

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2010-11**

WASHINGTON



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2012**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2010-11 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required 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 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16, 2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17, 2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, 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 2010-11 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 2010-11 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2010-11



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011
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.

Reading/Language Arts:

In July 2011 Washington State formally adopted the Common Core Standards for English language arts as new state learning standards for the K-12 English language arts. These standards will replace Washington's Grade Level Expectations for grades K-10 for reading and writing. These standards will be phased in over the next three years and will be assessed starting in the 2014-15 year.

Mathematics:

In July 2011 Washington State formally adopted the Common Core Standards for mathematics as new state learning standards for K-12 mathematics. These standards will replace Washington's 2008 K-12 Mathematics Learning Standards. These standards will be phased in over the next three years and will be assessed starting in the 2014-15 year.

Science:

No significant changes were made to the state's K-12 Science Learning Standards that were adopted in 2009 following an extensive revision process. The state is currently participating as a lead state to provide input in the development of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) process led by Achieve and the National Research Council. In light of our recently adopted revised standards, Washington will carefully consider the process and timeline by which the NGSS might be adopted once they are finalized, which is anticipated in late 2012. The 2009 revised science standards were assessed beginning in 2011, however the state will be also implementing a new Biology End of Course assessment beginning in spring 2012.

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 2010-11, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
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
Comments:	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11 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).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
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)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>No</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>No</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	553,026	533,247	96.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	9,209	8,654	94.0
Asian	39,661	38,531	97.2
Black or African American	26,181	24,772	94.6
Hispanic or Latino	104,260	100,462	96.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4,946	4,700	95.0
White	336,874	325,576	96.6
Two or more races	30,743	29,830	97.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	69,882	65,864	94.3
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	38,951	36,884	94.7
Economically disadvantaged students	249,916	240,669	96.3
Migratory students	11,118	10,611	95.4
Male	283,695	272,683	96.1
Female	268,911	260,323	96.8
Comments:			

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	47,493	72.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,093	21.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,278	6.5
Total	65,864	
Comments:		

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	553,028	536,589	97.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	9,208	8,760	95.1
Asian	39,662	38,319	96.6
Black or African American	26,181	25,011	95.5
Hispanic or Latino	104,261	101,226	97.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4,945	4,711	95.3
White	336,876	327,745	97.3
Two or more races	30,743	30,035	97.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	69,882	66,750	95.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	38,952	36,545	93.8
Economically disadvantaged students	249,917	242,250	96.9
Migratory students	11,119	10,689	96.1
Male	283,695	274,618	96.8
Female	268,913	261,680	97.3
Comments:			

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.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

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	58,297	87.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,176	6.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,277	6.4
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	66,750	
Comments:		

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	240,682	226,747	94.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	4,043	3,635	89.9
Asian	17,344	16,623	95.8
Black or African American	11,594	10,541	90.9
Hispanic or Latino	43,197	40,400	93.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,150	1,972	91.7
White	148,918	141,162	94.8
Two or more races	12,755	12,119	95.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	28,687	26,256	91.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,155	11,961	90.9
Economically disadvantaged students	103,517	96,958	93.7
Migratory students	4,825	4,465	92.5
Male	123,403	115,820	93.9
Female	117,027	110,844	94.7
Comments:			

