



Washington's ESSA Consolidated Plan

Fulfilling the requirements of Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)





Revised: January 12, 2018





Cover Page

Contact Information and Signatures	
SEA Contact (Name and Position): Michaela W. Miller ED.D., NBCT, Deputy Superintendent	Telephone: 360-725-6348
Mailing Address: Old Capitol Building P.O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200	Email Address: michaela.miller@k12.wa.us
<p><i>By signing this document, I assure that:</i></p> <p><i>To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct. The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304.</i></p> <p><i>Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.</i></p>	
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) Chris Reykdal, State Superintendent	Telephone: 360-725-6115
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative 	Date: January 12, 2018
Governor (Printed Name) Jay Inslee	Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540: August 7, 2017
Signature of Governor 	Date: September 13, 2017

Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Check this box if the SEA has included <u>all</u> of the following programs in its consolidated State plan.</i>
-------------------------------------	--

Or, if all programs are not included, check each program listed below that the SEA includes in its consolidated State plan:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney Vento-Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program</i>

Contents

Executive Summary.....	7
Plan Overview	8
A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies (LEAs)	11
A.1 Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments	11
A.2 Eighth Grade Math Exception	11
A.3 Native Language Assessments	12
A.4 Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities	14
A.5 Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators.....	69
A.5.A Summary of Results	74
A.5.B Public Reporting.....	74
A.5.C Root Cause Analysis	75
A.6 School Conditions.....	76
A.7 School Transitions	80
A.7.A Transition from Early Childhood Education to Elementary School	83
A.7.B Transitioning from Elementary to Middle School.....	90
A.7.C Transitioning from Middle School into High School	91
A.7.D Transition from High School to Post-Secondary Education and Careers	94
B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children.....	100
B.1 Supporting Needs of Migratory Children	100
B.2 Promote Coordination of Services	109
B.3 Use of Funds.....	110
C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk	114
C.1 Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs	114
C.2 Program Objectives and Outcomes	117
C.2.A Subpart 1 Program Objectives and Outcomes	117
C.2.B Subpart 2 Program Objectives and Outcomes	118
D. Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction	119
D.1 Use of Funds.....	119
D.2 Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools	121
D.3 System of Certification and Licensing	125
D.4 Improving Skills of Educators	125
D.4.A Evaluation and Support Systems	131

D.5	Data and Consultation.....	136
D.6	Teacher Preparation.....	138
E.	Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement.....	140
E.1	Entrance and Exit Procedures	140
E.2	SEA Support for English Learner Progress.....	141
E.3	Monitoring and Technical Assistance	142
F.	Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants.....	144
F.1	Use of Funds.....	144
F.2	Awarding Subgrants	144
G.	Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers.....	146
G.1	Use of Funds.....	146
G.2	Awarding Subgrants	150
H.	Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program	152
H.1	Outcomes and Objectives	152
H.2	Technical Assistance.....	152
I.	Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B.....	154
I.1	Student Identification	154
I.2	Dispute Resolution	155
I.3	Support for School Personnel	156
I.4	Access to Services.....	157
I.5	Strategies to Address Other Problems.....	159
I.6	Policies to Remove Barriers.....	162
I.7	Assistance from Counselors	163
	Appendix A: Measurements of Interim Progress	164
	Academic Achievement	164
	Graduation Rates	165
	Appendix B: Acknowledgements	166
	Appendix C: Glossary	176
	Appendix D: Summary of Public Engagement	178
	Invitation to Participate	178
	Outreach and Input.....	178
	Coordination	190

Public Input Results..... 190

Appendix E: Image Attribution and Copyright..... 191

Photo Credits 191



SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Chris Reykdal Old Capitol Building · PO BOX 47200 · Olympia, WA 98504-7200 · <http://www.k12.wa.us>

September 18, 2017

Dear Secretary Devos:

Washington state is pleased to submit its Consolidated Plan for implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) brought focus to education gaps across the nation. But the law was overly punitive to schools and districts. ESSA builds on the positive aspects of NCLB, while allowing states to determine what measures will be taken to improve schools. Washington state's plan is focused on accountability that emphasizes student sub-groups that have been historically underserved. We know that we cannot achieve our ultimate goal of 100 percent graduation with a high quality diploma without closing opportunity gaps. ESSA's flexibility is crucial to our efforts. Washington state approached the law holistically, understanding that implementation must occur across multiple programs and multiple fund sources— this is a plan that challenges us to leverage all of our resources, not just our federal programs.

To that end, our plan is a state plan. It is the result of more than a year of work, comprising 12 workgroups, a leadership team, and a consolidated plan team. The workgroups contained more than 200 members around the state, including those from education, business, legislative, and parent organizations. In addition to receiving hundreds of public comments, our leadership team (spanning two administrations) traveled throughout the state, holding regional forums for the public and meeting with leaders from historically underserved communities.

Our ESSA plan addresses opportunity gaps in the education system, and it works to promote equitable access and opportunity for all Washington students. Our responsibility as educators is to prepare every student – regardless of background, household income, or race/ethnicity – for post-secondary aspirations, careers, and life. That means looking closely at a more comprehensive set of student success variables that go beyond standardized tests: chronic absenteeism, ninth-grade class failure, and dual credit opportunities.

This is a plan that puts its focus squarely on student success. Washington intends to create an integrated federal, state and local system. Our plan addresses the federal requirements in a manner consistent with state law. State plans don't change outcomes by themselves; it's the hard work of educators engaging with students, parents, and communities that ultimately make the difference. Our work to implement has only just begun!

I thank every workgroup member and every person who provided comments to us. Let's take the next step together to support greater student achievement.

Sincerely,

Chris Reykdal
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Washington State

Executive Summary

This Consolidated Plan is a critical turning point in our state’s educational system, building on our path of innovation and excellence in education for our 1.1 million students. This Plan is a requirement of the 2015 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, entitled Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

Our state laws align closely with ESSA’s intent. Standards-based education started nearly 23 years ago with the passage of the Education Reform Act. Since then the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) has built a high-quality education system to support the learning of students from kindergarten through high school. It sets K–12 academic learning standards in English language arts (ELA), mathematics, science, social studies, the arts, and health and fitness.

Simultaneously, the state also implemented an assessment system to measure student progress meeting academic standards. Those standards and assessments have evolved over time to meet our student’s needs and to focus on college and career readiness. Our state is phasing in additional credits requirements to earn a high school diploma, which will be completed with the class of 2019.

More recently, the state collaboratively built and schools fully implemented the Teacher/Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP) to ensure teachers and principals receive the feedback and tools needed to be effective in the classroom.

Our state has recently taken significant steps addressing the opportunity gap through implementation of laws aimed at reducing the time students are excluded from school due to suspensions and expulsions, a focus on equity and civil rights, deeper disaggregation of student data to analyze disproportionality, family engagement, expansion of full-day kindergarten and early grade support, and improved focus on students’ equitable access to educators.

Washington fully implemented the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act after it passed in 2002. Unfortunately, NCLB lacked the flexibility to recognize our state’s important work in the areas of challenging state standards, assessments, teacher effectiveness, and student equity. As a result, it imposed restrictions on the use of federal funds that negatively impacted schools.

ESSA is a welcome change. Its intent is to “provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close the achievement gap,” aligning it well with Washington’s efforts.

Washington’s Consolidated Plan has been developed collaboratively and with an eye on equity to support districts and schools as they work to improve educational outcomes for all students. The Plan emphasizes greater cross-program coordination, planning, and service delivery. One goal of the plan: local education agencies (LEAs) will use a consolidated application for the federal programs under ESSA. This will allow LEAs to take a big picture, rather than segmented, approach to meeting student needs with their federal, state, and local dollars.

Plan Overview



Federal education programs provide support and funding to local education agencies for at-risk students. The programs are defined by title, and cover many aspects of our modern education systems. They include funding and guidance for improving basic operations, providing additional support for students, supporting teacher and principal quality, support for acquiring English language skills, and enrichment activities. Students who are at-risk, whether it is poverty, homelessness, incarceration, migratory status, or other factors receive additional support to help achieve high academic standards to succeed in school and beyond.

Version 2.0 of the Washington State ESSA Consolidated Plan is organized by federal program. It is a significant change from the initial guidance provided by the U.S. Department of Education and the first draft of our state’s Plan, which was released for public comment in December 2016. The structure of this final version of the Plan is simpler, and there is less required content under the revised guidelines.

In addition, incoming Superintendent Chris Reykdal extended the public comment period to ensure stakeholders had sufficient time to carefully review the draft contents and provide feedback. Many individuals and organizations provided input on the first draft, and every piece of feedback received was reviewed by a team to help improve this final release. OSPI produced a detailed report on the feedback received and reconvened several workgroups to reassess the Plan, particularly surrounding accountability measures.

The Plan is organized into chapters by federal program:

- A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies** serves the unique needs of children — kindergarten to grade 12 — who struggle to learn. Title I programs and services provide customized instruction and curricula that helps these students meet academic standards and take an active, engaged interest in what they

learn and can do. As the oldest and largest federal education program, Title I programs build equity of opportunity for children whose struggles often keep them on the academic sidelines.

- B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children** helps migrant students and youth in our state meet high academic challenges by overcoming obstacles created by frequent moves, educational disruption, cultural and language differences, and health-related problems.
- C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk** helps improve educational services for children so they have the opportunity to meet challenging State academic content and achievement standards; provides them with services to successfully transition from institutionalization to further schooling or employment; helps prevent youth who are at-risk from dropping out of school, and provides dropouts and children and youth returning from correctional facilities with a support system to ensure their continued education.
- D. Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction** increases the academic achievement of all students by helping schools and districts improve teacher and principal quality. This includes teacher preparation and qualifications of new teachers, recruitment and hiring, induction, professional development, and retention. In addition, Title II, Part A funds may be used to improve the skills and knowledge of principals and other school leaders for effective school leadership.
- E. Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement** addresses the unique needs of eligible students who come from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds to develop language proficiency that enables meaningful access to grade level curricula and instruction.
- F. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants** provide all students with a well-rounded education¹ including programs such as college and career counseling, Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM), arts, civics and International Baccalaureate/Advanced Placement (IB/AP) courses. It supports students with comprehensive school mental health, drug and violence prevention, and health and physical education. Finally, it provides support for the effective use of technology.
- G. Title IV Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers** creates community learning centers that provide academic enrichment opportunities during non-school hours for children, particularly students who attend high-poverty and low-performing schools.
- H. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program** is a federal initiative designed to address the unique needs of rural school districts. These districts frequently lack personnel and resources needed to compete for federal competitive grants and

¹ Section 8102 (52): The term “well-rounded education” means courses, activities, and programming in subjects such as English, reading or language arts, writing, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, geography, computer science, music, career and technical education, health, physical education, and any other subject, as determined by the State or local educational agency, with the purpose of providing all students access to an enriched curriculum and educational experience.”

often receive formula allocations that are too small to be used effectively for their intended purposes.

- I. **Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney Vento-Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program** provides training, technical assistance, and monitoring, as well as federal funding to support school district programs that serve homeless students. It ensures immediate enrollment and educational stability for homeless children and youth.

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

A.1 Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

(ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and (2) and 34 CFR §§ 200.1–200.8.)²

A.2 Eighth Grade Math Exception

(ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))

- i. *Does the State administer an end-of-course mathematics assessment to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA?*

Yes

No

- ii. *If a State responds “yes” to question 2(i), does the State wish to exempt an eighth-grade student who takes the high school mathematics course associated with the end-of-course assessment from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) of the ESEA and ensure that:*
- a. *The student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;*
 - b. *The student’s performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA;*
 - c. *In high school:*
 1. *The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;*
 2. *The State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and*
 3. *The student’s performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA.*

² The Secretary anticipates collecting relevant information consistent with the assessment peer review process in 34 CFR § 200.2(d). An SEA need not submit any information regarding challenging State academic standards and assessments at this time.

Yes

No

Not applicable.

- iii. *If a State responds “yes” to question 2(ii), consistent with 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4), describe, with regard to this exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school.*

Not applicable.

A.3 Native Language Assessments

(ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii) and (f)(4))

- i. *Provide its definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population,” and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.*

Washington defines *languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population* as any student/language combination that exceeds 1,000 in total across the state. Using data from 2015–16, the languages falling under that definition are (in order of frequency):

1. Spanish
2. Russian
3. Vietnamese
4. Somali
5. Arabic
6. Ukrainian
7. Tagalog
8. Marshallese
9. Korean
10. Punjabi
11. Chinese – Unspecified
12. Chinese – Mandarin

- ii. *Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.*

In spring 2017, Washington offered its state-developed science (grades 5, 8, and End-of-Course Biology) assessments in Spanish, Russian, Korean, Vietnamese, Chinese, Somali, and Arabic.

The Smarter Balanced mathematics assessment (grades 3–8 and 11) provided a full translation in Spanish. It also offered use of a glossary-based feature (translating only content-irrelevant terms) which is available in 11 languages (Arabic, Cantonese, Filipino, Korean, Mandarin, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, Ukrainian, Vietnamese, and Yupik).

As a participating member of Smarter Balanced, Washington continues to provide students with the language options that are supported through the consortium’s accessibility framework.

iii. Indicate the languages identified in question 3(i) for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

Of the languages identified in question 3(i), currently Somali, Marshallese, and Tagalog are not within the accessibility framework for the Smarter Balanced mathematics assessment.

OSPI will continue to monitor languages other than English that are present in the student population, both statewide and within geographic areas of the state. Working in partnership with Educational Service Districts (ESDs) and local school districts, OSPI will evaluate the potential need for providing assessments in additional languages.

iv. Describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population including by providing

- a. The State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(4);*
- b. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and*
- c. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.*

In its previous efforts to support the access of students to assessments in their native language, OSPI convened a panel of national experts on assessment and English learners’ (ELs) access to explore possible approaches for testing. The work of the panel focused on two approaches being most prevalent in supporting ELs – translations or accommodations. The panel provided input essentially reviewing their own work in the areas of EL testing and the pros and cons associated with each approach. In addition, OSPI looked at work from peer agencies to glean insight on the potential approaches from the experience of others.

