

**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 2014-15



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2015
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2016

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) 2014-15 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 2014-15, 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 2014-15 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 17, 2015**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 11, 2016**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2014-15, 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 2014-15 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 2014-15 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2014-15 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2014-15		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction		
Address: PO Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Anne Renschler		
Telephone: 360-725-6229		
Fax: 360-586-3305		
e-mail: anne.renschler@k12.wa.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Gayle Pauley		
Signature _____		Date _____

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2014-15



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2015
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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

Response	Options
<p><u>No Revisions or changes</u></p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	N/A	N/A	N/A

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic content standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

<p>Washington State Standards are up to date. The current focus is on supporting districts and regions with implementation, professional learning, and instructional materials decisions.</p>

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

Response	Options
<u>No Response</u>	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	N/A	N/A	N/A

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

--

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

Response	Options
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2017-18
Regular Assessments in High School	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2017-18
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2017-18

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

--

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 2014-15, 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)	0.00
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	100.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All development work was completed through the state's collaboration with the Smarter Balanced consortium operating under the Race to the Top Assessment grant or was legacy work from previous year's (specific to Science). Thus all funding went toward expenditures supporting test administration. WA has adopted the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards as the basis for its K-12 Learning Standards, so no funds were expended to support new content standards development; emphasis has been placed in efforts to increase capacity amongst the state's LEAs with respect to the newly adopted state learning standards. Accessibility continues to be enhanced and refined by the protocols Smarter Balanced constructs on behalf of it state membership.	

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 2014-15 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>No</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>Yes</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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

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	585,166	497,888	85.08
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,163	6,681	81.84
Asian or Pacific Islander	49,516	42,717	86.27
<i>Asian</i>	43,266	37,445	86.55
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	6,250	5,272	84.35
Black or African American	27,177	22,017	81.01
Hispanic or Latino	127,907	111,715	87.34
White	331,258	279,424	84.35
Two or more races	40,322	34,591	85.79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	75,911	64,531	85.01
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	55,690	49,523	88.93
Economically disadvantaged students	267,913	233,415	87.12
Migratory students	12,577	10,879	86.50
Male	300,527	255,759	85.10
Female	284,629	242,119	85.06

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified, and the above is an accurate account of testing in Washington in Spring 2015.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	28,034	43.44
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	31,515	48.84
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,982	7.72
Total	64,531	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	584,644	502,138	85.89
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,141	6,789	83.39
Asian or Pacific Islander	49,536	42,828	86.46
<i>Asian</i>	43,275	37,503	86.66
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	6,261	5,325	85.05
Black or African American	27,130	22,298	82.19
Hispanic or Latino	127,796	112,325	87.89
White	330,909	282,234	85.29
Two or more races	40,280	34,891	86.62
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	75,789	65,357	86.24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	55,784	49,277	88.34
Economically disadvantaged students	267,709	235,564	87.99
Migratory students	12,568	10,920	86.89
Male	300,273	257,976	85.91
Female	284,362	244,153	85.86

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified, and the above is an accurate account of testing in Washington in Spring 2015.

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	37,652	57.61
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	22,694	34.72
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,011	7.67
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	65,357	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	255,406	228,646	89.52
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,765	3,062	81.33
Asian or Pacific Islander	21,364	19,792	92.64
Asian	18,675	17,531	93.87
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,689	2,261	84.08
Black or African American	12,155	10,194	83.87
Hispanic or Latino	54,260	47,894	88.27
White	146,638	132,288	90.21
Two or more races	16,888	15,094	89.38
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	32,341	26,773	82.78
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,633	16,715	85.14
Economically disadvantaged students	114,237	100,122	87.64
Migratory students	5,386	4,661	86.54
Male	131,725	117,022	88.84
Female	123,680	111,623	90.25

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified, and the above is an accurate account of testing in Washington in Spring 2015.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	24,557	91.72
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	841	3.14
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,375	5.14
Total	26,773	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