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	19,825	75.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,791	18.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,640	6.2
Total	26,256	
Comments:		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,350	46,745	62.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,170	463	39.6
Asian	5,481	4,253	77.6
Black or African American	3,471	1,478	42.6
Hispanic or Latino	15,510	6,886	44.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	736	322	43.8
White	44,369	30,418	68.6
Two or more races	4,514	2,879	63.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,434	3,499	33.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,653	2,421	28.0
Economically disadvantaged students	36,986	17,742	48.0
Migratory students	1,434	508	35.4
Male	38,445	23,666	61.6
Female	36,867	23,061	62.6
Comments:			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75,289	54,967	73.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,166	655	56.2
Asian	5,443	4,474	82.2
Black or African American	3,471	2,110	60.8
Hispanic or Latino	15,494	8,808	56.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	736	454	61.7
White	44,364	34,950	78.8
Two or more races	4,517	3,454	76.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,419	4,071	39.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,585	3,088	36.0
Economically disadvantaged students	36,947	22,615	61.2
Migratory students	1,432	620	43.3
Male	38,408	26,276	68.4
Female	36,843	28,667	77.8
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Third graders are not assessed in Science in Washington State.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,227	46,275	59.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,218	454	37.3
Asian	5,528	4,254	77.0
Black or African American	3,447	1,312	38.1
Hispanic or Latino	15,765	6,521	41.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	723	339	46.9
White	45,842	30,527	66.6
Two or more races	4,614	2,829	61.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,900	2,999	27.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,348	1,689	23.0
Economically disadvantaged students	37,302	16,912	45.3
Migratory students	1,559	497	31.9
Male	39,558	23,563	59.6
Female	37,634	22,697	60.3
Comments:			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,218	51,757	67.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,212	564	46.5
Asian	5,495	4,306	78.4
Black or African American	3,452	1,731	50.1
Hispanic or Latino	15,757	7,622	48.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	723	386	53.4
White	45,870	33,875	73.9
Two or more races	4,616	3,225	69.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,905	3,337	30.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,285	1,521	20.9
Economically disadvantaged students	37,292	19,796	53.1
Migratory students	1,556	553	35.5
Male	39,550	24,617	62.2
Female	37,632	27,122	72.1
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Fourth graders are not assessed in Science in Washington State.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,752	47,973	61.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,314	521	39.6
Asian	5,475	4,294	78.4
Black or African American	3,609	1,430	39.6
Hispanic or Latino	15,028	6,739	44.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	793	359	45.3
White	46,855	31,691	67.6
Two or more races	4,589	2,901	63.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,634	2,680	25.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,867	1,350	23.0
Economically disadvantaged students	36,727	17,419	47.4
Migratory students	1,630	575	35.3
Male	39,809	24,144	60.6
Female	37,914	23,815	62.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,691	52,322	67.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,312	629	47.9
Asian	5,430	4,261	78.5
Black or African American	3,609	1,753	48.6
Hispanic or Latino	15,016	7,463	49.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	793	399	50.3
White	46,851	34,551	73.7
Two or more races	4,590	3,230	70.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,636	3,000	28.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,793	1,247	21.5
Economically disadvantaged students	36,686	19,562	53.3
Migratory students	1,627	612	37.6
Male	39,770	25,481	64.1
Female	37,892	26,827	70.8
Comments:			

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	77,668	43,322	55.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,312	453	34.5
Asian	5,446	3,634	66.7
Black or African American	3,610	1,134	31.4
Hispanic or Latino	15,009	5,070	33.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	794	246	31.0
White	46,812	30,133	64.4
Two or more races	4,595	2,619	57.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,620	2,720	25.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,821	715	12.3
Economically disadvantaged students	36,681	14,434	39.4
Migratory students	1,630	339	20.8
Male	39,765	22,015	55.4
Female	37,874	21,295	56.2
Comments:			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,111	45,778	59.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,313	483	36.8
Asian	5,286	4,082	77.2
Black or African American	3,672	1,360	37.0
Hispanic or Latino	14,701	6,050	41.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	627	267	42.6
White	46,953	30,736	65.5
Two or more races	4,453	2,748	61.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,766	1,934	19.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,988	941	18.9
Economically disadvantaged students	35,530	15,839	44.6
Migratory students	1,560	467	29.9
Male	39,676	23,087	58.2
Female	37,397	22,673	60.6
Comments:			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,088	54,113	70.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,313	648	49.4
Asian	5,246	4,147	79.1
Black or African American	3,674	2,003	54.5
Hispanic or Latino	14,693	7,715	52.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	624	314	50.3
White	46,973	35,973	76.6
Two or more races	4,457	3,242	72.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,775	2,684	27.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,929	904	18.3
Economically disadvantaged students	35,526	20,195	56.8
Migratory students	1,557	601	38.6
Male	39,659	25,940	65.4
Female	37,390	28,146	75.3
Comments:			

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 Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Sixth graders are not assessed in Science in Washington State.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	76,746	44,209	57.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,329	449	33.8
Asian	5,508	4,112	74.7
Black or African American	3,616	1,227	33.9
Hispanic or Latino	14,068	5,420	38.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	617	209	33.9
White	47,383	30,354	64.1
Two or more races	4,121	2,403	58.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,870	1,565	17.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,758	487	13.0
Economically disadvantaged students	33,894	14,147	41.7
Migratory students	1,591	476	29.9
Male	39,364	22,439	57.0
Female	37,347	21,755	58.3
Comments:			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	76,714	43,424	56.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,334	439	32.9
Asian	5,468	3,854	70.5
Black or African American	3,613	1,456	40.3
Hispanic or Latino	14,083	5,472	38.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	615	209	34.0
White	47,374	29,522	62.3
Two or more races	4,125	2,438	59.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,875	1,471	16.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,692	259	7.0
Economically disadvantaged students	33,889	14,152	41.8
Migratory students	1,589	450	28.3
Male	39,364	19,837	50.4
Female	37,315	23,572	63.2
Comments:			