With the reauthorization of ESSA in 2015 and the requirement for State Educational Agencies (SEAs) to construct state plans, OSPI employed feedback acquired through the Plan creation process (e.g., workgroups with diverse stakeholder participation, numerous statewide forums allowing broader public engagement, and web-based public comment opportunity) as the format for collecting meaningful input. All collected inputs were vetted by the Consolidated Plan Team (CPT), which was a mix of OSPI, other educational offices, and community stakeholders.

OSPI believes to date that it has met both a state legislative directive (intent within available funding) and good measurement practices through its approach to translated assessment support. OSPI plans to convene content and assessments experts to explore further development of assessments in language other than English. OSPI will collaborate with peer members of the Smarter Balanced consortium in advancing this work.

A.4 Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities

(ESEA section 1111(c) and (d)):

i. Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(c)(2)):

a. List each major racial and ethnic group the State includes as a subgroup of students, consistent with ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B).

Washington complies with the federal mandate of collecting ethnicity and race information for students in a two-part question. The first question asks if the student's identification is either Hispanic/Latino or Not Hispanic/Latino. The second question asks for each of the race categories with which the student identifies. The data from both of these questions is then consolidated into a single ethnicity/race category. It is based on the federal roll up rules of counting a student's Hispanic/Latino ethnicity first, and subsequently (if not Hispanic/Latino) counting the student in either a single racial ethnic group or "Two or More Races" if the student identifies with multiple races.

The following are the major racial ethnic groups used in federal reporting:

- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Black/African American
- Hispanic/Latino of any race(s)
- White
- Two or More Races

- b. *If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (i.e., economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.*

Washington will also publicly report state-level student outcomes for more detailed ethnic/race categories, as collected within our student data system. These sub-ethnic categories provide disaggregated data within each of the major federal categories. The disaggregated sub-ethnic categories within the race categories of Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, American Indian/Alaskan Native and White can be found in the [2017 Race and Ethnicity Student Data: Guidance for Washington’s Public Education System](#).

Additionally, Washington will be reporting performance data for students who are migrant, homeless, foster children, and military dependents; however, these additional subgroups will not be included in the accountability reporting or scoring.

- c. *Does the State intend to include in the English learner subgroup the results of students previously identified as English learners on the State assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) for purposes of State accountability (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B))? Note that a student’s results may be included in the English learner subgroup for not more than four years after the student ceases to be identified as an English learner.*

Yes

No

- d. *If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:*

Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i); or

Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii); or

Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii). If this option is selected, describe how the State will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner.


- ii. *Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)):*
 - a. *Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.*

Washington will combine three years of data for accountability purposes, and the combined (over three years) minimum number of students to be included will be 20. Washington reports data annually, and state law prescribes that the minimum number of students for reporting is 10. The accountability approach, to use an n-size of 20 when combining three years of data, is more inclusive but also balances stability and validity of data with the need to maintain student privacy. The n-size of 20 will be reported by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes, including meaningful differentiation and identification of schools that need Comprehensive and Targeted supports.

This method will maximize the inclusion of historically under-represented subgroups while still meeting the requirements for being statistically sound. For each measure, if there are fewer than 20 students in a particular subgroup or school across a three-year period, then the measure for that group or school will not be included for accountability. OSPI shall apply these definitions consistently across all schools and subgroups.

Minimum N-size

For annual reporting of measures on Washington's State Report Card: 10 is the minimum number of students for data to show. This won't change from what has been done historically.



ESSA Accountability: Using 3 years of combined data, 20 is the minimum number to be included in accountability.

This approach is more inclusive than the previous approach. This means the outcomes for more students will be included in determining which schools need the most support.




Figure .5. Minimum N-size.

Table 1 shows how different potential minimum numbers of students affects the inclusion of specific student groups and schools. The analysis below uses the graduation rate indicator because it is the indicator with the smallest denominator (it is a single cohort or grade level of students, rather than spanning multiple grade levels) and therefore represents the most restrictive

scenario, but other measures would see similar patterns. The first and fourth columns, (n≥20 over three years) presenting Washington’s proposed method, shows that the approach is more inclusive than the annual minimum of 10. Under the minimum number of 20 students using three years of combined data, the accountability framework shall include over 90 percent of students in each of five subgroups: Asian, Hispanic/Latino, Low-Income, Special Education, and White. Over 85 percent of students in Black/African American, English learner, and two or more categories are included. An annual n-size of 20 would include only six percent of students who are Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, while using the three-years-combined approach includes 54 percent. For American Indian/Alaskan Native students, this means an increase. Similar increases in the number of schools included, by subgroup, occur.

Table 1. Comparison of Washington state's proposed methodology to federal minimum guidelines.

Student Group	Percent of Students			Percent of Schools		
	% of Students Included N≥20 (over 3 years)	% of Students Included N≥10 (annual)	% of Students Included N≥20 (annual)	% of Schools Included N≥20 (over 3 years)	% of Schools Included N≥10 (annual)	% of Schools Included N≥20 (annual)
All	99.6%	99.3%	98.0%	65.2%	61.7%	53.2%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	47.3%	39.6%	21.6%	7.0%	4.7%	1.6%
Asian	93.8%	91.1%	82.2%	28.2%	24.3%	17.0%
Black/African American	86.3%	81.0%	65.4%	23.4%	18.8%	10.8%
English Learners	88.6%	82.8%	63.5%	31.0%	25.0%	13.3%
Hispanic/Latino	96.2%	94.3%	86.3%	45.6%	40.8%	29.1%
Low Income	99.2%	98.4%	95.5%	64.7%	59.8%	49.1%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	54.4%	40.1%	6.4%	9.5%	5.9%	0.6%
Special Education	92.6%	88.1%	75.3%	44.1%	36.8%	24.8%
Two or More	86.3%	80.4%	59.2%	31.5%	25.7%	14.2%
White	99.2%	98.5%	96.4%	60.0%	55.6%	46.4%

b. Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.

Washington analyzed the impact of different n-sizes on the stability and reliability of system results. To determine the reliability of these results, Washington reviewed the historic reading Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) results to determine the mean percent met standard and the standard deviation for different sized groups from 2004–05 through 2014–15. Washington found that increasing the minimum number of students from 10 to 20 significantly reduced the variability within a given year. Subsequent increases in n-size provided smaller reductions in variability.

Table 2. Historical analysis of the impact of different n-sizes on the stability and reliability of system results.

Group Size	Percent Met Standard in Reading	Standard Deviation
N<10	62.8%	26.7
10-19	47.5%	22.7
20-29	44.2%	21.2
30-39	43.2%	19.9
40-49	46.2%	18.0

Table 2 shows that the standard deviation gets smaller as the group sizes increase. The largest decreases in standard deviation are observed as we approach 20 students and when we get above 40. Additionally, Washington reviewed the changes from one year to the next within the same school and subgroup based on group sizes and found similar results, with the largest reductions occurring before 20 students and above 50 students.

These analyses indicate that using a smaller minimum number could introduce more fluctuation into the accountability measures, which could lead to less reliability in identifying challenged schools. Increasing the number above 20 could slightly improve stability, but at a cost of including fewer students (particularly in smaller subgroups) in the accountability system.

- c. *Describe how the minimum number of students was determined by the State, including how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.*

The minimum n-size was discussed in several workgroups, including the ESSA Report Card Workgroup, the Accountability System Workgroup (ASW), and the Technical Advisory Committee supporting the Accountability System Workgroup. Public comments on the n-size were received and reviewed before a final decision was made on n-size. The two primary considerations in n-size selection were the inclusivity of historically underserved populations and small schools and statistically sound results. Stability of results improves with larger minimum numbers but inclusivity declines. To balance these competing requirements, Washington will combine three years of data for a minimum number of 20. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the key results used to make this decision.

- d. *Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.*³

Washington utilizes several strategies in order to protect the privacy of students while displaying data. There is a state law with a minimum reporting size of 10. OSPI applies these definitions consistently across the state for subgroups and small schools. The combined (three years of data) minimum number of 20, prevents any results for a particularly small group of students from being inferred by subtracting results across two accountability reporting periods.

Annual reporting of measures (with a minimum reporting number of 10) and accountability (with a minimum of 20 using three years of combined data) protects student privacy by not allowing outcomes for very small numbers of students to be derived from other reported data.

- e. *If the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, provide the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting.*

The minimum number of students for purposes of reporting annual outcome data is 10. That reflects student outcomes for a single year of data, while the accountability approach combines three years and requires a minimum of 20 over those three years.

- iii. *Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)):*

- a. *Academic Achievement. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))*

1. *Describe the long-term goals for improved academic achievement, as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.*

Washington’s academic achievement goals will emphasize closing subgroup gaps in proficiency. OSPI proposes establishing a 90 percent minimum proficiency rate for each subgroup within 10 years. Schools and subgroups

³ Consistent with ESEA section 1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute for Education Sciences report “Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information” to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

whose performance is currently exceeding 90 percent will be expected to demonstrate continuous progress in moving each student in each subgroup toward proficiency. Schools and subgroups with less than 90 percent proficiency will have annual, interim targets set toward reaching that goal.

The projections below use 2015–16 data to estimate baseline values. When updated data are available, baseline values will be established using 2016–17 data. The annual increments are calculated by dividing the total achievement gap (goal of 90 percent - baseline performance) by 10 years. The result will be used to determine the annual improvement targets for each school year, from 2016–17 through 2026–27. This same approach will be used for all schools and student subgroups within each school.




Figure 1. ESSA long term goals for increasing ELA proficiency rates.

Table 3. ELA Proficiency Rate Baseline and Targets.

Subgroup	Projected 2017 ELA Proficiency Rates (%)	Annual Target for Improvement (%)	Projected 2027 ELA Proficiency Rates (%)
All	61.9	2.8	90
American Indian/Alaskan Native	31.6	5.8	90
Asian	76.6	1.3	90
Black/African American	44.6	4.5	90
English Learners	19.2	7.1	90
Hispanic/Latino	44.9	4.5	90
Low Income	47.3	4.3	90
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	41.3	4.9	90
Special Education	24.1	6.6	90
Two or More Races	64.7	2.5	90
White	68.2	2.2	90




Figure 2. ESSA long term goals for increasing math proficiency rates.

Table 4. Math Proficiency Rate Baseline and Targets.

Subgroup	Projected 2017 Math Proficiency Rates (%)	Annual Target for Improvement (%)	Projected 2027 Math Proficiency Rates (%)
All	53.1	3.7	90
American Indian/Alaskan Native	23.5	6.6	90
Asian	72.8	1.7	90
Black/African American	33.9	5.6	90
English Learners	20.7	6.9	90
Hispanic/Latino	36.4	5.4	90
Low Income	38.8	5.1	90
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	32.9	5.7	90
Special Education	20.7	6.9	90
Two or More Races	55.5	3.5	90
White	58.8	3.1	90

2. *Provide the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement in Appendix A.*

See Appendix A.

3. *Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps.*

Washington is working toward fulfilling a vision of public education that provides each student with an equitable education by engaging families and communities in efforts to intentionally design a system that addresses the needs of the whole child. Washington’s goals set the same bar for each and every student subgroup, with the same goals and expectations for all students and subgroups of students. Students, both those who have been historically underserved as well as those who are underperforming, will need additional focus and support to make larger incremental improvements to reach those goals. Research consistently finds that student success is impacted by academic and nonacademic factors, and in 2016, the Washington State Integrated Student Supports Protocol (WISSP) was legislated, the purpose of which is to ensure schools adopt an evidence-based, scientifically validated approach to identify and address both academic and nonacademic barriers. The WISSP is operationalized in a way that prevents fragmentation, duplication of efforts, initiative overload, and focuses on the success of

each Washington student through a unified service delivery system that supports the alignment, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of multiple efforts within the school and outside the school walls to maximize academic, behavioral and social-emotional outcomes. This integrated service delivery system is outlined in the [Washington State Multi-tiered System of Supports \(WA-MTSS\)](#), key components of which are using data in evidence-based processes that monitor student progress and rapidly connect staff and students to a system of supports; a tiered support system that ingrates evidence-based supports for behavior, achievement, and social emotional needs; collaborative inquiry practices that engage staff in action research to improve teaching and learning, and transformational leadership planning and actions that engage staff, families, students, and communities.

The three-tiered instructional/intervention model is a critical element of WA-MTSS implementation. In a typical system, Tier I includes the grade-level core instruction that all students receive, Tier II includes additional supplemental instruction or intervention provided to students not meeting benchmarks, and Tier III includes intensive, small group or individual interventions for students showing significant barriers to learning the skills required for success. As stated at the beginning of this ESSA plan, there is an emphasis on greater cross-program coordination, planning, and service delivery within OSPI and districts, and this expectation is supported in WA-MTSS.




Figure 3. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Framework.

b. *Graduation Rate. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))*

1. *Describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.*

Washington’s primary goal is for students to graduate from high school, ready for college, career, and life. As students exit the K–8 system and enter high school, the system is less focused on growth measures, and more concerned with a student’s ability to demonstrate proficiency, and to meet the requirements of high school graduation. Washington’s long-term goals for high schools reflect less emphasis on long-term growth, and more emphasis on meeting standard and closing the “graduation gap.”

Washington’s long-term goals in high school will place the focus on closing gaps in graduation rates by subgroup. To do this, OSPI proposes establishing a 90 percent minimum graduation rate for each subgroup. The goal is that in 10 years, no subgroup within a school will graduate at a rate less than 90 percent. Schools and subgroups currently graduating at a rate exceeding 90 percent will be expected to demonstrate continuous progress toward all students graduating. Schools and subgroups not graduating at 90 percent will have annual, interim targets set toward reaching that goal.