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.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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	79,258	45,636	57.58
American Indian or Alaska Native	950	324	34.11
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,358	4,577	71.99
<i>Asian</i>	5,546	4,275	77.08
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	812	302	37.19
Black or African American	3,512	1,309	37.27
Hispanic or Latino	18,819	7,472	39.70
White	43,112	28,179	65.36
Two or more races	6,332	3,663	57.85
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,535	3,130	29.71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,255	3,534	28.84
Economically disadvantaged students	39,354	16,470	41.85
Migratory students	1,749	487	27.84
Male	40,692	23,641	58.10
Female	38,566	21,995	57.03

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.

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	79,465	41,919	52.75
American Indian or Alaska Native	953	253	26.55
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,327	4,106	64.90
<i>Asian</i>	5,513	3,849	69.82
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	814	257	31.57
Black or African American	3,521	1,216	34.54
Hispanic or Latino	18,849	6,409	34.00
White	43,264	26,333	60.87
Two or more races	6,368	3,490	54.81
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,600	2,776	26.19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,146	2,349	19.34
Economically disadvantaged students	39,472	14,257	36.12
Migratory students	1,739	331	19.03
Male	40,791	19,727	48.36
Female	38,674	22,192	57.38

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Washington does not test 3rd graders in Science.			

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	77,671	42,565	54.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	980	286	29.18
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,740	4,756	70.56
<i>Asian</i>	5,864	4,444	75.78
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	876	312	35.62
Black or African American	3,410	1,180	34.60
Hispanic or Latino	18,065	6,384	35.34
White	42,634	26,692	62.61
Two or more races	5,732	3,198	55.79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,774	2,732	25.36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,252	2,315	22.58
Economically disadvantaged students	37,869	14,525	38.36
Migratory students	1,741	456	26.19
Male	39,821	22,108	55.52
Female	37,850	20,457	54.05

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.

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	77,783	42,981	55.26
American Indian or Alaska Native	979	278	28.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,713	4,551	67.79
<i>Asian</i>	5,837	4,242	72.67
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	876	309	35.27
Black or African American	3,420	1,236	36.14
Hispanic or Latino	18,070	6,379	35.30
White	42,752	27,214	63.66
Two or more races	5,739	3,251	56.65
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,797	2,575	23.85
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,171	1,779	17.49
Economically disadvantaged students	37,947	14,444	38.06
Migratory students	1,738	363	20.89
Male	39,850	20,237	50.78
Female	37,933	22,744	59.96

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Washington does not test 4th graders in Science.			

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	77,457	37,873	48.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,025	260	25.37
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,828	4,501	65.92
<i>Asian</i>	5,995	4,247	70.84
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	833	254	30.49
Black or African American	3,441	927	26.94
Hispanic or Latino	17,505	5,177	29.57
White	43,133	24,218	56.15
Two or more races	5,425	2,739	50.49
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,636	2,013	18.93
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,867	1,187	13.39
Economically disadvantaged students	37,049	11,814	31.89
Migratory students	1,714	319	18.61
Male	39,717	19,598	49.34
Female	37,740	18,275	48.42

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.

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	77,560	45,196	58.27
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,027	337	32.81
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,813	4,751	69.73
<i>Asian</i>	5,980	4,426	74.01
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	833	325	39.02
Black or African American	3,429	1,344	39.20
Hispanic or Latino	17,495	6,756	38.62
White	43,255	28,621	66.17
Two or more races	5,440	3,326	61.14
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,694	2,303	21.54
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,806	1,356	15.40
Economically disadvantaged students	37,107	15,398	41.50
Migratory students	1,706	421	24.68
Male	39,782	20,953	52.67
Female	37,778	24,243	64.17

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.

