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,972	633	32.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,796	4,604	67.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,317	1,380	32.0
Hispanic	12,419	3,719	29.9
White, non-Hispanic	48,628	28,515	58.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,053	1,935	19.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,321	513	11.9
Economically disadvantaged students	34,059	12,265	36.0
Migratory students	1,568	342	21.8
Male	39,206	20,355	51.9
Female	37,195	19,667	52.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,343	49,203	64.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,967	895	45.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,748	4,893	72.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4,317	2,126	49.2
Hispanic	12,398	5,524	44.6
White, non-Hispanic	48,600	34,252	70.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,032	2,440	24.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,239	570	13.4
Economically disadvantaged students	34,012	16,992	50.0
Migratory students	1,557	542	34.8
Male	39,131	23,396	59.8
Female	37,164	25,782	69.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 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 ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> This subject is not assessed at this grade level.			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	75,860	42,439	55.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,872	681	36.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,890	4,762	69.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,275	1,460	34.2
Hispanic	12,115	4,172	34.4
White, non-Hispanic	48,580	30,273	62.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,304	1,558	16.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,027	484	12.0
Economically disadvantaged students	32,618	12,934	39.7
Migratory students	1,568	438	27.9
Male	38,862	21,170	54.5
Female	36,942	21,253	57.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	75,845	48,035	63.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,875	871	46.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,847	4,842	70.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,279	1,964	45.9
Hispanic	12,093	5,311	43.9
White, non-Hispanic	48,621	33,740	69.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,319	2,079	22.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,965	483	12.2
Economically disadvantaged students	32,612	15,867	48.7
Migratory students	1,561	542	34.7
Male	38,860	22,939	59.0
Female	36,931	25,074	67.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 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 ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> This subject is not assessed at this grade level.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	75,142	39,324	52.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,833	612	33.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,733	4,505	66.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4,160	1,253	30.1
Hispanic	11,334	3,607	31.8
White, non-Hispanic	49,053	28,378	57.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,896	1,361	15.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,279	422	12.9
Economically disadvantaged students	31,152	11,375	36.5
Migratory students	1,383	367	26.5
Male	38,520	19,970	51.8
Female	36,565	19,342	52.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	75,111	52,305	69.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,837	991	53.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,680	5,083	76.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,153	2,340	56.3
Hispanic	11,328	5,961	52.6
White, non-Hispanic	49,082	36,576	74.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,895	2,236	25.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,210	418	13.0
Economically disadvantaged students	31,132	17,640	56.7
Migratory students	1,388	578	41.6
Male	38,512	24,722	64.2
Female	36,543	27,560	75.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 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	75,025	41,124	54.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,831	684	37.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,692	4,098	61.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4,132	1,318	31.9
Hispanic	11,320	3,421	30.2
White, non-Hispanic	49,012	30,600	62.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,857	1,789	20.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,239	251	7.7
Economically disadvantaged students	31,064	11,736	37.8
Migratory students	1,383	305	22.1
Male	38,452	21,910	57.0
Female	36,512	19,195	52.6
Comments:			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	74,054	33,614	45.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,634	445	27.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,922	3,998	57.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,081	890	21.8
Hispanic	10,239	2,350	23.0
White, non-Hispanic	49,414	25,182	51.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,556	906	12.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,853	311	10.9
Economically disadvantaged students	26,687	7,347	27.5
Migratory students	1,408	213	15.1
Male	37,744	17,846	47.3
Female	36,269	15,765	43.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	75,462	61,657	81.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,691	1,222	72.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,013	5,835	83.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4,210	2,906	69.0
Hispanic	10,497	6,971	66.4
White, non-Hispanic	50,256	43,268	86.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,712	2,975	38.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,860	729	25.5
Economically disadvantaged students	27,269	19,062	69.9
Migratory students	1,438	779	54.2
Male	38,472	30,363	78.9
Female	36,958	31,284	84.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	70,458	34,062	48.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,474	457	31.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,648	3,492	52.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,806	992	26.1
Hispanic	9,474	2,280	24.1
White, non-Hispanic	47,423	26,055	54.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,075	846	12.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,583	79	3.1
Economically disadvantaged students	24,850	7,565	30.4
Migratory students	1,301	184	14.1
Male	35,787	17,052	47.6
Female	34,658	17,007	49.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

#### 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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	2,320	961	41.4
Districts	297	91	30.6
<b>Comments:</b> The increase reflects new schools opened during 09-10 school year. The AYP determinations for schools with untested grades are included as defined by our accountability workbook.			