In recent years, data at the state level revealed that no student group was performing higher than the 90 percent threshold and some of the most underserved student groups will need to make substantial annual gains to meet the 10-year goal of 90 percent.

The on-time (four year) adjusted cohort graduation rate for 2016–17 would be used as the base year. The annual increment would be calculated by dividing the total graduation gap by 10. The result represents the annual increment that will be used to determine the annual improvement targets for each school year, from 2017–18 through 2027–28.

ESSA Long Term Goals for Increasing 4-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate




Table 5. ESSA long-term goals for increasing graduation rates.

Subgroup	Projected 2017 Graduation Rates (%)	Annual Target for Improvement (%)	Projected 2027 Graduation Rates (%)
All Students	79.1	1.1	90
American Indian/Alaskan Native	60.6	2.9	90
Asian	88.6	0.1	90
Black	70.7	1.9	90
English Learners	57.6	3.2	90
Hispanic/Latino	72.3	1.8	90
Low Income	69.4	2.1	90
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	68.2	2.2	90
Special Ed	58.1	3.2	90
Two or More Races	77.9	1.2	90
White	81.5	0.8	90

2. If applicable, describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, including (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-

year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious; and (iv) how the long-term goals are more rigorous than the long-term goal set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

The extended adjusted-cohort graduation rates (five-, six-, and seven-year rate) are not included as specific measures in the accountability framework and thus long-term goals for those measures are not applicable.

3. *Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in Appendix A.*

See adjusted cohort graduation rate in Appendix A.

4. *Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps.*

Washington’s goals set the same bar for each and every student subgroup. We have the same goals and expectations for all students and subgroups of students. Students who have been historically underserved will need additional focus and support to make larger incremental improvements to reach those goals. As discussed in an earlier section, the WA-MTSS combines both Response to Intervention (RTI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) with other student and learning supports, and is positioned within the state to provide the needed additional focus, support, and response to increase improvements and make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps.

- c. *English Language Proficiency. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))*

1. *Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.*

English Language Progress Measure. Washington is part of a consortium that developed ELPA21, a new English language proficiency assessment with four domains (i.e. reading, writing, listening, and speaking) aligned to a common set of English language proficiency standards that

correspond to the Common Core State Standards. Washington administered the ELPA21 annual assessment to English learners for the first time in the 2015–16 school year.

Washington currently has one year of ELPA21 progress data which we are using to establish the baseline.

Washington has established a timeline of six-years as the expectation for ELs to achieve language proficiency and exit the program.

Washington’s goal will be, in 2027, to have 77 percent of EL students annually making progress, such that all students are expected to transition from services within at most six years. The state will increase the percentage of English learners who demonstrate progress towards proficiency on the English Language Proficiency assessment by one percent each year until 2027. This goal will be re-evaluated and possibly re-established in three years when schools are selected for supports and we have more data to inform the target.

2. *Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency in Appendix A.*

See Appendix A.

iv. Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))

Table 6. Overview of indicators by grade span.

Grade Span		Academic Indicators		School Quality or Student Success Indicators
Elementary	Proficiency on the statewide assessments in ELA and Math	Academic growth as measured by Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs)	English Learner Progress	Chronic Absenteeism
Middle				
High	Proficiency on statewide assessments on ELA and Math	Graduation Rate	English Learner Progress	Chronic Absenteeism
				9th Graders on Track

Grade Span	Academic Indicators			School Quality or Student Success Indicators
				Advanced Course-Taking (dual credit)

Table 7. Indicator measures and descriptions.

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
Academic Achievement	Proficiency on the statewide assessments in ELA and mathematics.	Percentage of students at Level 3 or Level 4.
Academic Progress	Academic growth (elementary and middle schools only)	Student growth percentiles for 4th to 8th graders on the statewide assessments in ELA and mathematics.
Graduation Rate	High School Graduation	Four-year graduation rate, adjusted for relatively large increases in extended-year graduation rates.
Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	Progress on the ELPA21 assessment (on track to becoming proficient)	Percentage of students who are making enough progress to transition out of the program within 6 years.
School Quality and Student Success	Regular attendance	Percentage of students who regularly attend school (are present for 90% or more of school days)
	9th Grade On Track (high schools)	The percent of first time ninth grade students who earned credit for all attempted courses.
	Dual Credit (high schools)	Among all enrolled students (grades 9–12), the percent of students who completed a dual credit course or program (i.e., AP, IB, College in the High School, Cambridge, Running Start, Advanced Certificated Courses, or Tech Prep).

- a. *Academic Achievement Indicator. Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator (i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State’s discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.*

The academic achievement indicators are measures of proficiency on the ELA and mathematics assessments. Washington administers the Smarter Balanced assessments annually in grades 3–8 and once in high school in ELA and mathematics. Washington also administers an alternate assessment based on alternative achievement standards aligned to the Common Core State Standards for students with significant cognitive challenges called the Washington Access to Instruction & Measurement (WA-AIM). This assessment is also administered annually in grades 3-8 and once in high school in English Language Arts and Mathematics. There are four performance levels and students are considered to meet the state standard if they achieve a Level 3 or 4, and the academic achievement indicator is defined as the percentage of students meeting standard.

In the academic achievement indicators, Washington will include only students who are enrolled for half of the school year. For purposes of data and accountability, Washington defines the school year as enrolled at a school on October 1 and enrolled for at least 150 cumulative days at the same school during the school year. Washington defines a school year as September 1 through June 1. Washington previously used a definition of “continuously enrolled” for accountability inclusion, and this definition of “enrolled for half the year” identifies roughly the same quantity and same students. In the 2016–17 school year, the new definition of “enrolled for half the year” would include 91.8 percent of students, compared to 89.1 percent of students under the previous definition of “continuous enrollment.” This notion of cumulative enrollment days is meaningful as it captures students who have been in attendance at the same school for the majority of the school year, but doesn’t restrict it in the event the student left for a short period of time.

Mathematics and ELA proficiency will be reported separately, and rates will be calculated for each school and for student subgroups within schools. It will be a three-year combined measure, although results are also reported annually on the Washington State Report Card.

- b. *Indicator for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools (Other Academic Indicator). Describe the Other Academic indicator, including how it annually measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.*

Washington will use student growth percentiles (SGPs) as the academic indicator demonstrating student growth for elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools. Washington has calculated SGPs since 2013, reporting results to families and publicly. The measure will be the median student growth percentile (for ELA and mathematics separately) and will be calculated for each school and subgroups within schools. It will include students in grades 4–8 (a prior year’s test score is necessary to calculate growth, and thus SGPs are not available for grade 3) who are enrolled for at least half of the year.

SGPs are calculated for all students and each subgroup of students if the student group meets the $n \geq 20$ (three years combined) minimum. Given the transition of assessments to Smarter Balanced in 2015, the first year of SGPs that will be included for accountability will be from the 2015–16 school year.

- c. *Graduation Rate. Describe the Graduation Rate indicator, including a description of (i) how the indicator is based on the long-term goals; (ii) how the indicator annually measures graduation rate for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; (iii) how the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; (iv) if the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator; and (v) if applicable, how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25).*

Washington will use the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as the base for the high school graduation indicator. The graduation rate methodology follows the federal guidance (NCLB High School Graduation Rate, Non-Regulatory Guidance, December 22, 2008) and is based on when students first enter ninth grade, adjusting for students who transfer in or out of a school. Student graduation status is attributed to their most recently attended school. Washington has used this graduation methodology since 2010.

The graduation rate indicator has the four-year rate as its foundation, for which schools would receive a 1–10 score. Then Washington will use a derivation of extended-year graduation rates to assign a second number (0 to 2 points) which will be added to the initial score. The second number shall be based on the *additional* percentages of students that graduate in the extended timeframes (5 years, 6 years, or 7 years). That is, some percentage of students in the cohort class of 2016 graduated in their 5th year (in 2017), a percentage of students in the class of 2015 graduated in their 6th year (in 2017), and a percentage of students in the class of 2014 graduated in their 7th year (in 2017). The three percentages from those three cohorts will be combined, and schools will be assigned a score of 0, 1, or 2 based on their increase in graduation rates within the extended timeframe. Schools that graduate the highest percentages of students in the 5th, 6th, and 7th years will receive a score of 2, and the next highest schools will receive a score of 1. Remaining schools will receive a score of 0.

In other words, the graduation rate indicator is very similar to the other index measures in that it is based on a 1–10 scale, where the school scores are initially distributed uniformly between 1–10. This is centered on the four-year graduation rate. Then schools may get an “extra credit” point or two (moving them up the 1–10 scale) if larger numbers of students are graduating in the extended timeframe. Schools can only score 1–10 points on the indicator; the total number of points is capped at 10. Note that the weight of the graduation rate indicator within the overall framework, relative to the other indicators, will not shift.

Similar to the approach used for the other indicators and their 1–10 distribution of scores, Washington will establish the cuts for the supplemental score (0, 1, or 2 points) based on the data from 2016–17. The cuts will be used for determining scores in subsequent years. In the first year the distribution could be: the 10 percent of schools with the highest extended-year graduation rate differential will earn 2 extra credit points, and the next highest 10 percent will earn 1 extra credit point. The remaining schools will get 0 supplemental points. By having designated thresholds for achieving the extra credit, it facilitates continuous improvement for four-year and extended graduation timelines.

A uniform method is applied to all schools in assigning scores in both stages of this indicator. This approach acknowledges within the accountability framework that for some students a longer graduation timeframe is appropriate.

Washington will also report each graduation rate individually (4, 5, 6, and 7 year rates) on the Washington State Report Card.

Washington does not have a state-defined alternate diploma for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Recognizing that for some students a longer graduation timeframe is appropriate, the accountability framework (described in Section 4v) will include an upward adjustment for schools that graduate relatively high percentages of students in the extended timeframe. Washington will also report each extended graduation rate individually (five-, six-, and seven-year rates) on the Washington State Report Card.

Later in the Plan, Washington uses three additional indicators of school quality or student success (SQSS): regular attendance, ninth graders on track, and dual-credit participation as part of the state performance management system for the purpose of reducing opportunity gaps and increasing equity in the K–12 system.

- d. *Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator. Describe the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, including the State’s definition of ELP, as measured by the State ELP assessment.*

English Language Progress Measure. Washington is part of a consortium that developed ELPA21, a new English language proficiency assessment with four domains (i.e. reading, writing, listening, and speaking) aligned to a common set of English language proficiency standards that correspond to the Common Core State Standards. Washington administered the ELPA21 annual assessment to English learners for the first time in the 2015–16 school year. Working with migrant and bilingual office stakeholders, the Technical Advisory Committee analyzed ELPA21 data, historic transition rate data, and reviewed other state’s progress approaches. Because of that work, Washington proposes to use the following definition:

Percentage of students who are making adequate progress to transition out of the program within six years. Washington will calculate the ELP measure by comparing the student’s level at the first-year level (Emerging, Progressing 1, Progressing 2, or Progressing 3) to their Year 2 level (P1, P2, P3) to determine if a student is progressing (see Table 8). Progress is contingent upon non-regression in any single domain. Regression of proficiency in any language domain will result in that student’s score not counting toward growth. Students will be required to meet the expected growth annually in order for EL students to be on-track for transition.

Table 8. Six-year trajectory expectations for English learners.

First Year Grade	Baseline Year	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
All	Emerging (level 1 or 2 in all 4 domains)	P1	P2	P3	P3	T
All	Progressing 1	P2	P3	P3	T	
All	Progressing 2	P3	P3	T		
All	Progressing 3	P3	T			

Notes about measure calculation:

Progressing levels (P1, P2, and P3) are defined as any student with AT LEAST a level 3 in a single domain. Progressing levels are assigned P1, P2, and P3 by looking across all of the domains and taking the student’s lowest level in any of the domains. T means transitioned.

For example:

- If a student scores 1=reading, 2=writing, 2=listening, and 2=speaking they would be emerging
- If a student scores 1=reading, 2=writing, 2=listening, and 3=speaking they would get a P1
- If a student scores 2=reading, 3=writing, 2=listening, and 4=speaking they would get a P2

Numerator	Denominator
Number of students who made progress (as identified in the above table)	Students for whom we can measure EL progress (i.e. have two EL proficiency scores)

Note: Students who test into service via a placement test and subsequently test out on the ELPA later in the same year will also be included in the numerator and denominator.

In Table 9, Washington uses the results from one grade level to demonstrate how much progress students made from their 2016 ELPA21 test to their 2017 ELPA21 test. Only students who have tests in both years are included. The table shows last year’s grade level and scores in the first two columns. The data going across each row identify the number of students scoring at each level in 2017. For example, 1,479 kindergarten students scored Emerging in 2016 and scored Progressing 1 (P1) in 2017. From this and other similar analyses, Washington concluded that it is a reasonable expectation to require one level of gain per year. Students will be required to meet the expected growth annually in order for EL students to be on-track for

transition. Districts are held accountable for the progress from year-to-year for students.

Table 9.ELPA21 level changes from 2016 to 2017.

2016 Reporting Grade	Level	Emerging	P1	P2	P3	Transitioned
Kindergarten	Emerging	856	1479	584	146	26
Kindergarten	P1	205	1984	1368	532	216
Kindergarten	P2	72	1122	1824	935	359
Kindergarten	P3	18	347	1089	1066	1263

As ELPA21 is in its first year of roll out, OSPI will re-examine this definition when multiple years of data are available. Specifically, the Accountability System Workgroup recommended that OSPI do future research on the interplay between Proficiency on ELA and the English Learner Progress measure and examine whether grade span and time in an English learner program needs to be considered.