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	77,671	49,540	63.78
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,022	382	37.38
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,834	4,866	71.20
<i>Asian</i>	6,006	4,550	75.76
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	828	316	38.16
Black or African American	3,436	1,388	40.40
Hispanic or Latino	17,513	7,319	41.79
White	43,331	31,903	73.63
Two or more races	5,434	3,618	66.58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,687	3,484	32.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,843	1,841	20.82
Economically disadvantaged students	37,036	17,645	47.64
Migratory students	1,706	482	28.25
Male	39,827	25,107	63.04
Female	37,844	24,433	64.56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	76,379	35,369	46.31
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,096	267	24.36
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,757	4,425	65.49
<i>Asian</i>	5,954	4,235	71.13
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	803	190	23.66
Black or African American	3,386	880	25.99
Hispanic or Latino	16,827	4,427	26.31
White	43,022	22,835	53.08
Two or more races	5,238	2,514	48.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,208	1,329	13.02
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,183	569	9.20
Economically disadvantaged students	35,496	10,345	29.14
Migratory students	1,542	230	14.92
Male	38,960	17,662	45.33
Female	37,418	17,706	47.32

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.

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	76,557	41,688	54.45
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,103	324	29.37
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,732	4,720	70.11
<i>Asian</i>	5,932	4,447	74.97
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	800	273	34.12
Black or African American	3,402	1,233	36.24
Hispanic or Latino	16,854	5,955	35.33
White	43,159	26,387	61.14
Two or more races	5,247	3,038	57.90
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,269	1,537	14.97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,137	615	10.02
Economically disadvantaged students	35,627	13,259	37.22
Migratory students	1,539	344	22.35
Male	39,056	18,799	48.13
Female	37,500	22,889	61.04

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Washington does not test 6th graders in Science.			

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	75,303	36,922	49.03
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,014	263	25.94
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,656	4,571	68.67
<i>Asian</i>	5,865	4,343	74.05
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	791	228	28.82
Black or African American	3,350	968	28.90
Hispanic or Latino	16,244	4,799	29.54
White	42,980	23,774	55.31
Two or more races	4,994	2,523	50.52
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,347	1,107	11.84
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,424	547	10.08
Economically disadvantaged students	34,526	11,028	31.94
Migratory students	1,621	337	20.79
Male	38,476	18,538	48.18
Female	36,826	18,383	49.92
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.			

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	75,444	43,495	57.65
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,022	338	33.07
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,617	4,743	71.68
<i>Asian</i>	5,831	4,435	76.06
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	786	308	39.19
Black or African American	3,356	1,260	37.54
Hispanic or Latino	16,272	6,230	38.29
White	43,100	27,871	64.67
Two or more races	5,003	3,020	60.36
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,413	1,324	14.07
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,345	502	9.39
Economically disadvantaged students	34,629	14,055	40.59
Migratory students	1,613	420	26.04
Male	38,522	19,717	51.18
Female	36,921	23,778	64.40
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Washington does not test 7th graders in Science.			

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	76,328	36,275	47.53
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,058	242	22.87
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,726	4,522	67.23
<i>Asian</i>	5,926	4,294	72.46
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	800	228	28.50
Black or African American	3,382	869	25.69
Hispanic or Latino	16,315	4,722	28.94
White	43,760	23,393	53.46
Two or more races	4,924	2,448	49.72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,161	871	9.51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,847	563	11.62
Economically disadvantaged students	34,021	10,515	30.91
Migratory students	1,627	341	20.96
Male	39,393	18,020	45.74
Female	36,934	18,255	49.43
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.			

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	76,622	44,349	57.88
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,067	353	33.08
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,707	4,778	71.24
<i>Asian</i>	5,905	4,475	75.78
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	802	303	37.78
Black or African American	3,378	1,239	36.68
Hispanic or Latino	16,366	6,406	39.14
White	43,998	28,419	64.59
Two or more races	4,941	3,048	61.69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,241	1,289	13.95
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,791	443	9.25
Economically disadvantaged students	34,173	14,066	41.16
Migratory students	1,636	446	27.26
Male	39,533	20,135	50.93
Female	37,089	24,214	65.29
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The numbers were lower in the prior year due to the SBA pilot testing.			