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 Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Seventh graders are not assessed in Science in Washington State.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	76,258	38,935	51.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,261	387	30.7
Asian	5,614	3,924	69.9
Black or African American	3,555	1,045	29.4
Hispanic or Latino	13,731	4,538	33.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	657	231	35.2
White	47,332	26,748	56.5
Two or more races	4,002	2,031	50.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,568	1,148	13.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,480	447	12.8
Economically disadvantaged students	33,072	11,693	35.4
Migratory students	1,590	403	25.3
Male	39,089	19,494	49.9
Female	37,133	19,435	52.3
Comments:			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	76,259	52,573	68.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,264	623	49.3
Asian	5,556	4,343	78.2
Black or African American	3,556	1,937	54.5
Hispanic or Latino	13,751	7,376	53.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	654	365	55.8
White	47,361	35,020	73.9
Two or more races	4,010	2,851	71.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,592	2,022	23.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,406	498	14.6
Economically disadvantaged students	33,083	18,473	55.8
Migratory students	1,588	638	40.2
Male	39,090	24,849	63.6
Female	37,132	27,703	74.6
Comments:			

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	76,116	47,099	61.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,259	497	39.5
Asian	5,585	4,109	73.6
Black or African American	3,549	1,403	39.5
Hispanic or Latino	13,728	5,338	38.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	654	272	41.6
White	47,254	32,965	69.8
Two or more races	3,981	2,468	62.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,525	1,750	20.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,444	348	10.1
Economically disadvantaged students	32,983	14,797	44.9
Migratory students	1,585	422	26.6
Male	39,010	23,792	61.0
Female	37,070	23,292	62.8
Comments:			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	72,803	49,146	67.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,049	520	49.6
Asian	5,639	4,551	80.7
Black or African American	3,402	1,453	42.7
Hispanic or Latino	11,659	5,484	47.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	547	252	46.1
White	46,842	34,421	73.5
Two or more races	3,537	2,416	68.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,692	1,555	23.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,790	768	27.5
Economically disadvantaged students	27,158	13,981	51.5
Migratory students	1,247	464	37.2
Male	36,742	24,701	67.2
Female	36,031	24,433	67.8
Comments:			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	76,330	64,696	84.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,159	827	71.4
Asian	5,681	4,965	87.4
Black or African American	3,636	2,575	70.8
Hispanic or Latino	12,432	8,945	72.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	566	388	68.6
White	48,952	43,636	89.1
Two or more races	3,720	3,252	87.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,548	3,129	41.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,855	764	26.8
Economically disadvantaged students	28,827	21,345	74.0
Migratory students	1,340	784	58.5
Male	38,777	31,688	81.7
Female	37,476	32,971	88.0
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	72,963	38,281	52.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,064	372	35.0
Asian	5,592	3,231	57.8
Black or African American	3,382	932	27.6
Hispanic or Latino	11,663	3,192	27.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	524	119	22.7
White	47,096	28,568	60.7
Two or more races	3,543	1,836	51.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,111	1,117	15.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,696	114	4.2
Economically disadvantaged students	27,294	9,093	33.3
Migratory students	1,250	187	15.0
Male	37,045	19,801	53.5
Female	35,900	18,477	51.5
Comments:			

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 SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Schools	2,203	847	38.4
Districts	295	72	24.4
Comments:			

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 SY 2010-11 . 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 2010-11	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
All Title I schools	925	261	28.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	628	138	22.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	297	123	41.4
Comments:			

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 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11
281	59	21.0
Comments:		

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 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. 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 2011-12 (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)¹)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	111
Extension of the school year or school day	33
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	9
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	8
Replacement of the principal	22
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	22
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	55
Comments: The increase reflects the increase in schools in corrective action as well as reporting all Title I schools in corrective action.	