For the English Language Progress measure, Washington will include only students who are enrolled for at least half of the school year.

- e. *School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s). Describe each School Quality or Student Success Indicator, including, for each such indicator: (i) how it allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance; (ii) that it is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (for the grade span(s) to which it applies); and (iii) of how each such indicator annually measures performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.*

Washington will include three measures of school quality or student success (SQSS): regular attendance, ninth graders on track, and dual-credit participation. Each measure was subject to extensive review and feedback from stakeholders. These measures are currently a part of Washington’s performance management system for the purpose of reducing opportunity gaps and increasing equity in the K–12 system and are displayed on Washington’s public website ([OSPI Performance Indicators](#)). In addition, the Accountability System Workgroup’s Technical Advisory Committee, specifically convened to review the technical elements of this plan, reviewed the existing measure definitions and revised them to make them more applicable to a federal accountability system.

The data used to derive these measures is from Washington’s comprehensive statewide student information system, which began with the 2009–10 school year. Updates to this system are made annually and include clarifying data collection guidance as well as adding new data elements. Descriptions of the measures are below and Figure 4 illustrates the differentiation of schools within each.

Chronic Absenteeism (or Regular Attendance): Student-level absence data are submitted to OSPI and can be reported on by student group. Washington defines a student as chronically absent if they miss at least 10 percent of school days, including full-day absences (excused or unexcused). For a 180-day school year, it means that students missing 18 full days of school or more would be chronically absent. More specifically for this indicator, students must be enrolled for at least 90 days, and the chronic absent count is adjusted based on length of enrollment (two absences per 30 days of enrollment, cumulative). Students are excluded from this measure if they are enrolled for fewer than 90 days.

All student groups and all grade spans are included in this measure. Washington used a minimum number of 20 students over a combined period of three years to analyze the inclusion of different student subgroups and grade spans. When examining the *All students* category, 100 percent of students statewide (among those enrolled at least 90 days) are captured in this measure; five of the seven race/ethnic subgroups will have more than 95 percent of students included in this measure; and American Indian/Alaskan Native have 78 percent and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander have 81 percent, respectively. In instances where the percent of students included is less than 100 percent it indicates there aren’t enough students to meet the minimum.

9th Graders on Track: The first year of high school has been shown in research⁴ to be a critical predictor of students’ future likelihood of graduation. According to Breakthrough Collaborative, results from a Chicago school study with over 115,000 participants revealed that, “almost one quarter of students in the top quartile of their eighth grade were off track by the end of ninth grade.” Furthermore, passing all courses in 9th grade is strongly associated with graduating. “Research shows that between 70 and 80 percent of students who fail (any course) in the first year will not graduate from high school.” The 9th grade year has often been looked upon as a time when students will either make it or not. Even though this year is critical, the “failure rate in 9th grade remains higher than the rate in any other grade level.” To alleviate these issues before they even begin, districts and schools

⁴ Roderick, Melissa et al., [Preventable Failure: Improvements in Long-Term Outcomes when High Schools Focused on the Ninth Grade Year](#), University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research, April 2014

should consider having a robust grade 8 transition readiness plan in place. Washington has created an indicator of whether 9th grade students are “on track” for graduation, as measured by the percentage of 9th graders who passed all credits they attempted. Students who attain full credit on courses they attempt in ninth grade are considered “on track”.

Washington used a minimum number of 20 students over a combined period of three years to analyze the percentage of students in each subgroup that would be included in this indicator by grade span. When examining the *All students* category, 100 percent of students statewide (among those who are in 9th grade) are captured in this measure; five of the seven race/ethnic subgroups will have more than 95 percent of students included in this measure; and American Indian/Alaskan Native have 86 percent and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander have 84 percent, respectively. In instances where the percent of students included is less than 100 percent it indicates there aren’t enough students to meet the minimum.

Dual Credit Participation: Washington will derive a measure of dual credit participation, as measured by the percentage of all enrolled students (grades 9–12) who complete a dual credit course. This includes Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, College in the High School, Tech Prep, Running Start, and Cambridge programs.

Washington used a minimum number of 20 students over a combined period of three years to analyze the inclusion of different student subgroups and grade spans. When examining the *All students* category, 100 percent of students statewide are captured in this measure; two of the seven race/ethnic subgroups have more than 95 percent of students included in this measure; and the other five remaining subgroups range from 46 percent for American Indian/Alaskan Native to 94 percent for Asian. In instances where the percent of students included is less than 100 percent it indicates there aren’t enough students to meet the minimum.

Across all three indicators of SQSS, Figure 4 illustrates the differentiation among schools, overall and by subgroup. The circles represent decile thresholds for schools, and thus show the range of performance for the lowest 10 percent of schools to the 90th percentile. The 9th graders-on-track and dual-credit measures shows a wide range of outcomes. The regular attendance measure is more tightly clustered, but there is still considerable differentiation across schools on the lower end of the spectrum to the upper decile of schools where all students have regular attendance.



Figure 4. Differentiation among schools for school quality or student success (SQSS) measures, overall and by subgroup.

Additional measures will be considered for future inclusion as an SQSS category. Stakeholders expressed interest in considering the use of several measures for school accountability: disproportionate discipline, teacher assignment and equity, and a school climate and engagement survey. OSPI, the Washington State Board of Education (SBE), and stakeholder workgroups will evaluate those measures for suitability for future inclusion in state accountability, including data quality, validity, and research demonstrating their association with student achievement.

- v. *Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))*
 - a. *Describe the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA, including a description of (i) how the system is based on all indicators in the State’s accountability system, (ii) for all students and for each subgroup of students. Note that each state must comply with the requirements in 1111(c)(5) of the ESEA with respect to accountability for charter schools.*

Washington will use a combined multiple measures approach to meaningfully differentiate schools. This approach shall use each of the measures described above in (iv).

Within each measure, there will be a 1–10 scale where schools will be distributed evenly based on their results for that measure. That is, OSPI will construct a 1–10 scale that allots schools roughly evenly across the 1–10 scale. Results will be spread into deciles for each measure: approximately 10 percent of schools will have a one, 10 percent of schools will have a two, etc. For example, a school whose mathematics proficiency fell in the fourth decile (between the 31st and 40th percentile) would receive a four for the mathematics measure. Each school will have a 1–10 score corresponding to each measure (assuming a large enough number of student results per indicator). Detailed weighting is described below in Table 11.

Preliminary 2016 data decile cuts for each measure are shown in Table 10, and will be updated when 2017 data become available.

Table 10. Preliminary decile cuts for identified measures. All values are in percentages.

	(i) Academic Achievement (ELA Proficiency)	(i) Academic Achievement (Math Proficiency)	(ii) ELA Growth (ELA Median Student Growth Percentile)	(ii) Math Growth (Math Median Student Growth Percentile)	(iii) Graduation	(iv) English Language Progress	(v) School Quality or Student Success Indicator: 9th Grade on Track	(v) School Quality or Student Success Indicator: Regular Attendance	(v) School Quality or Student Success Indicator: Dual Credit
10th decile	77.9 - 100	73.6 - 100	62.5 – 100	63 – 100	93.2 - 100	79 - 100	100	100	76 - 100
9th decile	72 - 77.8	65 - 73.4	58.5 – 62	58.5 – 62.5	90.4 - 93.1	73.3 - 78.9	88.1 - 99.9	93.7-99.9	61 - 75.9
8th decile	67.7 - 71.9	58.9 - 64.9	55.5 – 58	54.5 – 58	87.9 - 90.3	69.7 - 73.2	81.1 - 88	91.1- 93.6	51.3 - 60.9
7th decile	63.8 - 67.6	54.3 - 58.8	53.5 – 55	52.5 – 54	84.4 - 87.8	66.6 - 69.6	76 - 81	88.9 – 91.0	43.7 - 51.2
6th decile	60.3 - 63.7	49.4 - 54.2	51.5 – 53	49.5 – 52	81.2 - 84.3	63.6 - 66.5	69.5 - 75.9	87 – 88.8	29.6 - 43.6
5th decile	56.6 - 60.2	44.3 - 49.3	48.5 – 51	46.5 – 49	74 - 81.1	61 - 63.5	64.8 - 69.4	84.8- 86.9	16.9 - 29.5
4th decile	52.1 - 56.5	39.6 - 44.2	46.5 – 48	44 – 46	51.9 - 73.9	57.8 - 60.9	60 - 64.7	82.1 – 84.7	6.6 - 16.8
3rd decile	46.1 - 52	34.3 - 39.5	43.5 – 46	40.5 – 43.5	30.2 - 51.8	53.9 - 57.7	52.8 - 59.9	78.1- 82	1.2 - 6.5
2nd decile	37.2 - 46	24.8 - 34.2	39.5 – 43	35.5 – 40	10.1 - 30.1	47.6 - 53.8	37.6 - 52.7	69.7 - 78	.2 - 1.1
1st decile	0 - 37.1	0 - 24.7	0 – 39	0 – 35	0 - 10	0 -47.5	0 - 37.5	0 – 69.6	0 - .1

The measure scores will then be aggregated using a weighting system (described in (v(b)) below) to arrive at a combined multiple measures score (or index). This score is the basis for identifying schools for comprehensive support.

Subgroups, in addition to the *All students* group, will receive scores for each measure and the combined multiple measures score. Subgroup scores will be assigned using the same scale as the *All students* group. In other words, the standards to be a five on the scale are the same, regardless of whether it is for *All students* or for any given subgroup.

This approach focuses on the measures individually, thereby making overall improvement more actionable. By establishing decile ranges and having designated thresholds for upward movement on the scale, it facilitates continuous improvement goals for schools. It maintains visibility for each measure, and for student subgroups.

The decile approach differentiates by each individual measure, as illustrated in Figure 5, showing the range of lower to upper performing schools.

Additionally, when the measures are combined, one can still see differentiation by student group.




Figure 5. Decile measures for All students group




Figure 6. Decile measure for individual subgroups

- b. Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.

Table 11 outlines the weighting scheme for a K–12 school, a typical elementary/middle school, and typical high school. These weights reflect the priorities of the state to foster the growth and career and college readiness of every student. There are also circumstances when a school may not have data for a particular measure (e.g., not having a large enough English learner population to report). For high schools, where there may be more than one SQSS measure, the SQSS measure scores are averaged to get an overall SQSS score, which is then factored into the weighting scheme.

Table 11. Detailed weighting based on missing indicators due to small n or grade level of school.

Detailed Weighting Based on Missing Indicators Due to Small N or Grade Level of School	(i) Academic Achievement (ELA Proficiency)	(i) Academic Achievement (Math Proficiency)	(ii) Growth	(iii) Graduation	(iv) EL Progress	(v) School Quality or Student Success Indicators (averaged)
K–12 Schools (with all indicators)	15%	15%	25%	25%	5%	15%
K–8 (no graduation)	20%	20%	50%	0%	5%	5%
No Growth (typical HS)	15%	15%	0%	50%	5%	15%
K–12 (no EL progress)	17.5%	17.5%	25%	25%	0%	15%
K–8 (no graduation and no EL progress)	20%	20%	55%	0%	0%	5%
No Growth or EL Progress (HS with no EL)	17.5%	17.5%	0%	50%	0%	15%

- c. *If the States uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a. above for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (e.g., P–2 schools), describe the different methodology or methodologies, indicating the type(s) of schools to which it applies.*

Schools in Which No Grade Level is Assessed

Schools in which no grade level is assessed under the State's academic assessment system (e.g., P–2 schools), although the State is not required to administer a formal assessment to meet this requirement.

OSPI will annually differentiate schools with no grade levels assessed under the state’s academic assessment system. These schools will be evaluated on a supplemental accountability system. Identification for comprehensive or targeted support will be conducted via two segments: available accountability (if available, based on the N size of 20 over 3 years) indicator data and schools improvement plans. Accountability indicators will be on the same 1–10 scale as are used for the broader accountability framework. School improvement plans will be evaluated on a four (1–4) point scale based on the rubric scoring process set by the Technical Advisory Committee and the Title I Committee of Practitioners. This process will delineate the quality of data provided to support each plan requirement.

For any school that receives a “1” in the improvement plan evaluation and has an indicator score(s) below the uniform threshold in the all students group, the school will be identified as a Comprehensive support school. For any school that receives a “1” and has an indicator score(s) below the

uniform threshold in one or more subgroups, the school will be identified as a Targeted support school.

Schools will be required to address the following:

- Achievement information on available ESSA Accountability indicators (such as regular attendance, or English learner progress); and
- Goals set for student achievement based upon the school’s needs assessment; and
- Curriculum implementation of state academic standards for English Language Arts and mathematics and Instructional practices that meet the state’s Learning Assistance Program’s Menu of Best Practices requirements; and
- Professional development opportunities to support teachers and principals to address the academic and non-academic learning needs of the school’s students; and
- Plan that will evaluate the impact of goals set to support student achievement.

Variant Grade Configurations

Schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., P–12 schools).

Schools with variant grade configurations are included in the accountability system via performance on any of the measures in the index. If a school has data in more than the four indicator categories that a typical school would have, the weight shall be proportionally distributed across all five indicator categories. This allows the state to compare and report performance on schools, regardless of their grade level configuration.

Small Schools

Small schools are any schools below the minimum number of 20 students over a combined period of three years for any indicator.

OSPI will annually differentiate small schools assessed under the state’s academic assessment system. These schools will be evaluated on a supplemental accountability system. Identification for comprehensive or targeted support will be conducted via two segments: available accountability indicator data and schools improvement plans. Accountability indicators will be on the same 1–10 scale as are used for the broader accountability framework. School improvement plans will be evaluated on a four (1–4) point scale based on the rubric scoring process set by the Technical Advisory Committee and the Title I Committee of Practitioners.