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	77,030	47,235	61.32
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,064	387	36.37
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,756	4,858	71.91
<i>Asian</i>	5,958	4,554	76.44
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	798	304	38.10
Black or African American	3,401	1,261	37.08
Hispanic or Latino	16,351	6,455	39.48
White	44,328	30,938	69.79
Two or more races	4,970	3,227	64.93
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,215	1,652	17.93
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,810	496	10.31
Economically disadvantaged students	34,139	15,025	44.01
Migratory students	1,625	448	27.57
Male	39,673	23,678	59.68
Female	37,356	23,557	63.06
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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	35,492	10,319	29.07
American Indian or Alaska Native	558	81	14.52
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,652	1,198	45.17
<i>Asian</i>	2,295	1,152	50.20
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	357	46	12.89
Black or African American	1,536	213	13.87
Hispanic or Latino	7,940	1,201	15.13
White	20,783	7,030	33.83
Two or more races	1,946	578	29.70
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,870	282	7.29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,695	123	7.26
Economically disadvantaged students	15,100	2,578	17.07
Migratory students	885	86	9.72
Male	18,700	5,522	29.53
Female	16,785	4,795	28.57

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Our high school testing grade changed from grade 10 to grade 11 with the SBA. Not all 11th graders needed to test because they had passed the assessments in the 10th grade.

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	38,707	19,523	50.44
American Indian or Alaska Native	638	226	35.42
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,919	1,620	55.50
<i>Asian</i>	2,505	1,500	59.88
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	414	120	28.99
Black or African American	1,792	591	32.98
Hispanic or Latino	8,419	3,033	36.03
White	22,706	12,911	56.86
Two or more races	2,153	1,112	51.65
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,343	603	13.88
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,881	121	6.43
Economically disadvantaged students	16,609	6,256	37.67
Migratory students	949	252	26.55
Male	20,442	9,216	45.08
Female	18,258	10,306	56.45

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Our high school testing grade changed from grade 10 to grade 11 with the SBA. Not all 11th graders needed to test because they had passed the assessments in the 10th grade.

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	73,945	56,496	76.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	976	543	55.64
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,202	5,036	81.20
<i>Asian</i>	5,567	4,727	84.91
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	635	309	48.66
Black or African American	3,357	1,836	54.69
Hispanic or Latino	14,030	8,270	58.95
White	44,629	37,154	83.25
Two or more races	4,690	3,626	77.31
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,871	2,051	29.85
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,062	582	19.01
Economically disadvantaged students	28,947	17,876	61.75
Migratory students	1,330	600	45.11
Male	37,522	28,523	76.02
Female	36,423	27,973	76.80
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data have been verified and are accurate.			

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

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2014-15. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
Schools	2,150	1,147	53.35
Districts	301	71	23.59

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator ³ based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
Schools			
Districts			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

³ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2014-15. 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 2014-15	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
All Title I schools	940	577	61.38
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	675	411	60.89
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	265	166	62.64

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator ⁴ based on data for SY 2014-15. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

⁴ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2014-15. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2014-15	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2014-15
284	64	22.54

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator⁵ based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2014-15	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

⁵ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

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 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2014-15
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	96
Extension of the school year or school day	22
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	22
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	6
Replacement of the principal	12
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	15
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	25
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 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)	26
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	212
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

--

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Under the Washington Accountability System and the No Child Left Behind law, school districts are expected to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) performance targets. For 2014-15, a district moved into (a) Step 1 of Improvement and sanctions when the Participation Rates or "other indicator(s)" were not met for two consecutive years at all of their grade levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high) or (b) Step 2 of Improvement and sanctions when the Participation Rates or "other indicator(s)" were not met for one year at all of their grade levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high).