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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	8
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	27
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<p>Bremerton School District The Mountain View Middle School is currently on step 4 and we spent the year developing our restructuring plan that was approved by our school board on June 16, 2011. The restructuring method selected was a transformational plan. Part of our comprehensive restructuring plan is to change the schedule to double the time allocated for Language Arts and Math and extended learning provided by highly qualified teachers.</p> <p>Brewster School District The district replaced the elementary principal and worked with the WIIN Center and several outside advisors for technical assistance and professional development, K-12.</p> <p>Clover Park School District Major restructuring of curriculum, professional development, assessment and school day.</p> <p>Everett School District: The school staff wrote a restructuring plan, which included a new leadership team structure and composition. They made adjustments to curriculum, including implementing a new reading curriculum. Data monitoring increased, with school-wide data compiled on every student once a trimester and students of concern monitored every six weeks. An ELL coach was</p>

assigned half-time to the building to lead the work with ELL students, who comprise half of the student population. Central support increased for professional development, PLCs, and instructional strategies.

Ferndale School District

We implemented of new instructional materials in math and new assessment and progress monitoring processes in reading and math. Teacher teams were reconfigured to optimize the best of skills and talents among staff.

Grandview School District

Grandview Middle School received a SIG/MERIT transformation grant for the 2010-11 school year.

Granger School District

"Granger High School - Restructuring - Year 1

*Required implementation of a new research based curriculum: Moved from Integrated Math to our step approach of Algebra, Geometry, Alg II, Pre Calc and Calc.

*Extension of school year or day: Offer after school programs, such as 21st century and tutoring to all students targeting our lowest performing students

*Replacement of Staff: Replaced one math teacher who was not highly qualified. Replaced 2 English teachers with 2 highly qualified English teachers. New Assistant Principal with focus on curriculum was also hired.

*Restructuring internal organization: Implemented the Granger Enrichment Center which focuses on those students not ready for graduation and that have not met standards. Also implemented a new freshman enrichment class to teach our 9th grade students how to be successful in high school by teaching them study skills and other successful practices.

Granger Middle School - Restructuring - Year 2

*Restructuring of course offerings to be more aligned with state standards

*Realignment of staff to better meet the needs of students

*Assignment of Asst Principal to be part of the 6th and 7th grade PLC's

*RTI training with Wayne Callendar for 4 days at ESD 105 - team of 10 including 6 classroom teachers, Resource Room teacher, Sped Director, Asst Principal and Federal Programs Director.

*Schoolwide implementation of Navigation 101

*Continued time and support given to grade level and content level PLC's

*Staff development in PLC's"

Highline School District

"Additional push and support for each school in step 4 or 5 of improvement through additional supervisor support.

- required use of 5 priorities: RTI, Math/literacy frameworks, PBIS and our instructional frame with equitable practices."

Mount Adams School District

Transformation activities as part of the Summit Initiative.

Lake Quinault School District:

We hired a principal for the 2011-2012 School Year to replace the dual position of principal/superintendent. We combined two elementary grades to establish a

Special Programs teacher to supervise Title I, LAP Migrant and ELL programs.

Quincy School District:

District improvement facilitator, WIIN Grant.

Renton School District:

Each school in restructuring has implemented comprehensive school improvement plans which include action plans for math and literacy improvement and equity and access to instruction. They have presented their plans to the superintendent and district leadership and have received feedback and support for implementation. Each school has a Technical Assistance Consultant that assists the school leadership to execute the action plans and determine impact on student achievement. Each school is implementing a "Vision of Instruction" through "Lesson Study Cycles" and PLC delayed start Fridays and are receiving technical assistance from an outside consultant.

Royal School District:

Created a plan with the building staff, district administration, parents, and community and the assistance of an outside expert. This school has actively implemented the RTI, SIOP, PLCs and Step Up to Writing curriculum. These implementations have been guided by outside assistance. The building also instituted a Walk to Math model and adopted new intervention curriculums in math and reading.

Tukwila School District:

Tukwila School District is receiving support from OSPI as a SUMMIT participant.

Wellpinit School District:

The elementary school is a part of the WIIN Grant program and is restructuring using the turn around model.

Yakima School District:

Adams, Barge-Lincoln, Davis, Eisenhower, Franklin, Lewis & Clark, ML King, Stanton, and Washington were not new to step 5 (restructuring) and continue to implement their restructuring plans. Provided with an additional School Improvement Grant: Adams, Stanton, Washington-which has further enabled these schools to follow federal reform.

School Improvement initiatives at Barge-Lincoln and ML King focus on similar reorganization for the Tier 1 schools. This year, it is the intent of the district to support Barge-Lincoln, Garfield, Hoover, and Lewis and Clark through the WIIN grant. Hoover has also been supported this year by an outside School Improvement expert.