##### 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 2009-10 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 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	946	391	41.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	573	185	32.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	373	206	55.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

##### 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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
280	74	26.4
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)<sup>1</sup>)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	12
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	8
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	8
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	9
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	37
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

<p>Adams ES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identified MERIT school</li> <li>• Replaced Principal/Asst Principal</li> </ul> <p>Aki Kurose MS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extended day in Math &amp; Reading</li> <li>• More district oversight</li> <li>• Replaced 9 teaching staff</li> <li>• Extended learning day by 30 minutes</li> </ul> <p>Barge-Lincoln ES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased building admin. supervision due to realignment Central Office supervisor</li> </ul> <p>Cascade MS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive behavior incentive program</li> <li>• New supervision structure</li> <li>• Restructured schedule for extended day, intervention classes, &amp; teacher collaboration time/grade-level meetings</li> <li>• Weekly coaching cycles for math teachers &amp; additional algebra &amp; math-concept PD</li> <li>• Literacy teacher peer observation &amp; one-on-one coaching</li> <li>• Walk-to interventions w/ ReadRight &amp; Math Whizz</li> </ul> <p>Chinook MS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New supervision structure</li> <li>• Restructured schedule for extended day, intervention classes, and teacher collaboration time</li> <li>• Summer success camp- academic &amp; social success</li> <li>• Family engagement: creation of parent-teacher organization</li> <li>• Walk-to interventions w/ ReadRight &amp; Math Whizz</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Davis HS:

- Replaced Asst Principal
- Increased building administration supervision due to realignment Central Office supervisor

Dimmitt MS:

- Outside expert in school transformation assigned to provide TA in planning & implementing school restructuring efforts
- Renton SD providing assistance to the principal

Eisenhower HS:

- Replaced Asst Principal
- Increased building administration supervision w/ realignment Central Office supervisor

Ellen Ochoa MS:

- Alignment of SIP w/ DIP
- PD for administrators on consistency of instruction & curriculum
- Block Schedule to increase student time
- Literacy & Math instructional coaches

Franklin MS:

- Increased building administration supervision w/ realignment Central Office supervisor
- Each Administrator is a part of a PLC
- Re-aligned administrative duties
- Re-aligned decision-making matrix for ILT members & parents

Granger MS:

- Restructuring of course offerings aligned with WA state standards
- Re-alignment of staff to meet the needs of students
- Assignment of VP to be part of the 6th & 7th grade PLCs

Jason Lee MS:

- Implementation of Compassionate Schools program
- Implementation of AVID program
- Increased number of Algebra sections at each grade level
- Student Led Conferences implemented

Kirkwood ES:

- Lead teachers at each grade level
- PLCs formed
- SIP to align w/ DIP
- Outside consult hired to assist in the development of SIP/DIP
- Completed our self-assessment, reading gap analysis, & math gap analysis

Lewis & Clark MS:

- Increased building administration supervision w/ alignment of Central Office supervisor

Longfellow ES:

- Alignment of SIP w/ DIP
- PD for administrators on consistency of instruction & curriculum
- Literacy & Math instructional coaches

McFarland MS:

- District restructuring occurred to move 6th grade from 3 elementaries into the middle school
- Full-time Instructional Coach to work on SI actions

Midway ES:

- Restructured schedule
- Summer success camp
- Family engagement: creation of parent-teacher organization, seminars & trainings for parents

ML King, Jr. ES:

- Increased building administration supervision w/ alignment of Central Office supervisor
- Meeting weekly w/ K-5 teachers to discuss reading program & to review progress monitoring

Morris Schott MS:

- New math curriculum aligned w/ state standards adopted
- Reading curriculum was piloted for adoption in SY2010
- Participated in Math 360 Grant
- District hired a Migrant Graduation Specialist
- PD was offered during the summer for reading, math, & SIOP
- Summer school was offered for 3 weeks after school year & an additional 3 weeks prior to the start of SY2010

Mount Adams MS:

- TAC assigned to HS and MS

- Established process for ongoing assessments in reading & math
- LT planned a process for implementation of lesson planning cycle

Mount Baker MS:

- Included a district representative at SLT Meetings
- Implemented High Yield, SIOP, & AVID instructional strategies throughout the entire school
- Began using common assessments in both reading & math
- Developed a school-wide focus on vocabulary development
- Planning for a tiered intervention reading & math model