Requirements/Sanctions
The criteria for sanctions are:

- Set by the State and the State Board of Education in accordance with the Revised Code of Washington (RCW 28A.657.110) requiring the state to establish an accountability framework that creates a unified system of support for challenged schools and recognition of schools for exemplary performance;
- Based on Adequate Yearly Progress decisions; and
- Applied uniformly across public schools and districts.

All districts in Step 1 or 2 of Improvement must set aside an amount equal to 10 percent of their total Title I, Part A allocation for professional development. Additional requirements for Districts in Step 1 or Step 2 of Improvement follow.

- Districts in Step 1 are required to develop or revise a district improvement plan and implement the plan 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:
 - o Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs of the district's school(s), especially the needs of low-achieving students;
 - o Define specific measurable achievement goals and targets for each student subgroup;
 - o Incorporate strategies grounded in scientifically based research that will strengthen instruction in core academic subjects;
 - o Include appropriate student learning activities before school, after school, during the summer, and during any extension of the school year;
 - o Provide for high-quality professional development for instructional staff that focuses on improved instruction;
 - o Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the district's schools; and
 - o Include a determination of why the district's previous plan did not bring about the required increase in student academic achievement.
- Districts in Step 2 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:
 - o Defer program funds or reduce administrative funds; or
 - o 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
A total of 97 districts were identified for improvement in 2014-15:

- New in Step 1: 41 districts
- Continuing in Step 1: 4 districts
- New in Step 2: 26 districts
- Continuing in Step 2: 26 districts

Technical assistance provided to districts in improvement varies to meet the needs of districts as they are developing their improvement plans or in various stages of implementing their plans. Among the most common supports are:

1. Guidance to develop/revise plans: The document, Central Office Action Planning: Guidance for Districts with Priority and Focus Schools, was developed in collaboration with divisions across OSPI and the Washington Association of School Administrators. It outlines specific steps to support districts teams to (a) analyze existing systems, structures, data, and research findings and (b) develop/revise, implement, and monitor their district improvement plan using an online action-planning tool, Indistar. The tool supports integration of required action plans for districts with persistently lowest achieving schools (i.e., Priority and Focus schools) and Title I District Improvement Plans. This assists districts to move from compliance to transformation as they address requirements for their plans.
2. Additional support: In collaboration with regional Educational Service Districts, the Office of Student and School Success and Title I Section convene regional outreaches for district/school teams each fall and spring. State staff outline requirements for district improvement plans and provide assistance for teams to use Indistar as they develop/revise, implement, and monitor their plans.
3. Review of district improvement plans: District improvement plans for districts with Priority and Focus schools are reviewed annually by OSPI's Office of Student and School Success; the remaining district improvement plans are reviewed by OSPI's Title I Section. The review provides district teams with feedback regarding plan requirements and recommendations for next steps.
4. External Facilitator: OSPI assigns a part-time Leadership Coach to each Priority and Focus school. Coaches are experienced educators who have been successful in improving student performance. They help build capacity at the school and district levels to support implementation of high-quality, data-driven, and research-based improvement plans.
5. Professional development and expertise: Additional resources for professional development and expertise OSPI could provide (e.g., working with diverse student populations and implementing research-based practices and programs) are determined on a case-by-case basis for Priority and Focus schools and their districts.
6. District Review: Districts can request an Educational On-Site Review 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.
7. Designation of districts for required action: OSPI is required to annually recommend to the State Board of Education school districts for designation as Required Action Districts (RAD). These districts include at least one school identified as persistently lowest achieving, with the lowest levels of achievement and rates of improvement in the "all students" group on state assessments in ELA/reading and mathematics for the last 3 consecutive years. These districts and their schools receive state funding to implement one of the four federal turnaround models or the state-approved Synergy Model. The Office of Student and School Success created the document, Required Action Districts: Level One Plan Guidance, to serve several purposes. First, it describes exactly what districts need to do to satisfy requirements for Required Action Districts and to exit required action status. Next, the guidance is intended to clarify our intention that districts identified for required action build upon their current Student and School Success Action Plans when addressing concerns raised in an external audit of the district and school.