This process will delineate the quality of data provided to support each plan requirement.

For any school that receives a “1” in the improvement plan evaluation and has an indicator score(s) below the uniform threshold in the all students group, the school will be identified as a Comprehensive support school. For any school that receives a “1” and has an indicator score(s) below the uniform threshold in one or more subgroups, the school will be identified as a Targeted support school.

Schools will be required to address the following:

- Achievement information on available ESSA Accountability indicators (such as regular attendance, or English learner progress); and
- Goals set for student achievement based upon the school’s needs assessment; and
- Curriculum implementation of state academic standards for English Language Arts and mathematics and Instructional practices that meet the state’s Learning Assistance Program’s Menu of Best Practices requirements; and
- Professional development opportunities to support teachers and principals to address the academic and non-academic learning needs of the school’s students; and
- Plan that will evaluate the impact of goals set to support student achievement.

Schools Designed to Serve Special Populations

Schools that are designed to serve special populations (e.g., students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings, students living in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children including juvenile justice facilities, students enrolled in State public schools for the deaf and blind, recently arrived English learners).

All public schools are included in the state’s accountability system, but the support for some school types may be approached differently. OSPI, in partnership with the SBE shall consider whether there ought to be an alternate accountability framework for some school types, such as re-engagement schools. OSPI staff will provide guidance to these schools based on nationally recognized and state identified best practices that support each special population.

Charter Schools

Charter schools are required to meet all state accountability requirements under ESSA and all are included in the state’s accountability system. In addition, the state’s Charter Schools law contains measures for renewal of their charter that go above and beyond the measures included in the statewide accountability system.

Newly Opened Schools

Newly opened schools that do not have multiple years of data, consistent with a State’s uniform procedure for averaging data under §200.20(a), if applicable.

Newly opened schools will be included after their second year. The data for those two years will be combined and subject to the minimum number of 20, as is applied to all other schools with combined data over years.

In schools with small n-sizes, student data at the school level will not be publicly reported. However, student data may be aggregated at the district and/or state level. In some types of specialized schools, students are reassigned back to an appropriate accountability school. Washington’s accountability system captures all students regardless of the school they attend.

vi. *Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))*

- a. *Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State’s methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.*

Washington’s comprehensive support and improvement Title I schools will be identified using the combined multiple measures system (index) described in Section 4(v). The measures will each be calculated using three years of combined data. The approach to meaningfully differentiating schools combines the multiple indicators (each with a score 1–10) with the weighting system (in Table 11) and yields a score between one and 10 for each school. Using that information, the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools will be identified for comprehensive support, and Washington will establish an improvement threshold at the five percent cut line for all schools.

Washington will identify schools for comprehensive support once every three years. The first year of identification will be for the 2018–19 school year, using data from the 2014–15, 2015–16, and 2016–17 school years. The five percent threshold will be re-established every three years.

- b. *Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State’s methodology for identifying all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.*

In addition to the above described methodology, Washington will identify for comprehensive support all high schools with less than a 67 percent four-year graduation rate, using three years of combined data. The first year of identification will be for the 2018–19 school year, using data from the 2014–15, 2015–16, and 2016–17 school years.

- c. *Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the methodology by which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on identification as a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.*

Washington’s uniform threshold for identifying schools is higher (more inclusive) than the minimum that is required in ESSA because the threshold is based on the performance of all schools, not the subset of schools receiving Title I, Part A funds.

A Targeted support school has any subgroup whose multiple measure score falls below the uniform threshold of our Comprehensive support schools. A Targeted school will be identified for Comprehensive support and improvement if subgroups meeting the criteria discussed above do not demonstrate growth, after a period of time not to exceed four years. The first identification will be no later than 2021–22.

- d. *Frequency of Identification. Provide, for each type of school identified for comprehensive support and improvement, the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. Note that these schools must be identified at least once every three years.*

Washington will identify Comprehensive support schools on a three-year cycle.

- e. *Targeted Support and Improvement. Describe the State’s methodology for annually identifying any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the definition used by the State to determine consistent underperformance. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii))*

Washington will define *consistently underperforming* subgroups as any subgroup whose multiple measures score falls below the threshold set by the “*All students*” comprehensive support identification (described in section (a) above). Using a threshold set by the *All students* subgroup creates a uniform standard for all student subgroups and schools.

Targeted schools with at least one subgroup that is consistently underperforming based on the lowest performing five percent of all schools will be identified annually.

The Washington system of meaningfully differentiating schools is based on three years of combined data, and the definition of “consistently underperforming” is aligned with that. The subgroups for targeted supported are students who are: American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Black/African American, Hispanic, White, Two or More Races, English Learner, Students with Disabilities, and Low Income.

Annual identification will begin in 2018–19.

- f. *Additional Targeted Support. Describe the State’s methodology, for identifying schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), including the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. (ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))*

If a school has any subgroup whose multiple measure score falls below the threshold, the school will be identified for Targeted Support.

Identification will begin in 2018–19 and will be conducted annually thereafter. OSPI will work with the district to monitor progress of these schools in meeting their identified progress goals.

Schools will have up to four years of full implementation of targeted support and improvement plans before being expected to meet all exit criteria.

Additional Statewide Categories of Schools. If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

Washington will identify an additional category of targeted support schools for consistently low-performing English Learner Progress. The schools with the lowest performance on the English Learner Progress measure shall be designated for targeted English learner support. It will be based on a combined measure, using three years of data, and schools shall be identified every three years. In the first identification of schools (for identification in the 2018–19 school year), Washington will use only one year of data, given that the first administration of the ELPA21 assessment was in 2016 and there is only one year of progress data available.

- vii. *Annual Measurement of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)): Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.*

Washington shall calculate academic achievement (proficiency rates) according to ESSA, which requires the denominator for the achievement calculations to be the number of students participating in the assessments or 95 percent of all students, whichever is greater.

Proficiency = [among students in the denominator, the number that achieved Level 3 or 4 on the assessment] / [95 percent of the number of enrolled students **or** the number of tested students (whichever is greater)]

In this way, students who don't participate in the assessment are counted as not meeting standard. By using this calculation, Washington embeds the non-participation rate in accountability. Schools or subgroups with larger numbers of non-participants will have proportionate decreases in demonstrated achievement rates.

Washington will include only students enrolled at least half the school year, as required in ESSA. This is defined as enrolled in a school on October 1st and enrolled for at least 150 cumulative days at the same school during the school year. Washington defines a school year as September 1 through June 1.

If a school does not meet the 95 percent participation, this issue must be addressed in their school improvement plan. The plan must address any population of students (the "ALL" and/or any subgroup) that are not meeting the 95 percent participation rate. The plan must include goals and actions a district or school will take that will ensure that 95 percent of the students will participate. Any school/district that does not meet the 95 percent participation

rate may not receive state or national awards that are based on elements of the accountability plan. If a school does not meet the participation rate of 95 percent for three consecutive years, the school’s accountability rating will be lowered by one step (1–10).

viii. Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A))

a. Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

Washington has created the multiple measures framework to support the entire continuum of schools and the students served in them. To distinguish the schools that have made sufficient progress and that continue to need help, Washington will use the following criteria for schools to be eligible to exit comprehensive supports:

1. School shall show improvement on the overall multiple measures score; and
2. School shows improvement of at least one consistently underperforming subgroup’s multiple measures score; and
3. School is not identified during next round of identification (three years); and
4. The school has a strong plan for sustainability of the progress that it has made which includes information on measurable goals, aligned strategies, intentional fiscal support, and a well-defined monitoring/evaluation system. The plan must explain how the school will maintain achievement and support across all student groups served within the school.

Schools may petition OSPI after the second year of supports to grant an accelerated exit date if the criteria are met. Washington plans to reevaluate this identification process after three years, ensuring the data reflects the state’s priorities.

b. Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

The additional targeted support schools are those identified with multiple consistently underperforming subgroups. The improvement threshold (baseline score established to identify comprehensive support schools) holds all students in the state to the same standard, and exit criteria hinge on improvement of each subgroup above that threshold.

After the designated three-year support period, Washington will apply the following criteria for schools to be eligible to exit the additional targeted support category:

1. All consistently underperforming subgroups show improvement on their multiple measures score; and
2. There are no subgroups designated as consistently underperforming during the next round of identification; and
3. The school has a strong plan for sustainability of the progress that it has made which includes information on measurable goals, aligned strategies, intentional fiscal support, and a well-defined monitoring/evaluation system. The plan must explain how the school will maintain achievement and support across all student groups served within the school.

Washington plans to reevaluate this identification process after three years, ensuring the data reflects the state’s priorities.

- c. *More Rigorous Interventions. Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the ESEA.*

OSPI is committed to providing supports to Comprehensive and Targeted schools throughout the three years of support that they will receive to meet the state’s accountability criteria. During the three-year time period OSPI will work with LEAs to monitor the impact of the school’s Comprehensive or Targeted Plan to determine if the school is on a trajectory of success. OSPI will work with LEAs to build, support, and maintain a proactive system of systemic and sustained improvement with an emphasis on greater cross-program coordination, planning, and service delivery, such as WA-MTSS.

During the three years, the state will annually review and adjust supports and interventions for identified Comprehensive and Targeted schools. If progress during this time is not being achieved, the state in partnership with the district will determine appropriate interventions. These may include:

- Directed use of resources/funds
- Increased coaching/on-site monitoring

Determinations will be made in consultation with OSPI’s staff from Learning and Teaching, Student Support Services, Special Education, Migrant and Bilingual Education, Title I and Learning Assistance Program, Center for the Improvement of Student Learning, and Equity and Civil Rights. LEAs may also partner with Educational Service Districts (ESDs), agencies or organizations

which possess expertise supporting specific populations of students, and other types of support organizations to provide information on research-based practices, guidance and/or professional learning opportunities to the school.

If a Targeted school does not exit after three years of support, the school will be identified as a Comprehensive school. The school will be required to follow the requirements that have been set for newly identified Comprehensive schools.

If a Comprehensive school does not meet exit criteria after three years, the district will be expected to pursue more rigorous interventions. The school will be required to conduct a comprehensive analysis to diagnose the reasons why the school did not exit and then develop a new plan to address the specific issues based on root causes. The analysis will examine previous school improvement efforts/plans, programs, strategies, initiatives, instructional practices, assessments, staffing, systems development, and all factors that were intended to bring about change in that school. This will also include an assessment of the leadership capacity/competency at the school and district level.

OSPI will work with the district to identify an external partner to conduct qualitative needs assessments at both the school and district level. OSPI will work with the district to provide focused on-site technical assistance and professional learning opportunities. By using an external partner to conduct the qualitative needs assessment, the district/school will get an unbiased, objective assessment of the school from a fresh perspective.

OSPI will work collaboratively with the district and school to examine the findings of the needs assessment and provide support in the development of an appropriate and actionable improvement plan. Additional data analyses (quantitative data described above) will be used to identify which of the previous interventions should or should not be continued and to determine if other evidence-based strategies are needed.

Based on comprehensive analysis, including the qualitative needs assessment, a district will be required to amend its comprehensive support and improvement plan to:

1. Address the reasons the school did not meet the exit criteria, including whether the school implemented the interventions with fidelity and sufficient intensity, and the results of the new qualitative needs assessment.

2. Update how the district will continue to address previously identified resource inequities and identify any new resource inequities consistent with the requirements to review those inequities in its original plan.
3. Include the implementation of additional evidence-based interventions in the school that are identified by an external district needs assessment and that are more rigorous and based on strong or moderate levels of evidence.

OSPI will provide support and guidance to the district for providing operational and financial flexibility for schools identified for improvement.

A “more rigorous intervention” will depend in part on what interventions the school previously implemented, the effectiveness of implementation, and other factors that did not lead to improved outcomes. This will take a concerted effort between OSPI and the district to examine programs, systems, strategies, and financial alignments that were contributing factors to the lack of improved outcomes. The determination of a “more rigorous intervention” will be made on a school-by-school basis. Interventions will be aligned to the school’s needs assessments and the indicator areas for which the schools were identified. LEAs with a significant number of identified Targeted schools and Comprehensive schools will receive prioritized access to technical assistance and available resources.

Currently OSPI’s Office of System and School Improvement staff are working to develop a system of supports for Comprehensive and Targeted schools through a School Improvement Pilot. Staff are actively engaging in 2017-18 with schools that were previously identified as Priority or Focus schools to identify effective support structures that will be included in supports to Comprehensive and Targeted Schools as they are identified. District leaders are included in this pilot, so that their insights will become part of the state’s support system. Information from this pilot will become part of the state’s 2019 revised ESSA Consolidated Plan.

Furthermore, Washington appreciates that ESSA provides for a more precise view of the academic outcomes for every student through an increased focus on student subgroups. OSPI’s plan for support has been developed in recognition of the increased number of schools that will be identified due to this focus, as well as an increased level of autonomy and responsibility for LEAs. In building systems of support for Comprehensive and Targeted schools, OSPI seeks to develop a whole-agency, tiered approach enabling OSPI to deploy differentiated support and technical assistance, as well as regular progress monitoring between the SEA and LEA, resulting in continuous improvement and local capacity building.

As one example of a whole-agency approach, the Office of System and School Improvement and Special Education will work together to develop data reviews and protocol templates to provide LEAs with the opportunity to receive, analyze, and use student level data in formats which show potential impacts and correlations with student groups in conjunction with administrative and instructional practices. These efforts should in turn drive targeted professional development and technical assistance to address root causes to complex problems such as disproportionality in special education identification, placement, and academic achievement.

As a second example of a whole-agency approach, the Office of System and School Improvement will champion the use of Washington’s Integrated Student Supports Protocol with the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning as part of the plan development, execution, and ongoing support for identified schools. Washington’s Integrated Student Supports Protocol facilitates the development of a seamless system of wraparound supports for students, families, and the school to address students’ academic and nonacademic barriers to learning. OSPI recognizes that many of the challenges facing Comprehensive and Targeted schools are systemic in nature and thus require a systemic and sophisticated approach to interventions.