WIIN, MERIT And SUMMIT grants are provided to the schools and districts through OSPI's school improvement office.

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 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. 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 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. **(This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 2010-11 a total of 113 districts were identified for improvement. Districts were identified in four district improvement groupings: (1) New in Step 1, a total of 3 districts; (2) Continuing in Step 1, a total of 31 districts; (3) New in Step 2, a total of 8 districts; and (4) Continuing in Step 2, a total of 71 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 WIIN 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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	23
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	3
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	1
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	5
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	2
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2010-11 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	20	15
Schools	265	195
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete	10/14/11
---	----------

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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 2010-11.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) 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: District and School Improvement and Accountability are allowed to use the maximum set-aside to provide school improvement services on a statewide basis.

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

For SY 2010-11 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 2010-11.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2010-11, the SEA received support through the 5% available for administration to assist selected districts with the pre-implementation/implementation of the SIG initiative along with the continued development through contracts with private providers focused on a statewide system of support.

Purpose and Background

In the 2010-11 school year, three primary things influenced the use of 1003(g) funds in support of the new Federal School Improvement Grant initiative. First, a major shift in Federal policy focusing on the bottom 5% of Title I and Title I eligible schools identified through a composite score on reading and math achievement measured by the state assessment over the past three consecutive years and graduation rate of less than 60%. Second, the provision of the Federal 1003(g) Regular funding source was delayed until the second half of the 2009-10 school year, with the intended support of the new SIG initiative in 2010-11, along with the prospect of SIG pre-implementation activities occurring prior to the end of the 2009-10 school year. Third, for the 2010-11 Federal SIG initiative, additional 2009-10 SIG ARRA funds were provided to dramatically enhance the state's ability to fully implement the SIG model(s) in a greater number of schools identified in the bottom 5% of Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) schools.

Our current work is based on an approved State application for SIG funding and subsequent funding waiver request (a composite of 1003(g) Regular and SIG ARRA), for three years (through September 2013). Districts with schools identified in the bottom 5% on the PLA list were afforded the opportunity to compete for SIG funds. In this competitive application process, eligible districts/schools were required to identify their level of readiness and need, selecting one of four Federal models along with their agreement to implement required elements within these models for each applicant school. Additionally, schools/districts selected through this competitive process were required to individually present their SIG plans based on their recognition and implementation of the required actions specific to the model chosen.

In addition, the Washington Statewide System of Support, in part implemented through the use of a portion of the 2009-10 1003(g) Regular funds, continued to support services to identified districts. These services included but not limited to need assessments, contextual survey data and data dashboard support, classroom walkthrough training/PD and improvement planning support and monitoring/tracking for accountability purposes.

Evaluation and Technical Assistance

The SEA provides Evaluation and Technical Assistance support through agency FTEs that are funded through the SIG 5% administrative reserve. At that time, approximately 3 FTE provided coordination efforts for baseline evaluation involving the 9 districts and 18 schools selected for SIG Cohort I. The majority of the SIG evaluation component is being accomplished through a third party contractor who also provides evaluation services for other state-level improvement initiatives (e.g. Summit and WIIN services). Data from the evaluation of SIG is assisting the SEA in continued funding decisions and provide evidence for rapid-retry and other supportive initiatives to help sustain these improvement efforts once the grant funding is no longer available.

Continued Technical Assistance from Staff and contractors is 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), helps target specific outcomes within the themes of:

- Effective Leadership
- Quality Teaching and Learning
- Support for System wide Improvement
- Clear and Collaborative Relationships

Foundational Professional Development Support for enabling effective classroom instruction is currently centered 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.

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 2010-11 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 the continued decline of state revenue and the loss of other non-Title I resources supporting improvement efforts, no state funding was made available for additional school improvement activities tied to current models. We continue to explore private foundation funding but have been unsuccessful, further impacting our efforts and diminishing our capacity to provide services at the current level of need.

For 2010-11, the evolution of the School Improvement Assistance (SIA) model has assisted in creating a more systemic focus of our improvement efforts. Through the use of 1003(a) funds, the Washington Improvement and Implementation Network (WIIN) have helped refocus resources on the bottom quintile of persistently lowest achieving schools. The growth/strengthening of a regional-based partnership with our Educational Services Districts continue to assist with the implementation of the WIIN services throughout the state. Regional facilitation of WIIN PD modules in reading, math, ELL and Special Education provide the basis of our collaborative efforts in our evolving focus on PLA schools. The development of a Math Benchmark Assessment has also strengthened the use of benchmark and other formative assessment data at the district and building level.