Othello HS:

- Counselor assigned to school w/ specific responsibility for support & monitoring of ELL/Migrant students
- Asst Principal assigned to school with specific responsibility to support ELL students & CTE programs
- Received a full time Instructional Coach

Pasco HS:

- Alignment of SIP with DIP
- PD for administrators on consistency of instruction & curriculum
- Instructional coaches in ELA, CTE & Math
- PD for all teachers in GLAD, Strategic Schooling & Differentiated Instruction

Quincy Jr. HS:

- Use a LIT to review NWEA and MSP assessment data.
- Provides additional instructional time with 90 minute Reading/Language Arts and Math blocks
- Extended school day program provide additional instruction in reading and math

Robert Frost ES:

- Alignment of SIP with DIP
- PD for administrators on consistency of instruction & curriculum
- Literacy & Math instructional coaches
- Kindergarten students to Gray Kindergarten Center

Saddle Mtn Int:

- Math curriculum aligned with the state standards was adopted
- PD was offered during the summer for reading, math, & SIOP
- Summer school was offered for 3 weeks after the school year and an additional 3 weeks just prior to the start of SY2010
- District partnered w/ ESD 105 in obtaining support for literacy for ELL

Southgate ES:

- New math materials for all grade levels
- Increased staffing to support the large number of ELL students
- Training in differentiation of instruction and development of common assessments
- Full time parent involvement coordinator
- TAC assigned by the state to support the building staff
- Implementation of revised SIP

Stanton Alt:

- Identified MERIT school
- Added Dean of Students
- Assc Superintendent supervises MERIT schools

Stevens MS:

- Alignment of SIP w/ DIP
- PD for administrators on consistency of instruction & curriculum
- Block Schedule to increase student time in content areas
- Literacy instructional coaches

Sunnyside HS:

- Extended school day in reading/math
- Implemented 100 minutes/week to reading
- Implementing SIP aligned w/ district goals
- Became a part of MERIT program in January 2010

Toppenish MS/HS:

- PLCs formed
- New schedule implemented for teachers
- SIP to align w/ DIP
- Outside consult hired to assist in the development SIP/DIP
- Principal was replaced in 2008
- Completed our self-assessment
- Received CWT training

Wahluke HS:

- New math curriculum aligned w/ state standards adopted
- Reading curriculum piloted
- Participated in the Math 360 Grant
- District hired a Migrant Graduation Specialist
- PD was offered during the summer for reading, math, & SIOP
- Summer school offered for 3 weeks after school year and 3 weeks just prior to start of SY2010

Wapato MS:

- New principal chosen
- New VP transferred to MS
- All district buildings are in AYP sanctions
- Reading/math support embedded in the regular school day
- PD opportunities provided for teachers
- Providing after school tutoring for students in reading/math

White Swan HS:

- TAC assigned HS/MS
- Initiated process for ongoing assessments in reading & math.
- LT planned a process for implementation of lesson planning cycle

Whittier ES:

- Alignment of SIP w/ DIP
  - PD for administrators on consistency of instruction and curriculum
  - Literacy and Math instructional coaches
-

## 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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As previously indicated, all districts receiving Title I funds and identified for a step of improvement are 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 for 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 2009-10 a total of 97 districts were identified for improvement. Districts were identified in four district improvement groupings: (1) New in Step 1, a total of 41 districts; (2) Continuing in Step 1, a total of 4 districts; (3) New in Step 2, a total of 26 districts; and (4) Continuing in Step 2, a total of 26 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 was 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 the Washington Association of School Administrators (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.

The district focused support model will be incorporated in the menu of \NIIN related services for the ensuing biennium. The legacy of this initiative, strengthened partnerships with districts along with a variety of stakeholder groups, will continue to provide benefits in our system of support for the persistently lowest-achieving schools.