OSPI’s Office of System and School Improvement will also take the following actions in support of the transition to the new accountability and support system:

- Complete an audit to catalogue existing technical assistance and professional learning provided by the agency
- Conduct an audit of technical assistance and professional learning provided by key partners
- Catalogue current services provided by OSPI, obtain stakeholder feedback in conjunction with state level data, determine the effectiveness of those services, and identify additional services that are needed across Washington
- Conduct a Listening and Learning Tour of a representative number of Washington’s schools and synthesize obtained feedback for use in developing and strengthening the systems of support for identified schools
- Organize provided support by Accountability Indicator and intentionally connect schools with technical assistance or professional learning provided by OSPI or by a partner agency based on identified LEA-specific needs
- Establish a cross agency design team to review progress of identified schools relative to the submitted improvement plan,

documented access to OSPI’s tiered technical assistance and professional learning, and overall effectiveness of provided support. The design team will identify and assign problems of practice to the multidisciplinary resource and advisory committee to establish templates and considerations in support of implementation and sustainability

- Author and publish case studies highlighting efforts and implementation specifics of identified schools with demonstrable progress relative to their submitted improvement plan so effective use of best practices and improved student outcomes can be implemented elsewhere
- Identify affinity groups based on shared success and/or challenges; provide technical assistance as appropriate to support and facilitate networked improvement communities; co-create templates that bridge student level information with administrative and instructional practices; recommend areas for potential research partnerships and/or future case studies

In addition, specific sections of the agency (offices of Migrant and Bilingual Education, Special Education, Civil Rights, Learning and Teaching) will be engaged in providing professional learning opportunities to these schools. Through these actions, the SEA will continue refining its whole-agency, tiered support model, demonstrating shared commitment to continuous improvement as is expected of schools identified through the Accountability process. Stakeholder partnerships will play a key role in this process.

- d. *Resource Allocation Review. Describe how the State will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.*

OSPI has a universal grants management system (iGrants) which allows LEAs to apply for funds for state and federal programs administered by the state.

Title I, Section 1003 funds will be provided to Title I schools identified for Comprehensive support and if funds are available, to Title I, Part A schools identified for Targeted support.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Title I, Section 1003 funds awarded are \$9,169,084 and FY16 School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds awarded are \$7,169,084. SIG funds have been awarded to prior identified SIG schools. The FY17 Title I, Section 1003 funds will be distributed to current Title I, Part A Priority and Focus schools. In the 2018–19 school year, Title I, Section 1003 funds will be distributed to newly identified Title I, Part A Comprehensive schools, and if funds are available to newly identified Title I, Part A Targeted schools. Funds

will be determined through a formula that includes the number of schools, the number of students enrolled in each school, and those schools identified as in greatest need based on their current fiscal resources.

Each year, the district will submit an application to access ESSA Title I, Section 1003 school improvement funding. As part of the application process, the district will need to explain how it is allocating resources to ensure sufficient support for the schools identified for comprehensive or targeted improvement. As part of the application, a district will identify the funds that will be provided to schools and how those funds will be used to assist the schools in meeting the goals set to support students in meeting state standards.

After the distribution of Title I, Section 1003 funds to Comprehensive schools, there will most likely be insufficient funds to support all of the identified Targeted schools. In the event that there are any remaining Title I, Section 1001 funds, those Targeted schools that have multiple subgroups not meeting state accountability requirements, will be given priority to be awarded funds.


Given that Title I, Section 1003 funding may not be available, OSPI will provide guidance to LEAs and schools on how local, state and federal funds can be braided to provide monetary support to Comprehensive and Targeted Support schools.

Washington provides additional school improvement funds for non-Title I schools and to supplement the Title I, Section 1003 funds for Title I schools. The state's appropriation for the 2017–18 school year is \$9,352,000.

Regardless of funding amount allocated to LEAs, OSPI will provide technical assistance to support all Comprehensive and Targeted Schools. (2017-18 Priority and Focus schools will receive technical assistance during the 2017-18 school year.) OSPI will monitor all improvement plans, their implementation success and expenditures of their Title I, Section 1003 and State funds periodically throughout the school year. A complete fiscal review will be conducted, annually, through OSPI's Consolidated Program Review (CPR) process.

Additionally, during the 2017–18 school year OSPI has opened a pilot project with 10 schools from eight districts to identify technical assistance needs of schools as we transition to identifying Comprehensive and Targeted Support Schools. The pilot will focus on the state's role, the LEA's role and the identified school's role in identifying technical assistance needs and resources needed to effectively support Comprehensive and Targeted schools.

To provide additional transparency in resource allocation, OSPI has an internet based allocation of state resources portal and a request to the legislature to enhance the portal. OSPI staff will be able to use this portal in its current and future state, as well as comparability reports, to inform its review requirement to periodically review resource allocations to the schools identified for improvement.



e. *Technical Assistance. Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.*

Targeted Schools

OSPI’s Office of System and School Improvement (OSSI) and the Special Programs and Federal Accountability division (SP&FA) will work in partnership to provide technical assistance to LEAs that have a significant number of identified Targeted schools. In addition, specific sections of the agency (offices of Migrant and Bilingual Education, Special Education, Civil Rights, Learning and Teaching) will be included in providing professional learning opportunities to these schools.

Under ESSA, LEAs are responsible for supporting a Targeted school’s development of a targeted school improvement plan, instituting an ongoing

review process and monitoring/evaluating the implementation of the plan. This is a new requirement for LEAs and because of this the state will implement a new LEA technical assistance opportunity. A joint OSSI and SP&FA team will be convened to provide technical assistance to LEAs on Targeted school improvement plan development, implementation, reviews and monitoring.

Examples of technical assistance that will be provided include:

- Conducting differentiated on-site support visits based on needs
- Assisting LEAs with the evidence-based decision-making process
- Supporting use of transparent robust high-quality data
- Helping identify best practices for professional learning in designated academic content areas
- Supporting initial development of Targeted school improvement plans with encouragement to select bold, innovative evidenced-based interventions and share considerations developed by the resource support committee to support effective implementation of the identified strategies
- Supporting implementation and monitoring of Targeted school improvement plans
- Monitoring strategies and action steps for completion and success
- Supporting implementation of bold evidence-based school systems and structures to create powerful change
- Supporting and guiding selection and implementation of innovative, locally selected evidence-based interventions leading to significant increases in student achievement
- Reviewing quarterly data submissions and discuss needed midcourse adjustments
- Monitoring improved student outcomes
- Reviewing resource allocation by the LEA to schools identified for targeted support, if the LEA has a significant number of targeted support schools
- Partnering with early learning providers to improve kindergarten

The identified school, in partnership with key school, LEA, family, and community stakeholders, will develop and implement a school-level targeted support and improvement plan to improve student outcomes for the identified groups. Regardless of ESSA Section 1003 funding or set-aside funding streams, Targeted improvement schools will need to annually tailor the improvement plans to address the needs of the underperforming subgroups identified by OSPI. The plan must be informed by OSPI indicators used to identify the school and include evidence-based interventions specifically addressing the subgroup(s) identified for additional support

services. After identification, the school will need to submit the plan to the LEA for approval based on the timeline set by the LEA. The LEA will need to approve the plan. This allows for implementation by the start of the school year and for the LEA to incorporate improvement strategies into the various federal grant applications and budget planning. The LEA is responsible for monitoring the school’s improvement plan upon submission and throughout the plan’s implementation.

If specific school improvement funds from ESSA Section 1003 are available for targeted assistance, the identified Targeted School must submit an application for funds that includes a summary of the needs assessment, identification of resource inequities and a completed Targeted school improvement plan to their LEA. The LEA will then submit the needs assessment, summary of resource inequities, and school improvement plan to OSPI in an application. Once the application is reviewed and approved, funding is awarded for plan implementation. OSPI will review the application, and if it meets all the necessary components, approve no less than 30 days after LEA submission. This will allow the improvement plan to be in place and funds to be allocated in time for the start of the school year.

Because OSPI is not yet able to predict the funding available for Targeted schools, it will, resources available, provide priority for technical assistance to Targeted schools that have multiple subgroups identified as in need of assistance, demonstrates a commitment to improving schools through partnerships, elicit authentic stakeholder engagement, and use evidence-based best strategies and practices to drive student success.

Comprehensive Schools Support

Once OSPI identifies the Comprehensive schools, it will convene meetings with and for schools and LEAs for an exploration of what it means to be an identified school. The meetings will include a review of the data that led to the school’s identification. It will outline the process steps required of the school. Comprehensive schools, under the guidance of the LEA, must conduct a needs assessment based on the criteria used to identify the school as needing improvement. The needs assessment in part includes an examination of:

- Student demographics
- The performance of different student groups on assessments
- Effective school leadership
- Strategic allocation of resources
- Clear and shared focus on student learning
- High standards and expectations for all students
- High level of collaboration and communication

- Aligned curriculum, instruction, and assessment to state standards
- Frequency of monitoring of learning and teaching
- Focused professional development
- Supportive learning environment
- High level of family and community involvement
- Alternative secondary schools best practices
- Any unique circumstances or characteristics of the school or LEA
- Related LEA practices, policies and collectively bargained provisions

Resource and Advisory Committee

OSPI will establish a multidisciplinary resource and advisory committee to establish templates and considerations for successful implementation and sustainability of school and LEA improvements. Recruitment efforts will target: strong representation from school and LEA leaders, including Human Resources and/or Finance; accomplished classroom practitioners; mental health or school counselor professionals; special education experts, English Learner experts; family engagement specialists; student behavior professionals; labor movement representatives; and beginning educator support representatives. OSPI leadership will be represented on the resource advisory committee; however, the gender, ethnic, and racial representation of committee members will be reflective of student demographics in Washington. Core membership will center on practitioners and subject matter experts to help design improvement plan implementation considerations for schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support. In partnership with the Center for Improvement of Student Learning (CISL), the resource advisory committee will contemplate various research- and evidence-based approaches to school improvement and recommend implementation considerations by which schools can phase-in improvement strategies over the three-year period of being in improvement.

Processes for Ensuring Effective Implementation of School Improvement Plans

Washington will use two overarching processes to ensure effective development and implementation of school support and improvement plans, including evidence-based interventions that LEAs and schools will be able to use. They include:

- All schools identified for improvement will use a web-based action-planning tool identified by the OSPI for developing school improvement plans and identifying evidence- or research-based interventions it has put into place for the school year. The tool will serve as a resource to document and communicate the work of improvement teams through a continuous cycle of assessment,

planning, implementation, and progress monitoring of improved student outcomes.

- All schools identified for improvement will be required to use evidence-based practices as defined in the state’s Menu of Best Practices for Mathematics, English Language Arts (ELA), and Behavior, or provide data illustrating that an alternative practice selected by the LEA is effective. The menus offer evidence-based interventions to assist students who are struggling, including the use of MTSS and Universal Design for Learning (UDL). In 2013, the Washington State Legislature passed a bill (ESSB 5946) requiring OSPI to improve the Learning Assistance Program (LAP) system and K–4 literacy outcomes by using proven practices for supporting students who struggle to learn. Now, OSPI convenes expert panels annually to identify the interventions that best help students grow and succeed academically. Each year, LEAs report on the academic growth of students receiving LAP services.

Under ESSA Section 1003, LEAs have the option of requesting OSPI directly to provide support or arrange for services. OSPI’s whole-agency tiered approach will position LEAs to request services and benefit from the learning of other LEAs. For example, participate in affinity groups based on shared success and/or challenges, receive technical assistance, join networked improvement communities, co-create templates that bridge student level information with administrative and instructional practices, explore culturally relevant instructional practices, and inform recommended areas for potential research partnerships and/or future case studies. Other tiers of support will include leadership coaching or instructional coaching in ELA, mathematics, special education, English Learners, positive behavior intervention systems, and implementation considerations developed by the multidisciplinary resource support committee. OSPI will provide an option on the grant application for the LEA to allow OSPI to retain a portion of the LEA’s Section 1003 improvement funds for locally determined activities at the school.

Other State Identified Strategies

OSPI and the state’s nine Educational Service Districts (ESDs) provide many opportunities for professional development and technical assistance for individual schools under state or federal improvement plans. Schools can access information about available resources and activities through OSPI’s Office of System and School Improvement or request customized instructional services.

OSPI’s whole agency approach will ensure that LEAs with a significant number of identified Targeted and Comprehensive schools will receive

prioritized access as it offers professional learning opportunities and program workshops for LEAs and schools.

In addition, OSPI will provide technical assistance to the LEA during the needs assessment process by providing a template, the Menu of Best Practices, and a form package on the iGrants system.

System of Performance Management

Washington’s system of performance management for implementation of state and LEA plans for Accountability, Support, and Improvement is based on the following components:

- Promote collaborative problem solving and open communication with educators, other school and LEA stakeholders, families/guardians, and community members.
- Promote equity by addressing inequities in funding, access to rigorous curriculum, advanced coursework, high-quality preschool programs and access to and retention of effective teachers and school leaders.
- Collect, analyze, and use data to identify LEA needs to set LEA educational goals.
- Use data to identify and plan for needed changes in the instructional program.
- Use culturally relevant curriculum and instructional practices.
- Use assessment and non-academic indicators to determine the educational and non-academic supports students require to successfully attain student achievement and graduation goals.
- Use evidence-based intervention models to support comprehensive and targeted schools.
- Implement, provide support systems, and monitor the impact of the goals identified in a Comprehensive and/or Targeted school’s improvement plan.