Funding Emphasis

Previous state and foundation funds supported the completion of improvement efforts in buildings that were not Title I eligible through building-based grants; contracts for on-site facilitation, on- and off-site professional development, leadership training for teachers and principals, and other related trainings (e.g. PLC development, school board training). These funding sources also aided in the continuation of goods and services to help support the development, implementation, and sustainability of improvement efforts at the local level. At one time, state funding sources also provided additional capacity to work with external education partners and affiliated community-based support groups to help integrate school improvement initiatives within the community context of educational practice. As noted previously, sustaining and growing this partnership with the community and educational partners continues to be critical for the long-term sustainability of improvement practices at both the school and district levels.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	203,252
Applied to transfer	2,270
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,166
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2,281,069

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	89

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:

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	111,436
Applied for supplemental educational services	24,672
Received supplemental educational services	12,817
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 15,196,176
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	246,042	241,440	98.1	4,602	1.9
All elementary classes	27,439	27,353	99.7	86	0.3
All secondary classes	218,603	214,087	97.9	4,516	2.1

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.

Washington 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	63.0
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	37.0
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.

	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)	37.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	46.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	17.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Based on 2010-11 reporting for the secondary level, we had approximately 17% classes taught in the areas of bilingual studies, Juvenile detention centers and alternative education classes. These teachers are currently scheduled to take the WEST E exam to become highly qualified.

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.

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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	8,343	8,303	99.5
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	6,009	5,993	99.7
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	39,149	38,154	97.5
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	56,823	56,239	99.0

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	68.3	30.5
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate	
Secondary schools	58.1	25.9
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.
- b. *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.
- c. *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.
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish, Russian, Chinese
<u>No</u>	Two-way immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish, Russian
<u>No</u>	Heritage language	
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>No</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>No</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>No</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>No</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	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	98,467
Comments:	

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.	97,948
Comments:	

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	65,772
Russian	4,395
Vietnamese	4,033
Somali	2,506
Ukrainian	2,139

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' 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 (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	91,472
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,861
Total	93,333
Comments: Percentage of students tested of those who were enrolled during the test window (93,333) is 98%. Table 1.6.2.1 includes all students enrolled at any point during the school year. The validity check uses the wrong denominator to test <95%.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	18,502
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	20.1
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	90,962
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,841
Total	92,803
Comments: Percentage of students tested of those who were enrolled during the test window (92,803) is 98%. Using the denominator from Table 1.6.2.2 includes all students enrolled at any point during the school year. The validity check uses the wrong denominator. Those taking the assessment for the first time include: Revise First time assessed to 23,922 Of which 14,966 were kindergarteners Another 8,356 were newcomers And there were 600 who should have been tested but were not.	
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).	
	#
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.	23,922

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

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 Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State 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 percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	51,251	76.4	43,642	66.70
Attained proficiency	18,347	20.2	12,170	13.30
Comments: Progress = 51,251 - No progress = 14,179, Total = 65,430 matched 78.3% gains Proficient = 18,347 - Not proficient = 73,153, Total = 91,500 20.1% proficient				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
NA
NA
NA
NA
NA
Comments: Not applicable

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- 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
11,009	14,189	25,198
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
15,865	9,315	58.7	6,550
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for 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 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
15,945	10,921	68.5	5,024
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP(MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,943	1,512	38.3	2,431
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	168
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	120
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	126
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	127
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	136
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	3
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2009-10 and 2010-11)	46
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	46
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)	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: Consortia districts were counted separately by 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>No</u>
Comments: State did not meet AMAO-3 (AYP for LEP)	

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>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
17,727	5,686	35

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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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.	1,180
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,634

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	156	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	74	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	7	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	64	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	47	
Other (Explain in comment box)	19	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	151	25,899
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	113	4,501
PD provided to principals	99	1,154
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	95	1,307
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	86	1,720
PD provided to community based organization personnel	37	697
Total	156	35,278

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

19 districts provided training to parents with 752 parents participating.

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 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/10	07/01/10	45
Comments: The timeline begins on the date the districts has submitted a request for review. The final approval is contingent on the district submitting additional information to thier "needs more work request. To ensure districts can obligate fund beginning July 1st, the state has in place a subtantually approve status process.		