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 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 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 2014-15
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	58
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	20
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	3
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	20
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2013-14 and beginning of SY 2014-15 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Replacement of personnel includes staff members and or principals.	

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 2014-15 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	7	5
Schools	34	22
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2014-15 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2014-15 data was complete	10/7/15

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2014 (SY 2014-15) 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*: 4.00 %

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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 2014-15.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2014-15, the SEA received support through the 5% available for administration to assist selected districts with the sustainability of SIG Cohort II (Year 4), monitoring and intervention in support of SIG Cohort III (Year 1), and the continued development through contracts with private providers focused on a statewide system of support.

Purpose and Background:

In the 2014-15 school year, OSPI's Office of Student and School Success continues the use of 1003(g) funds in support of the Federal School Improvement Grant initiatives.

The 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/language arts and math achievement measured by the state assessment over the past three consecutive years and graduation rate of less than 60% has allowed the Office of Student and School Success to provide support to 21 schools statewide.

Our current work is based on an approved state application for SIG funds and subsequent funding waiver request which granted the SEA an additional year of support and services for the SIG Cohort II districts/schools. Of the 10 schools selected in Cohort II, 8 applied for a 4th year of support for the 2014-15 school year. SIG Cohort II will conclude the initiative on September 30, 2015.

SIG Cohort III has continued to receive support and services to implement required elements aligned to the LEAs selected intervention model (transformation, turnaround, closure, and restart).

In addition, the Washington State Service Delivery Model continued to support a variety of services to identified SIG districts. These services included but were not limited to needs assessments, contextual survey data and data dashboard support, classroom walkthrough training/PD, improvement planning support and monitoring/tracking for accountability purposes, onsite visits to SIG districts and schools, and executive coaching from the Office of Student and School Success Staff.

Evaluation and Technical Assistance:

The SEA continues to provide Evaluation and Technical Assistance support through agency FTEs and a third-party contractor. 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 FTE and contractors is in alignment with school structures and practices Turnaround Principles described in federal guidance, as well as 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

Enhanced Technical Assistance Efforts:

The implementation of effective instruction, assessment and intervention systems in reading/language arts and mathematics is essential to enabling all students to achieve at high levels. Within the context of Student and School Success district action plans, OSPI staff are providing technical assistance in the content areas of reading and mathematics and in meeting the needs of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities.

Specific areas of continued focus will depend on district context relative to implementation of Common Core 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.

The Office of Student and School Success Coaches with both leadership and instructional expertise have been assigned to each of our SIG districts. These experienced, exemplary educators work in an ongoing capacity with district personnel, supporting the effective implementation of strategies in leadership, instruction, data analysis, assessment, intervention, and the alignment of district and school improvement plans. Our ability to maintain this level of technical assistance will be critical to sustain the ongoing efforts to the existing districts and schools.

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 2014-15 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.

Background and Purpose:

In 2013 Washington State Legislature passed E2SSB 5329 to support three main performance outcomes within the public schools in Washington State.

1. Create a differentiated system of accountability and support that permeates all schools in Washington State. Rewarding exemplar schools and identifying schools that are under-performing, both Title I and non-Title.
2. Recommend to the State Board of Education those schools within Washington State that, despite significant intervention, continue to be amongst the lowest performing, for RAD (Required Action District).
3. Support through targeted investment: Fiscal Grant, Leadership and Instructional Coaching to ensure the success of all Non-Title Priority, Focus, and RAD schools statewide.

Services Provided:

The services provided to schools as a result of E2SSB 5329 legislation include: fiscal grants to identified schools to support their Student and School Success Action Plan, leadership coaching provided to the building principals of identified schools and targeted district staff, instructional coaching provided in the classrooms of identified schools, and data analysis/assessment to support the improvement planning process. A fixed amount is also assigned to support the administrative expenses and investment within OSPI related to the growth in program by increasing the number of schools identified statewide and differentiating the fiscal support.