OSPI has identified accountability system indicators that include:

- In grades 3–8 proficiency on the statewide assessments, academic growth as measured by Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs), English Learner Progress, and at least one non-academic indicator (i.e. Chronic Absenteeism).
- In high schools, proficiency on the statewide assessments, graduation rate, English Learner Progress and three non-academic indicators. (i.e. Chronic Absenteeism, 9th Graders on Track, and Advance Course Taking Dual Credit).

The data collected from these measures will be provided to LEAs, schools, families, and communities through Washington’s Report Card. These data, along with other data that a LEA identifies will be the basis for the performance indicators that a LEA identifies in their LEA Consolidated Plan for Accountability, Support, and Improvement for schools. This plan will go through a review process by OSPI’s federal program staff. This is an intensive process that often requires LEAs to provide additional information or clarification before the plan is approved. The review process will be completed in a timely manner.

In addition, the LEA’s schools that have been identified as Comprehensive or Targeted will prepare school improvement plans. Each of these plans will identify accountability goals, the evidence-based intervention model(s), and the evaluation system the school will implement to determine achievement of performance indicators. Targeted improvement schools will annually tailor the improvement plans to address continuing disproportionality and persistent opportunity gaps as highlighted by state level data.

Washington’s system of performance management works with LEAs to evaluate the impact of their plans on student success, shares information across Washington through networked improvement communities and other communication channels, and identifies new actions for continuous progress to address root causes of complex, systemic problems.

LEA Accountability Plan

(This is specifically for LEAs that have a majority of their schools identified as Comprehensive or Targeted. All LEAs will be required to complete a LEA Consolidated Plan which will require similar information as listed below.)

The development of LEA plans should use a lens of equity with a focus on access and opportunity for all students. The LEA plans will include evidence-based interventions addressing student academic learning and achievement as well as school quality and success measures including, but not limited to such topics as:

- Evidence-based academic interventions which are bold, innovative, and based on data
- LEA/school culture and climate
- Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
- Alternatives to suspension/expulsion
- Restorative Justice
- Chronic Absenteeism
- Whole School Reform models
- School wellness indicators

- Graduation Rate
- College and Career Ready
- Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)
- Washington Integrated Student Support Protocol (WISSP)
- Equitable and intentional funding with a plan for sustainability when appropriate
- Related LEA practices, policies, and collectively bargained provisions
- For elementary schools, the readiness of children when they enter kindergarten

Various elements of the LEA activities listed above necessarily engage other community agencies and stakeholder groups. For example, kindergarten readiness activities will involve collaboration with early learning providers in local communities and in collaboration with the Department of Early Learning at the state level.

LEA Consolidated Plan

Development and implementation of LEA Consolidated Plans: Each LEA that applies for ESSA Title program funds, will be required to complete an LEA Consolidated Plan, to be implemented in phases. A specific section of the LEA Consolidated Plan will require LEAs to identify their achievement and accountability goals. Information provided in the LEA plan must include what supports the LEA will put in place to assist their lowest performing schools and which federal and state program funds will be used. If a LEA has identified Comprehensive or Targeted schools, the LEA will be required to describe how these schools will be supported, reviewed and what fund sources will be used in their support.

Review and Approval of LEA Plans

OSPI is designing a new LEA Consolidated Plan to be phased in over a three-year period. This application will identify elements of Washington’s ESSA Consolidated Plan that will need to be addressed by LEAs as they write their plans. For the ESSA Title programs that a LEA selects to include in the LEA plan, the LEA will identify how these programs will support the LEAs goals, while maintaining the purpose and intent of the specific programs while considering data and local context. Additionally, LEA’s will provide information on how the allocations from these programs will be used and if applicable, blended with other program funds.

OSPI will determine if the LEA activities align with the specific needs of the LEA by a review of the LEAs identified goals and if the activities that are proposed directly support the goals. OSPI will share information or resources with the LEA upon request and in the event adjustments need to be made to LEA activities. In addition, the LEA will complete an ESSA end-of-year report

that requires the LEA to provide an evaluation of their plan and, and provide information on what actions or activities will be removed or added to the next year's plan based on the changes in subgroup performance resulting from the previous year's plan and activities.

During the LEAs development of their Consolidated Plan several professional learning opportunities will be provided to assist them in meeting ESSA requirements. For example, in January 2018 the SEA's federal programs staff will be conducting a number of workshops with LEA federal programs staff on meeting the requirements of ESSA. This is only one of many technical assistance opportunities that will be provided to LEAs as the state transitions to full implementation of ESSA.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement Plans

In Washington, LEAs and schools identified as low-performing have a statutory requirement to complete a plan of improvement that identifies specific strategies and targets that address the reasons why the LEA or school was identified as low-performing. LEAs and schools will use a web-based action-planning tool identified by OSPI for developing school improvement plans and identifying evidence- or research-based interventions it has put into place for the school year. The system will track and report improvement activities transparently. Implementation plans will clearly reflect strengths and areas identified for improvement in the needs assessment, as well as identifying transforming initiatives for LEAs and individual schools. The tool will support LEA and school staff as they assess the school's status on specific indicators for implementing interventions that align to selected turnaround principle. OSPI will work with Comprehensive schools and the LEAs to assist them in engaging families and other school and LEA stakeholders in the needs assessment and in the design, implementation and review of the Comprehensive school improvement plan in alignment with the Washington Integrated Student Support Protocol.

OSPI will approve, monitor and review the LEA's comprehensive support and improvement plans two times per year, in a mid-year and end-of-year check consistent with the Comprehensive school's submission via the web-based tool described above. OSPI monitoring will include written review on how schools are making progress toward their goals and also demonstration of improved student outcomes.

Collection and Use of Data

Engagement in the submission of plans described above will require school and LEA leadership teams to conduct a needs assessment that finalizes three data measures—student achievement data, process data, and demographic data. In addition, for elementary schools, teams will need to analyze the

readiness of children when they enter kindergarten as measured by Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS). The data analysis must include a trend analysis over a number of years and will be used to inform decisions made at the local/school level regarding professional development, classroom instruction, and efforts toward the provision of additional time for collaboration among teachers.

Through the two review periods, mid-year and end-of-year, data will be reviewed by the LEA and OSPI to determine if the Comprehensive school is on track to meet goals set for implementation of strategies that have a positive impact on improving student outcomes. If the school is not on a trajectory of demonstrating goal attainment, the school will be required to adjust the goals that they have set. Information will be accessed from and provided to all stakeholders throughout the data collection and review process.

Continuous Improvement

This is an ongoing process. LEAs and schools identify the goals that they have set to achieve in their plans. The Comprehensive plans are periodically reviewed by OSPI staff. Targeted plans are reviewed by LEAs on a periodic basis and are adjusted during those reviews as required. If a Targeted identified school does not meet the goals set for improving the achievement of a specific population of students within in three years, this school then moves to be a Comprehensive school. Under OSPI's current procedures, if a school is not making sufficient progress by end of year two, a team is convened prior to year-end to review the school's level of progress. The team is comprised of, but not limited to, the principal and other school stakeholders, families/guardians, superintendent or designee, OSPI/ESD content lead for goal areas needing to be addressed. Members of the multidisciplinary resource support committee may also be appointed to this team based on LEA need. The team may include an outside consultant agreed upon by the SEA and LEA. The school's plan is reviewed and the team provides the LEA a report including commendations and recommendations.

- f. Additional Optional Action. If applicable, describe the action the State will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting exit criteria established by the State or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.*

OSPI will follow the process outlined in Washington state law ([RCW 28A.657.020](#)) enacted in 2013 to support schools in need of improvement and increased levels of state oversight. This process currently applies to schools identified as Priority and Focus under NCLB. It will extend to schools

identified for comprehensive and targeted support under ESSA. Of the overall set of these schools, state law calls for OSPI to identify a subset, the persistently lowest achieving (PLA) schools. These Comprehensive schools are identified for lack of progress on indicators used to identify the school for improvement, including *All students* and subgroups, over a three-year period. The process to identify a school for PLA must take into account the level of state or federal resources available to implement a required action plan required under [RCW 28A.657.050](#).

OSPI may identify an LEA as a Required Action District (RAD) Level I if it has at least one school identified as persistently lowest achieving. Once identified, a school can request reconsideration, which is limited to whether the school met the criteria for PLA ([RCW 28A.657.030](#)).

OSPI has the authority to recommend the LEA for RAD Level I to the Washington State Board of Education. Based on the recommendation, the SBE may designate the LEA as RAD 1. The LEA must notify all families of the students attending the school that the district has been identified as RAD Level I based on the school's performance.

Once identified for RAD Level I, the LEA must submit a RAD plan to the SBE for approval. LEAs with more than one persistently lowest achieving school must develop a required action plan for each school, as well as a plan for how the district will provide assistance. It must include the following components A through G ([RCW 28A.657.050](#)):

A. External Review (Academic Performance Audit) ([RCW 28A.657.040](#)):

OSPI provides an external review team to conduct an academic performance audit of the LEA and each persistently lowest achieving school. The audit identifies potential reasons for the school's low performance and lack of progress. The review team consist of persons who have expertise in comprehensive school and district reform. The team may not include staff from the agency, the LEA that is the subject of the audit, or members or staff of the SBE. The audit is based on criteria developed by OSPI and must include but not be limited to an examination of the following:

- Student demographics
- Mobility patterns
- School feeder patterns
- The performance of different student groups on assessments
- Effective school leadership
- Strategic allocation of resources
- Clear and shared focus on student learning
- High standards and expectations for all students

- High level of collaboration and communication
 - Aligned curriculum, instruction, and assessment to state standards
 - Frequency of monitoring of learning and teaching
 - Focused professional development
 - Supportive learning environment
 - High level of family and community involvement
 - Alternative secondary schools best practices and
 - Any unique circumstances or characteristics of the school or district
- B. School Improvement Model:** The LEA must select and implement a federal- or state-approved school improvement model. Federal models include Closure, Restart, Transformation, and Turnaround. The selected model must address the concerns raised in the academic performance audit and be designed to increase educator capacity and substantially improve student achievement.
- C. Required Action Plan:** The LEA superintendent and local school board of a LEA designated as a Required Action District must submit a required action plan to the SBE for approval. The SBE will establish submission dates for required action plans. A required action plan must be developed in collaboration with administrators, teachers, and other staff; parents and families; unions representing any employees within the district; students; and other representatives of the local community. The school board must conduct a public hearing to allow for comment on a proposed required action plan. See [RCW 28A.657.040](#) and [RCW 28A.657.050](#) for additional information.
- D. Web-based Action-planning Tool:** LEAs and schools must use OSPI’s approved web-based action planning tool to create, implement, monitor, and revise their required action plans. OSPI will provide support to LEA and school teams to use tool as the platform for their action planning.
- E. Family Notification:** A LEA designated as a Required Action District must notify all families of students attending a school identified as a persistently lowest achieving school in the LEA of the SBE’s designation of the district as a Required Action District and the process for complying with the required action district requirements. See [RCW 28A.657.040](#) through [28A.657.100](#).
- F. Collective Bargaining Agreement:** The parties to any collective bargaining agreement negotiated, renewed, or extended under RCW chapter [41.59](#) or [41.56](#) after June 10, 2010 by a Required Action District must reopen the agreement, or negotiate an addendum, if needed, to make changes to terms and conditions of employment that are necessary to implement a required action plan. If the LEA and the employee organizations are unable to agree on the terms of an addendum or modification to an existing collective bargaining agreement, the parties, including all labor organizations affected under the required action plan, must request the

public employment relations commission to, and the commission shall, appoint an employee of the commission to act as a mediator to assist in the resolution of a dispute between the LEA and the employee organizations. See RCW 28A.657.040 for specific guidance for mediation of an addendum or modification of an existing collective bargaining agreement and other information.

- G. Professional Development and Technical Assistance (PD/TA):** School and LEA teams engage in required PD/TA to build leadership and instructional capacity to effectively implement their action plan.

The SBE then approves or rejects the required action plan. If SBE rejects a required action plan, the LEA may request reconsideration by a Required Action Plan Review Panel (Panel) convened for this purpose. The Panel makes recommendations, but SBE's decision after reconsideration is final. ([RCW 28A.657.070](#))

The LEA must implement the required action plan after SBE approval. OSPI must provide the RAD with technical assistance and federal and/or state funds for school improvement, if available, to implement an approved plan. The LEA must submit a report to OSPI on the progress it is making in meeting the goals based on the state's assessments, identifying strategies, as assets used to solve the external performance audit's findings, and establishing evidence of meeting plan implementation benchmarks as set forth in the required action plan. ([RCW 28A.657.090](#))

Once the required action plan is approved by the SBE, OSPI provides progress reports on the RADs twice a year to the SBE. From there, OSPI must recommend to SBE whether the LEA should:

1. Be released from RAD I after three years, has made progress, including closing the educational opportunity gap, and no longer has a school within the district identified as PLA.
2. Remain in RAD I.
3. Move to RAD II, where the State Superintendent becomes responsible and accountable for improvements in the school, and has a role in improvement plan development. Before assigning a district to Level II, SBE must submit its findings to an Education Accountability System Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee), which must provide a review and comment back to SBE on the Level II decision.

The process for RAD Level II is provided in [RCW 28A.657.105](#). If a RAD Level I has not demonstrated sufficient improvement after at least three years of implementing a required action plan, SBE may either require development of a new plan or assign the LEA to a new Level II RAD process. (If the RAD was a

previous recipient of a federal SIG, SBE may assign the LEA to Level II after one year.) Before assigning a LEA to Level II, SBE must submit its findings to the Education Accountability System Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee), which must provide a review and comment back to SBE on the Level II decision.

Under Level II, OSPI must direct that a needs assessment and review be conducted to identify the reasons why the previous required action plan did not succeed. OSPI must then work with the school board to develop a Level II Plan that specifically addresses the findings of the needs assessment and specifies the interventions that must be implemented.