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.

-Establish timelines and due dates for grant applications.
 -Make program applications, training, and preliminary allocation available by May 1st to ensure that districts have available the information needed to assist in the application process.
 -Implement a substantially approved process to allow districts to beginning incurring cost as early as July 1st.
 -Review the status of applications submitted on a weekly basis.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	82.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	76.9
Hispanic	76.2
White, non-Hispanic	84.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	78.9
Limited English proficient	67.6
Economically disadvantaged	78.0
Migratory students	78.5
Male	80.8
Female	84.5
Comments:	

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 2009-10). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.1
Black, non-Hispanic	6.8
Hispanic	6.3
White, non-Hispanic	4.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5.2
Limited English proficient	7.5
Economically disadvantaged	5.6
Migratory students	5.6
Male	5.0
Female	4.1
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	254	254
LEAs with subgrants	41	41
Total	295	295
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	400	556
K	1,123	841
1	1,157	856
2	1,263	821
3	1,165	717
4	1,179	736
5	1,125	752
6	991	705
7	988	671
8	1,004	729
9	1,127	869
10	947	751
11	1,091	732
12	1,542	1,210
Ungraded	0	0
Total	15,102	10,946
Comments: For 2010-11 our state collected and reported the permitted value for "homeless child under 3 years of age." (1.9.1.1) This number was added to the "age 3-5 not kindergarten" total. This was done to avoid an error with the "nighttime residence" count. (1.9.1.2)		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	3,478	2,663
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	10,174	7,336
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	665	371
Hotels/Motels	785	576
Total	15,102	10,946
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	567
K	850
1	868
2	833
3	720
4	744
5	756
6	719
7	686
8	744
9	882
10	779
11	757
12	1,231
Ungraded	
Total	11,136
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1,918
Migratory children/youth	668
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,081
Limited English proficient students	1,180
Comments:	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,372	723
4	1,376	605
5	1,416	598
6	1,263	584
7	1,192	389
8	1,213	537
High School	1,006	642
Comments:		

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,377	520
4	1,371	432
5	1,418	491
6	1,264	411
7	1,193	352
8	1,212	279
High School	847	345
Comments:		

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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	590
K	1,896
1	2,087
2	1,983
3	1,901
4	2,066
5	1,943
6	1,832
7	1,852
8	1,903
9	1,951
10	1,883
11	1,679
12	1,706
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	8,970
Total	34,243
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.

Decrease was 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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	34
K	295
1	323
2	307
3	309
4	295
5	217
6	229
7	169
8	114
9	138
10	168
11	229
12	120
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	2,947
Comments:	

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.

An increase in summer funding was made available to local school districts which resulted in more students served during Summer 2011 (15.75%).

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

A: The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program contracts with the Migrant Student Data and Recruitment (MSDR) office to maintain the Migrant Student Information System (MSIS). The MSIS is used for the exclusive collection of data for migrant students identified by Washington State's MEP recruitment staff. The MSIS database is accessed via a web application created with Coldfusion and the database itself resided in a SQL Server. This system is used to generate counts for both Category 1 and Category 2.

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

A: Yes.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Q: How was child count data collected?

A: Staff at each project LEA are required to identify migrant students according to MEP eligibility requirements and record such eligibility determinations on the State COE. The State COE incorporates all required data elements and sections of the National COE. Student enrollment and movement information is reported into MSIS once their attendance has been verified for those students attending non-project districts, staff at the MSDR office enter their mobility and enrollment information into MSIS after their residency 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 through a face to face interview. 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, street address, mailing address (if different), city, state, zip, and phone number. 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. This enrollment is not processed until enrollment, residency and eligibility have been confirmed through contacting the family. The enrollment contained the student unique ID number, student name, district ID, building ID, enrollment date, and grade level.

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 whose residency has been confirmed by LEA staff by completing a preprinted form in MSIS containing a list of the previous year's students. 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. 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. 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. All COEs completed by LEA staff are reviewed by MSDR staff for accuracy. 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 yearly enrollments directly into the MSIS SQL database, after student residency has been confirmed through family contact. School district staff may update enrollments by accessing and updating the specific record directly through the Internet or by mailing data to the MSDR Office. Updates occur when a migrant student is new to the local district, has made a more-recent qualifying move, or has changes to the data collection components listed in Part 1 of this Section. Data is organized by designating a unique student identification number. When an enrollment is processed, it is tied to the student ID number, thus making it possible to query the MSIS database for a specific number of students who had an enrollment during a specified time frame. Data may be sorted for state reporting and management purposes utilizing the unique student ID number and the various data elements collected

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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 unique student ID number, maximum enrollment date, birth date, and qualifying arrival date fields ensure only those students enrolled and eligible for this reporting period are counted. Utilizing this process, students with multiple enrollment dates are only counted once in the reporting period.