**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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	44
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	21
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	14
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	13
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	38	31
Schools	185	142
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	10/15/10
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

### 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 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

#### 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 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

*Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
  - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

*States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2010.
  - 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 2010.
  - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the <b>mathematics</b> 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 2009-10	29,958	29,342
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	9,430	8,917
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	31.5	30.4
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> 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 2009-10	30,010	29,049
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	14,384	15,289
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	47.9	52.6
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	2
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	0

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10

**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 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies) identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
6 = Combo 1	1-4)All aspects listed below are integral parts of the School Improvement Asst. initiatives. 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 & district level through leadership team training, creating continuity and sustainability. Support for 09-10 was provided through 1003 (a) & 1003(g) funds. Serving feeder schools to Title I is also provided	127	4	1	A	
<b>Comments:</b>						

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
-----------

#### 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 students, (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 are 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

Professional development opportunities provided to schools and districts are designed to communicate ideas and concrete examples through specific content strands; They focus on demonstrated best practices and existing, impactful improvement activities and strategies, such as 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 communities and other peer review strategies and activities; classroom walkthrough demonstrations and trainings and the use of formative and summative assessment tools. These have been key to the growth in understanding, valuing and embracing the improvement movement in our districts and at our schools.

##### Technical Assistance

Districts receive individualized assistance through the provision of contracted external facilitation purposefully designed to raise critical questions, promote reflection, and enhance goal-setting with attainable, focused action steps that impact identified needs. Districts receive training by a host of external partners (e.g. Principals' Association, Superintendent's Association, School Board Association, Teachers' Association and other private contractors) and have multiple 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 the beliefs that all kids can learn and achieve proficiency on all assessments.

Schools participate through leadership teams and individual leader trainings provided by educational partners. These trainings assist in creating an enhanced awareness of research based techniques and educational experiences that lead to increased achievement by all students, in all socioeconomic settings, with diverse cultural and life-experiential backgrounds.

#### 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 2009 (SY 2009-10) 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:** LEAs, through state level assurances and performance agreements, allow the SEA to hold back a portion of the 95% of this Title I A, 4% set-aside to secure contracts that provide direct services and other training to assist with individualized improvement efforts at the school and district level. These are intended to promote and ensure sustainability beyond the available grant window.

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

For SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2009-10 the SEA used the 5% available for administration to assist selected districts with the development and startup of the Summit Initiative.

#### Purpose and Background

All Summit districts, through the use of 2009-10 1003(g) School Improvement funds, were provided technical assistance to help 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.

Districts receiving Title I funds and identified for a step of improvement were also 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.

The following student achievement goals continue to 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/or career pathways.

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

As we fully appreciate the recent SIG guidance along with the updated, more narrowed focused use of SIG funds, the LEA/Systemic foundation for improvement and sustainability efforts will be scaled back and supported through alternate federal sources (1003a) for the remaining initiative commitment (Cohort II ending SY 2011-12).

#### 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 focuses 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 began in 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 was completed. Student achievement and growth data have been compiled following the official release of 2009 WASL scores. The compilation of district data will be completed on a

line that allows for all of it to be summarized during the district's Needs Assessment visit.

Summit Needs Assessment Teams conducted a one-week onsite district review. The external team shared compiled data with district stakeholders, reviewed district documents, conducted focus groups and interviews. The week closed as team members presented

findings and recommendations to a district stakeholder team. District participants identified and prioritize recommendations for district action. In weeks following the identification of priorities, Needs Assessment Team members facilitated action planning sessions with relevant district staff as identified by the Summit district Superintendent.

Resulting District action plans are the driver for subsequent efforts in the district to accelerate achievement for all students. District goals and plans have been 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 have been developed or adjusted to align the efforts of all district stakeholders in a common effort.

#### Enhanced Technical Assistance Efforts

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 have provided technical assistance in the content areas of reading and mathematics and in meeting the needs of English Language Learners. Specific areas of continued 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 continues to supplement content-specific activities.

District and school-based technical assistance contractors have been assigned to Summit districts. These experienced, exemplary educators 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.

**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 2009-10 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**

Due to declining state revenue and resources supporting improvement efforts, a diminished amount of state funding was made available to complete our focused assistance efforts in a combined cohort of 25 schools. The loss of additional funding through a private foundation with state general fund match (two million dollars per year) has caused our efforts in this area to be scaled back and transformed.

For 2009-10, the evolution of the School Improvement Assistance (SIA) model created a segway to a more systemic focus of our improvement efforts. This year marked the completion of our SIA Cohort schools and the initiation of the Washington Improvement and Implementation Network (WIIN) as an upgraded effort to focus resources on the persistently, lowest-achieving schools.

The growth/strengthening of a regional-based partnership with our Educational Services Districts have helped in the implementation of the new effort throughout the state. Regional facilitation of PD modules in reading, math, ELL and Special Education provide the basis of our collaborative efforts in our evolving focus on PLA schools.