Criteria for receiving services and/or grants include the following:

1. Priority Schools: Based on low performance in the "All Students" category
 - i. Less than 40% for Reading/Math combined
 - ii. Less than 60% for Adjusted 5-year Cohort Graduation Rates
 - iii. Lowest ranked schools based on Achievement Index (#1748-#1801)
 - iv. Continuing Priority from previous year
 - v. Bottom 5% of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools
2. Focus Schools: Based on Subgroup performance
 - i. Less than 60% for Adjusted 5-year Cohort Graduation Rates
 - ii. Lowest 10% in Reading/Math-threshold less than or equal to 13.58% proficient in Reading/Math (combined)
 - iii. Continuing Focus from previous year
3. RAD (Required Action District)

Our current work is based on an approved Agency Fiscal Note for to support Title/Non-Title Priority and Focus schools and also RAD schools. The beneficiaries in 2014-15 included 275 schools in 115 districts.

Evaluation and Technical Assistance:

Each identified school in Washington State is required to submit a Student and School Success Action Plan that is reviewed at least three times annually by the Office of Student and School Success. These plans, along with ongoing data analysis provide the "prescription" to ensure ongoing growth and proficiency of the students in identified schools. In addition to the student performance gains, the Office of Student and School Success monitor changes/improvements in educator practice of both the building leadership and teaching staff. Through the formalized Instructional Review Process, all Priority, Focus, and RAD schools who are not exhibiting growth will continually be both scrutinized and supported for growth and targeted intervention.

Continued Technical Assistance from FTE and contractors is in alignment with school structures and practices Turnaround Principles described in state and federal guidance, as well as 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

Enhanced Technical Assistance Efforts:

The implementation of effective instruction, assessment and intervention systems in reading/language arts and mathematics is essential to enabling all students to achieve at high levels. Within the context of Student and School Success district action plans, OSPI staff are providing technical assistance in the content areas of reading and mathematics and in meeting the needs of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities.

Specific areas of continued focus will depend on district context relative to implementation of Common Core 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.

The Office of Student and School Success Coaches with both leadership and instructional expertise have been assigned to each of our SIG districts. These experienced, exemplary educators work in an ongoing capacity with district personnel, supporting the effective implementation of strategies in leadership, instruction, data analysis, assessment, intervention, and the alignment of district and school improvement plans. Our ability to maintain this level of technical assistance will be critical to sustain the ongoing efforts to the existing districts and schools.

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 Title I school 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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	267,778
Applied to transfer	2,593
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,969
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,293,785

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	105

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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*.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	162,247
Applied for supplemental educational services	17,456
Received supplemental educational services	13,214
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 13,219,737
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Classes	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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	251,797	243,676	96.77	8,121	3.23
All elementary classes	29,144	28,547	97.95	597	2.05
All secondary classes	222,653	215,129	96.62	7,524	3.38

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction in 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 elementary classes as 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.

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes	
Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	82.80
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	12.80
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.60
Other (please explain in comment box below)	1.90
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data includes bilingual, alternative education and juvenile detention teachers.

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes	
Secondary School Classes	Percentage
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	60.60
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	23.30
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.80
Other (please explain in comment box below)	13.40
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data includes bilingual, alternative education and juvenile detention teachers.

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	9,230	8,980	97.29
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	6,451	6,321	97.98
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	36,904	35,298	95.65
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	65,937	64,298	97.51

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	66.00	33.00
Poverty metric used	Free-Reduced Lunch is the metric used.	
Secondary schools	66.00	33.00
Poverty metric used	Free Reduced Lunch is the metric used.	

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/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Russian, Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Russian, Spanish, Vietnamese
<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>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>No</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- o 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.
- o 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	110,774
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of LEP students in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	109,513
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	74,349
Russian	4,513
Vietnamese	3,969
Somali	2,883
Chinese	2,630

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).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	113,549
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,896
Total	117,445
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	19,018
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	16.75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The state saw an increase in transition rates that were attributed to the Vendor repeating the use of test Form C in this year.	