The second dataset is comprised of students between the ages of 3 and 21 who were identified by LEA or MS DR 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 and are counted as Out of School Youth 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 MS DR 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 MS DR 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/intercession 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 enroll migrant students in a summer building ID and 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.

The state used the same system to generate Category 2 counts as was used to generate 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 required to attend annual MSDR trainings at which staff are trained 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 annual state MEP conference and at our annual 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 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. 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 following the MSDR COE Review Process. This process includes at least 2 MSDR members reviewing the COE prior to data entry. Questionable COES are held until the local educational agency home visitor/recruiter returns calls for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification to MSDR. 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 through summer end of year monitoring activities.

*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 are 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, Washington State conducted the Prospectus Re-Interview through an independent reviewer as required in the MEP. This re-interview was conducted with assistance from trained Oregon State MEP recruitment staff who used a standard re-interview form to collect eligibility information through a face-to-face interview of randomly selected Washington State MEP families. Through a computer generated query that randomly selects families from designated districts, families who had a COE completed in the 2010-11 school year were selected to be reviewed. A total of 28 large and small school districts from throughout the state, with new and veteran recruiters, were selected, but clustered according to region. Three families were not available to be re-interviewed at the time the Re-interviewer was in the area, so an alternate family was used. For every district selected to be reviewed, two additional alternate families were selected in case families moved away. A total of 75 COEs were reviewed by the independent reviewer with 72 COEs found to be eligible with three families to have been found to have been incorrectly qualified.

In addition, as part of the on-going Washington State COE Quality Control process, new home visitors and recruiters who

were hired during the 2010-11 school year had COEs reviewed through an MS DR staff member as did home visitors who incorrectly qualified a family during the 2009-2010 school year. An MS DR staff member conducts these reviews to maintain a third party review of the COE. Through this process 51 COEs were reviewed with 49 COEs found to be Eligible and 2 COEs found to have inaccurately qualified families.

Overall, through the Prespectus Re-Interview activity and the Quality Control Re-interview Process a total of 126 COEs were reviewed with 121 COEs found to have accurately documented eligibility and 5 COEs found to have inaccurately documented a families' eligibility.

All student information for those students who were inaccurately identified is removed from the MSIS database.

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.

MSDR staff conduct quarterly monitoring of LEA staff data entry activities. This includes monitoring enrollment and education data updates. As the MSIS database provides LEA staff with instant access to student/district data, 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 MS DR 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 MS DR 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. As a result of the prospectus re-interviewing, material has been developed and disseminated to staff to assist with those moves requiring additional comments, weekly eligibility emails are sent to all staff completing COEs, and commonly occurring errors are highlighted via the quarterly newsletter or at regional/statewide trainings in the fall and spring.

CSPR Part I: Data Verification Table 2010-11
Program Office Comments:

Please provide information about the additional quality control and why those numbers were included in the overall count for the reinterview. provide information about how you ensured that the process was independent. Also include information

about the training provided to the reinterviewers. Provide information about the SEAs written procedures to ensure that child count data are inputted and updated accurately.

State Response:

The additional quality control is part of the annual state initiated quality control process and as such, the number of revalidations conducted are included in the overall count for reinterviews.

The reinterview process is completed by a state level recruiter who samples Certificates of Eligibility completed by newly employed Local Educational Agency Identification and Recruitment staff to verify program eligibility and correct any errors.

The state level recruiter has over 20 years in Identification and Recruitment of migrant families in Washington State and is nationally recognized for his interview techniques. He annually attends national I/R trainings and also participates in state Identification and Recruitment trainings.

The state has a written process for quality control which identifies the method for selecting Local Educational Agencies where reinterviews will occur (based on newly employed I/R staff); notification to LEA informing them of the activity to take place; process for random selection of COE's completed by new staff member; process for reinterviewing family; procedures for COE verification or corrections to COE; process for entering updated information into the state student database system; and procedures for notifying LEA of results of verification process.

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.