**Funding Emphasis**

These funds supported the completion of improvement efforts in buildings that were not Title I eligible through building-based grant funds; contracts for facilitation, professional development, leadership training for teachers and principals, and other training; and goods and services to help support the development, implementation, and sustainability of improvement efforts at the local level.

State funding sources provided additional capacity to work with the external education partners and affiliated community-based support groups to help integrate school improvement initiatives within the community context of educational practices. Sustaining and growing this partnership with the community and educational partners 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 sustainability of these high quality and positive educational practices, culminating in an enriched educational experience for all children.

**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.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	188,771
Applied to transfer	4,930
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,698
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,761,061

**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.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	84

**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.

**Comments:**

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	79,626
Applied for supplemental educational services	12,440
Received supplemental educational services	7,905
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 10,685,779
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	261,563	257,507	98.4	4,056	1.6
All elementary classes	27,946	27,838	99.6	108	0.4
All secondary classes	233,617	229,669	98.3	3,948	1.7
The reason for the increase was that in past years, we reported data on a "snapshot" date of October 1. We are now required to count all classes all year- including summer. The additional semesters and trimesters, along with summer school classes, have increased our counts.					

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.	<u>Yes</u>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

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 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	22.0
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	78.0
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.

N/A

	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)	39.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	50.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	8.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	3.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Based on 2009-2010 reporting for the secondary level, we had approximately 17 classes taught in the area of bilingual studies. Our juvenile detention centers also reported teachers not qualified in Science, Mathematics, Reading, English Language Arts, History, Geography (a total of 6 classes). This accounts for approximately 3%.

### 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
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	7,148	7,111	99.5
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	7,360	7,327	99.6
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	52,863	51,677	97.8
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	52,468	51,815	98.8
1.5.3.1 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.			

**1.5.3.1** 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	65.6	29.1
Poverty metric used	Free Reduced Lunch Rate The data has been corrected and verified.	
Secondary schools	56.5	23.7
Poverty metric used	Free Reduced Lunch Rate The data has been corrected and verified.	

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

- What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- 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](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
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Dual language	Spanish/English
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Two-way immersion	NA
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	NA
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish/English, Russian English
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Heritage language	NA
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Structured English immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Content-based ESL	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Pull-out ESL	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Newcomer Program

**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	93,069
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.	92,547
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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	61,924
Russian	4,235
Vietnamese	3,628
Somali	2,304
Ukrainian	2,221

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

others < 2,000 Chinese 1,970 Korean 1,656 Tagalog 1,264
------------------------------------------------------------------

**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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	86,375
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,572
Total	88,947
<p><b>Comments:</b> The number of students enrolled during the 2009-10 school-year = 93,069. The number of LEP students enrolled during the test window = 88,947. Total number of LEP students not enrolled during the testing window = 4,122. Of LEP enrolled during testing window, 97.2% tested.</p> <p>An analysis of these students revealed two general classes of explanations for district failure to test:</p> <p>1. Students were not correctly identified as ELL in the CEDARS database for the Pre-ID list that generated the student identifying labels on the WLPT-II test materials. Of the untested students 42% were not identified in the Pre-ID list and were not tested with unlabeled booklets. An additional 17% of the untested students were included in the Pre-ID list but still not tested. Analyses of these students revealed that enrollment withdrawal dates of some of both of these groups of students may not have been correctly recorded in the TBIP database at the time the TBIP files were frozen for EDEN reporting purposes resulting of over-identification of students enrolled during the test window. Others appear to have been continuously enrolled for the entire year and the reason for their not being tested is unclear.</p> <p>2. Another 41% of the untested students were recorded in the TBIP database as enrolling after December 31ST (note: this exemption window has now been changed to January 31st at the direction of DOE for the current test year).</p>	