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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing		#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		111,797
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		3,324
Total		115,121
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested		#
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.		28,363

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:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **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.
3. **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.
4. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and 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%).

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	64,867	77.75	58,816	68.10
Attained proficiency	18,710	16.74	8,941	8.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

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).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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)
None
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 (MFLEP) 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
12,797	11,228	24,025
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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
14,674	7,105	48.42	7,569
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These scores reflect the first year of Washington State's Smarter Balanced results. There is no concordance between the previous year's state assessment instrument and the Smarter Balanced assessment.			

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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,690	7,717	52.53	6,973
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These scores reflect the first year of Washington State's Smarter Balanced results. There is no concordance between the previous year's state assessment instrument and the Smarter Balanced assessment.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for 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 MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,363	2,227	51.04	2,136
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	151
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	17
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	120
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	119
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	21
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2013-14 and 2014-15)	21
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2014-15 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	21
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15)	26

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. If applicable, also please note if this method is the same or different from the previous year.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Same. Each school district was counted as a separate entity. For purposes of requiring districts to write a Title III improvement plan, the determination was based on consortium results.

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only 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
27,505	1,942	1

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 educational programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	946
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,446

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 and 1.6.4.)
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.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	165
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	66
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	123
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	49
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	35
Other (Explain in comment box)	50

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	169	21,238
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	127	3,779
PD provided to principals	114	1,020
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	131	906
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	149	4,967
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	28
Total	//////////	31,938

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Topics includes multicultural education, ELLs w/disabilities, language test proctor training, SEA webinars (various topics), GLAD trainings, and student transition workshops.

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2014-15 funds July 1, 2014, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2014, for SY 2014-15 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/2015	7/1/2015	30
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The state received the funds on the same date that the funds were made available to approved sub grantees. The 2014 dates entered are accurate.		

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.

N/A Met target

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	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	268	268
LEAs with subgrants	34	34
Total	302	302

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. correcting the #LEAs reporting data from 267 to 268

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	370	308
K	1,750	1,266
1	1,767	1,313
2	1,677	1,312
3	1,540	1,147
4	1,598	1,138
5	1,449	1,044
6	1,376	982
7	1,380	943
8	1,287	950
9	1,255	1,061
10	1,234	1,070
11	1,368	1,118
12	2,075	1,733
Ungraded	0	0
Total	20,126	15,385

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	2,409	3,396
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	15,579	10,332
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	933	668
Hotels/Motels	1,205	989
Total	20,126	15,385

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,219	2,503
Migratory children/youth	1,331	255
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,049	3,252
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	3,274	1,864

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	340
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	731
K	1,349
1	1,378
2	1,388
3	1,212
4	1,202
5	1,139
6	1,063
7	1,006
8	1,005
9	1,117
10	1,114
11	1,186
12	1,810
Ungraded	0
Total	17,040

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	2,704
Migratory children/youth	266
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,343
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,037

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,160	337	29.05	952	282	29.62
4	1,196	339	28.34	940	274	29.15
5	1,070	343	32.06	846	287	33.92
6	1,067	292	27.37	815	232	28.47
7	997	327	32.80	723	206	28.49
8	922	290	31.45	735	237	32.24
High School	532	173	32.52	388	123	31.70

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,168	379	32.45	939	303	32.27
4	1,197	330	27.57	941	256	27.21
5	1,085	248	22.86	837	192	22.94
6	1,056	218	20.64	802	169	21.07
7	990	223	22.53	718	170	23.68
8	911	184	20.20	740	167	22.57
High School	514	59	11.48	335	34	10.15

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	1,069	409	38.26	836	332	39.71
6						
7						
8	914	308	33.70	746	266	35.66
High School	731	380	51.98	617	318	51.54

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Blank fields for the science assessment (above) are due to the fact that our state did not test in those grade levels.