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

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	11,112
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	12.9
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	85,835
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,487
Total	88,322
<p><b>Comments:</b> The number of students enrolled during the 20090 school-year = 92,547. The number of LEP students enrolled during the test window = 88,322. Total number of LEP students not enrolled during the testing window = 4,225. Of LEP enrolled during testing window, 97.2% tested.                  An analysis of these students revealed two general classes of explanations for district failure to test:                  1. Students were not correctly identified as ELL in the CEDARS database for the Pre-ID list that generated the student identifying labels on the WLPT-II test materials. Of the untested students 42% were not identified in the Pre-ID list and were not tested with unlabeled booklets. An additional 17% of the untested students were included in the Pre-ID list but still not tested. Analyses of these students revealed that enrollment withdrawal dates of some of both of these groups of students may not have been correctly recorded in the TBIP database at the time the TBIP files were frozen for EDEN reporting purposes resulting of over-identification of students enrolled during the test window. Others appear to have been continuously enrolled for the entire year and the reason for their not being tested is unclear.                  2. Another 41% of the untested students were recorded in the TBIP database as enrolling after December 31ST (note: this exemption window has now been changed to January 31st at the direction of DOE for the current test year).</p>	
<p>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 and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. 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).</p>	
	<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	23,810

**1.6.3.2.2**

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

	<b>Results</b>		<b>Targets</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Making progress	39,458	63.6	38,910	66.00
Attained proficiency	11,044	12.9	10,970	12.70
<p><b>Comments:</b> The number of matched LEP student records = 58,954. Of the number of matched LEP student records 39,458 or 66.9% made progress.</p>				
<p>The number of LEP students tested = 85,835. The number of LEP students attaining proficiency 11,044 or 12.9%</p>				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b> Assessments in native language are not available.	

**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
<b>Comments:</b> Assessments in native language are not available.

**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
<b>Comments:</b> Assessments in native language are not available.

**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
<b>Comments:</b> Assessments in native language are not available.

**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.
- 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
14,456	14,001	28,457
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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 out of language instruction educational programs 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
18,058	9,123	50.5	8,935
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) 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
18,038	11,796	65.4	6,242
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 out of language instruction educational programs 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,153	1,075	20.9	4,078
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	152
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	59
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	99
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	77
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	107
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	24
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	24
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	19
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	19

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Each districts in a consortium bundled together and counted as single district

**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>      </u> No
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>      </u> N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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
16,891	7,936	19

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.

**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) û 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 as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,175
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,678

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

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	142	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	58	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	19	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	45	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	33	
Other (Explain in comment box)	19	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	135	21,560
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	109	6,398
PD provided to principals	80	1,045
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	78	789
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	81	1,438
PD provided to community based organization personnel	18	178
<b>Total</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>31,408</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Para-professionals 108 districts 4,954 participants Parents 24 districts 431 participants
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 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 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/2009	7/1/2009	45
<b>Comments:</b> Final approval is contingent on districts submitting additional information to their "need work " applications.		

#### 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.

Continue to:

- Establish timelines and due dates for grant application
- Make program applications and preliminary allocations available by May 1st.
- Implement a substantially approved status process to allow districts to begin incurring costs as early as July 1st.

**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= 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 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	60.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	88.1
Black, non-Hispanic	72.0
Hispanic	72.0
White, non-Hispanic	81.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	71.4
Limited English proficient	66.4
Economically disadvantaged	71.0
Migratory students	77.5
Male	76.6
Female	82.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	10.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.3
Black, non-Hispanic	7.8
Hispanic	7.2
White, non-Hispanic	4.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6.3
Limited English proficient	8.3
Economically disadvantaged	6.6
Migratory students	6.4
Male	5.6
Female	4.5
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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 automatically calculated.

	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	172	172
LEAs with subgrants	123	123
Total	295	295
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	58	565
K	158	1,305
1	158	1,562
2	157	1,516
3	164	1,478
4	150	1,464
5	161	1,408
6	137	1,429
7	160	1,256
8	143	1,269
9	157	1,581
10	159	1,350
11	192	1,349
12	270	1,975
Ungraded	N<10	91
Total	2,228	19,598
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	173	5,332
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,822	12,206
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	160	1,010
Hotels/Motels	73	1,050
Total	2,228	19,598
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	522
K	1,156
1	1,404
2	1,395
3	1,339
4	1,349
5	1,303
6	1,300
7	1,166
8	1,175
9	1,489
10	1,257
11	1,271
12	1,823
Ungraded	113
Total	18,062
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied youth	2,158
Migratory children/youth	1,174
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,218
Limited English proficient students	2,120
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	57
Expedited evaluations	20
Staff professional development and awareness	71
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	63
Transportation	93
Early childhood programs	34
Assistance with participation in school programs	79
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	53
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	56
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	58
Coordination between schools and agencies	74
Counseling	41
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	30
Clothing to meet a school requirement	64
School supplies	89
Referral to other programs and services	63
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	31
Other (optional – in comment box below)	8
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Graduation costs. Community outreach. Phone. Credit retrieval/college application fees, yearbooks. Elementary level instruction books, musical instruments. Assistance with FAFSA and college applications.

**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.

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	24
School Selection	19
Transportation	58
School records	34
Immunizations	18
Other medical records	12
Other Barriers – in comment box below	20

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Working with tribal agencies. No available/affordable housing in community. Cultural barriers. Birth certificates. Community resources such as food/clothing. Principal not wanting to enroll at end of school year. Students have the number of credits to graduate but not in the right educational areas. Fines/fees. SpEd placements. Previous liaison did not leave info behind. Lack of parent support. Need training/awareness for new community members.

**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*.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	944	456
4	1,038	474
5	986	422
6	973	404
7	855	339
8	844	380
High School	1,389	793
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
3	948	361
4	1,026	302
5	990	272
6	955	253
7	848	232
8	845	217
High School	1,527	335
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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:

*a. 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.

*b. 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	765
K	2,195
1	2,151
2	2,135
3	2,248
4	2,107
5	2,025
6	1,979
7	2,031
8	1,817
9	2,245
10	2,108
11	1,716
12	1,719
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	9,059
Total	36,304

**Comments:**

**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 2008-09 (37,367) and 2009-10 (36,304) 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	52
K	239
1	282
2	252
3	288
4	219
5	211
6	142
7	98
8	58
9	153
10	223
11	211
12	118
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	2,546
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 2008-09 (2,763) and 2009-10 (2,546) is 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.

<p>Q: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate teh 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.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 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, 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 collected 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 10 number and the various data elements collected.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

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

---

### 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;
- 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 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. 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 child count 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.

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.

A total of 149 COEs were selected for review through a third party with 115 COEs being found to remain eligible, 29 were eligible with changes, 5 were found to be ineligible. All COE data and associated enrollments for the families found to be ineligible were deleted from the MSIS.

UPDATE 2/9/2011

ED REVIEW COMMENTS: Describe the reasons why such a large number of COEs (29) required changes. Additional trainings and a newsletter are the same as last year's response in the area of improvements/corrective actions. Are there additional improvements or corrective actions for this year?

STATE RESPONSE: Of the 149 COEs that were reviewed, 29 were found to be eligible with required changes. Those 29 COEs were found to have had errors in accurately documenting the qualifying criteria or children's information. The errors consisted of:

- Omitting children that made the qualifying move (4 COEs);
- Listing children that did not make the qualifying move (1 COE);
- Incorrectly listing the "To" or "From" city (12 COEs);
- Incorrectly documenting the qualifying "crop" or "activity" (6 COEs);
- Incorrectly documenting the "qualifying arrival date" (1 COE);

Containing insufficient comments for a "to join" move (2 COEs); or  
Incorrectly documenting a "with", "to join", or "on own" move (3 COEs).

In instances where the COEs incorrectly documented the "to city", the majority of the cities documented were small rural towns that share families with towns/school districts. In instances where the COEs incorrectly documented the "from city", the majority of the cities documented were from parts of California that recruiters may have been unfamiliar with.

In addition to the on-line posting of the recruiter manual, one-on-one new recruiter trainings, annual spring recruiter academies, annual statewide recruiter conference, on-line posting of eligibility presentation material, on-line posting of major qualifying crops and activities in Washington State (in English and Spanish), quarterly newsletter, toll-free telephone number to answer eligibility questions, and a local school district and state COE review process, this year we are:

- oDisseminating tip cards that explain the required comments for "to join" moves, personal subsistence moves, temporary moves and moves of brief duration;
- oDisseminating a front to back laminated flyer explaining the qualifying criteria as noted on OME's powerpoint that was shared at October conference;
- oPosting on-line the recently released USDE MEP Eligibility Guidance;
- oImplementing on-line quarterly eligibility surveys with at least 10 eligibility questions that recruiters complete. Responses will then be used at regional trainings. and
- oSending weekly emails to recruitment staff, the majority of which will have eligibility reminders.

---

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. 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 isolated to be 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 LEAs receiving migrant funds 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 completed 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 continues to incorporate additional interviewing scenarios into the home visitor/recruiter training activities to assist recruitment staff with eligibility determinations when commonly occurring errors are identified. The trainings 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.