Interventions may include reallocation of resources, reassignment of personnel, use of a specified intervention model, or other conditions that OSPI determines are necessary for the Level II plan to succeed, which are binding on the LEA. The Level II plan must also specify the assistance to be provided from OSPI, which may include assignment of onsite specialists with experience in school turnaround and cultural competence, and assistance from the educational service district. Level II plans must be submitted to SBE for approval. If OSPI and the school board do not agree, then OSPI must submit the Level II Plan to SBE directly. The school board may request a reconsideration from the Panel, but the SBE's decision is final after considering the Panel's recommendations.

A.5 Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators

(ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)):

Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the SEA with respect to such description.

As outlined in [Washington's Ensuring Equitable Access to Excellent Educators Plan \(Equity Plan\)](#), OSPI has analyzed student access rates to educators, specifically calculating rates of students of color, students in poverty, and students receiving Special Education and English language learner services to out-of-field and inexperienced teachers. These disproportionalities in access rates or "equity gaps" are calculated at the Educational Service District (ESD), school district and school level. Extensive data profiles, including longitudinal data is available at [OSPI's Equity Plan](#).

In the 2018–19 school year, the first full year of implementation of ESSA, OSPI will calculate the access rates of students to teachers rated ineffective through the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP).

1. Transition between access rates of low-income students and non-low-income students as well as between access rates of minority students and non-minority students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A.
2. Comparison between access rates of low-income students and non-low-income students as well as between access rates of minority students and non-minority students in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A.
3. Comparison between access rates of low-income students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and low-income students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A as well as between access rates of minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and minority students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A.
4. Comparison between access rates of low-income students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and non-low-income students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A as well as between access rates of minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and non-minority students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A.

Table 12. Rates and disproportionalities in the 2013–14 school year.

SCHOOL YEAR	Title I, Part A fund	STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by an ineffective teacher	Disproportionality between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an out-of-field teacher	Disproportionality between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an inexperienced teacher	Disproportionality between rates	
2013–14	Schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Low-income students	N/A	N/A	4.6	0.1	22.7	2.7	
		Non-low-income students	N/A		4.5		20.0		
		Minority students	N/A	N/A	4.7	0.3	24.1	5.1	
		Non-minority students	N/A		4.4		19.0		
	In schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Low-income students	N/A	N/A	6.7	0.7	17.6	0.1	
		Non-low-income students	N/A		6.0		17.7		
		Minority students	N/A	N/A	6.0	-0.4	18.9	2.0	
		Non-minority students (White)	N/A		6.4		16.9		
	Low-income students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and low-income students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		-2.1		5.0
	Minority students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and minority students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		1.3		5.2
Low-income students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and non-low-income students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		-1.4		5.1	
Minority students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and non-minority students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		-1.7		7.2	

Table 13. Rates and disproportionalities in the 2014–15 school year.

SCHOOL YEAR	Title I, Part A fund	STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by an ineffective teacher	Disproportionality between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an out-of-field teacher	Disproportionality between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an inexperienced teacher	Disproportionality between rates	
2014–15	Schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Low-income students	N/A	N/A	4.8	0.6	25.8	3.3	
		Non-low-income students	N/A		4.2		22.5		
		Minority students	N/A	N/A	5.0	0.9	27.2	5.4	
		Non-minority students	N/A		4.1		21.8		
	In schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Low-income students	N/A	N/A	7.3	1.2	19.6	0.0	
		Non-low-income students	N/A		6.1		19.6		
		Minority students	N/A	N/A	6.6	0.0	20.9	2.1	
		Non-minority students (White)	N/A		6.6		18.8		
	Low-income students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and low-income students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		-2.5		6.2
	Minority students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and minority students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		-1.6		6.3
Low-income students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and non-low-income students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		-1.4		6.2	
Minority students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and non-minority students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		-1.6		8.3	

Table 14. Rates and disproportionalities in the 2015–16 school year.

SCHOOL YEAR	Title I, Part A fund	STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by an ineffective teacher	Disproportionality between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an out-of-field teacher	Disproportionality between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an inexperienced teacher	Disproportionality between rates	
2015–16	Schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Low-income students	N/A	N/A	4.3	0.1	27.5	3.7	
		Non-low-income students	N/A		4.2		23.8		
		Minority students	N/A	N/A	4.4	0.3	29.0	6.3	
		Non-minority students	N/A		4.1		22.7		
	In schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Low-income students	N/A	N/A	6.5	0.9	22.3	0.5	
		Non-low-income students	N/A		5.6		21.9		
		Minority students	N/A	N/A	6.1	0.3	23.3	2.1	
		Non-minority students (White)	N/A		5.9		21.3		
	Low-income students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and low-income students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		-2.2		5.2
	Minority students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and minority students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		-1.6		5.7
Low-income students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and non-low-income students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		-1.3		5.7	
Minority students in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A and non-minority students in schools NOT receiving funds under Title I, Part A				N/A		-1.4		7.7	

A.5.A Summary of Results

In general students who are enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A are disproportionately taught by inexperienced teachers than students who are enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A. However, students who are enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A have higher access rates to out-of-field teachers than students who are enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A. The disproportionalities regarding access rates to inexperienced teachers between low-income students and non-low-income student as well as between minority students and non-minority students are larger than that of out-of-field teachers in recent three consecutive school years; the absolute range of the disproportionalities are from 0.0 to 9.7 and from 0.0 to 2.5, respectively.

In schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A, low-income students and minority students have the highest access rates to inexperienced teachers and out-of-field teachers than non-low-income students and non-minority students in each school year. Especially, the access rates to inexperienced teachers are much higher than that of out-of-field teachers. In schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A low-income students and minority students have higher access rate to out-of-field teachers and inexperienced teachers; however, access rate to inexperienced teachers from low-income students and minority students are not as high as that of low-income students and minority students who are enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A.

A.5.B Public Reporting

OSPI will publish and annually update the data regarding rates and disproportionalities, and percentages of teachers in each LEA⁵ categorized by effectiveness level, out of field or inexperienced on its website at www.k12.wa.us/TitleIIA/EquitableAccess/default.aspx.

The School Employee Evaluation Survey (SEES) is administered in mid-October, and is due to OSPI in mid-November. It collects evaluation information for all certificated and classified staff, aggregated by school for teachers, and by district for all others. The data are collated and suppressed internally in December and January, and an external report is prepared in February. Changes to SEES to collect data needed to determine Effective/Emerging Effective/Ineffective will be made in the spring and summer of 2017, in time for the administration of the 2017 SEES, which will collect evaluation data for 2016–17 school year. It should be available by the end of January 2018. Based on the baseline evaluation data, the Effective Educator Workgroup will review the n-size requirements and adjust by the end of the 2017–18 school year, if needed.

⁵ Subject to a minimum sample size to ensure that personally identifiable information is not disclosed.

OSPI consults with many stakeholder groups to address educator equity, both because OSPI is fully committed to transparency and collaboration, and because it is required that OSPI reach out to identified groups for consultation. For a full listing of stakeholders, please see the state’s [Equity Plan](#).

A.5.C Root Cause Analysis

OSPI uses a framework aligned to the career continuum of educators to identify issues impacting equitable access to effective, experienced, and in-field educators, as shown in Figure 7. There are factors in each area of the career continuum that contribute to inequitable access to effective educators.




Figure 7. Framework for addressing educator equity.

As part of the development of the 2015 Equity Plan, OSPI employed a working conditions survey. The Washington Educator Working Conditions Survey⁶ gathered input on working conditions in schools from teachers, educational staff associates, paraeducators, principals/assistant principals, district administrators, families, and community members. The survey addressed five core scales including family and community involvement, leadership, professional learning, classroom support, and safety. The Equity Plan Leadership reviewed the results of the Washington Educator Working Conditions survey along with other stakeholder feedback in order to determine congruence between identified potential root causes and consensus on proposed strategies to close equity gaps. Going forward, the Educator Working Conditions Survey will be employed annually to inform policy decisions and implementation of the Equity Plan.

Washington, like many other states, is experiencing a significant teacher and substitute shortage. This shortage is occurring not only in the long-term shortage areas (e.g., mathematics, science, special education, Bilingual), but also in many other areas, including Early Childhood and Elementary Education teachers. The shortage is significant enough that the Washington State Legislature directed the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) in [House Bill 1813](#) to broadly expand the definition of shortage areas to being “in a subject or geographic endorsement shortage area, as defined by the Professional Educator Standards Board.” The PESB has directed school districts to locally define the shortage area. The shortage in early childhood (birth–grade 3) and elementary teachers (K–8) is largely a result of recent increases in funding full-day Kindergarten and K–3 class size reduction. In a survey of school district Human Resource Directors in fall

⁶ Modeled after the North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey, developed with the American Institutes of Research.

2016, more than 70 percent of the respondents indicated that the shortage is “more” or “much more” challenging in fall 2016 compared to fall 2015.

Please see the strategies outlined in the [Equity Plan](#) for further identification of root causes and OSPI’s plan to address equitable access to educators.

A.6 School Conditions

(ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(C)):

Describe how the SEA agency will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning, including through reducing: (i) incidences of bullying and harassment; (ii) the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and (iii) the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

Washington has a legislative history of focusing on issues of bullying and harassment, disproportionality in student discipline, and use of aversive behavior interventions that compromise student health and safety. The legislature has addressed these topics in a number of laws. They are as follows:

Harassment, intimidation, and bullying prevention policies and procedures ([RCW 28A.300.280](#)):

(1) By August 1, 2011, each school district shall adopt or amend if necessary a policy and procedure that at a minimum incorporates the revised model policy and procedure provided under subsection (4) of this section that prohibits the harassment, intimidation, or bullying of any student. It is the responsibility of each school district to share this policy with parents or guardians, students, volunteers, and school employees in accordance with rules adopted by the superintendent of public instruction. Each school district shall designate one person in the district as the primary contact regarding the anti-harassment, intimidation, or bullying policy. The primary contact shall receive copies of all formal and informal complaints, have responsibility for assuring the implementation of the policy and procedure, and serve as the primary contact on the policy and procedures between the school district, the office of the education ombuds, and the office of the superintendent of public instruction.

(2) "Harassment, intimidation, or bullying" means any intentional electronic, written, verbal, or physical act, including but not limited to one shown to be motivated by any characteristic in [RCW 9A.36.080\(3\)](#), or other distinguishing characteristics, when the intentional electronic, written, verbal, or physical act:

(a) Physically harms a student or damages the student's property; or

(b) Has the effect of substantially interfering with a student's education; or

(c) Is so severe, persistent, or pervasive that it creates an intimidating or threatening educational environment; or

(d) Has the effect of substantially disrupting the orderly operation of the school.

OSPI provided tools to districts, families, and community members through OSPI’s website on [Preventing Bullying, Intimidation and Harassment and Increasing Student Knowledge on Mental Health and Youth Suicide](#) which can be found on the [Harassment, Intimidation, or Bullying Toolkit](#) website.

ESSB 5946 “an act relating to strengthening student educational outcomes” was passed by state legislators. The law set time limits on exclusionary discipline practices and provided additional due process rights for students—including language explicitly stating that “School districts should make efforts to have suspended or expelled students return to an educational setting as soon as possible.”

A Discipline Task Force was created to develop data collection and definition standards related to school discipline. A report was published that addressed the data collected.

The Task Force directed OSPI Data Governance to revise the Comprehensive Education Data and Research System (CEDARS) to incorporate Task Force data collection standards. The standards made discipline data analytics publicly available through OSPI website. [OSPI Discipline Data Analytics](#): suspensions and expulsions included as a current agency performance indicator.

OSPI provided an avenue, through the Learning Assistance Program (LAP), for districts to support implementation of best practices in addressing school conditions that impact student learning. Under [ESSB 5946](#), Section 2: Learning Assistance Program, the new law:

- Included behavior within the scope of LAP allowable services.
- Directed OSPI to convene a panel of experts to develop a menu of best practices for behavior.
 - [Behavior Menu of Best Practices and Strategies](#): Third version published May 24, 2017. Updated annually by July 1st.

OSPI’s equity and civil rights regulations (WAC 392-190-048) require school districts and public charter schools to, at least annually, review disaggregated student discipline data to identify and address disproportionalities based on sex, race, limited-English proficiency (i.e., English learners), and disability (including students protected under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act). This data review must include, but is not limited to, short-term suspensions, long-term suspensions, expulsions, and emergency

expulsions. If a school district or charter school finds it has disciplined or applied corrective action to a substantially disproportionate number of students, it must take prompt action to ensure the disproportion is not the result of discrimination.

OSPI has a coordinated service agreement with AESD (9 Educational Service Districts) Network, which developed a two-day, discipline-data training for school administrators on identifying disproportionality, doing root cause analysis, creating an action plan, and engaging in a cycle of inquiry or evaluation.

During the 2016 legislative session, a bill was passed, [4SHB 1541](#) an act relating to implementing strategies to close the educational opportunity gap (effective 6/9/16) as provided under Part 1: Disproportionality in Student Discipline of the new law:

- A long-term suspension or expulsion must not exceed the length of an academic term.
- School districts must not use long-term suspension or expulsion as a form of discretionary discipline—included language explicitly stating that, before imposing long-term suspension or expulsion, school districts “should first consider alternative actions.”
- School districts may not suspend the provision of educational services as a disciplinary action and must provide an opportunity for students to receive educational services while suspended or expelled.
- School districts must annually disseminate discipline policies and procedures to students, families, and the community.
- School districts must use disaggregated data to monitor the impact of district discipline policies and procedures.
- School districts must periodically review and update district discipline policies and procedures in consultation with staff, students, families, and the community.
- OSPI must develop discipline training modules to support implementation of discipline policies and procedures.
 - OSPI reconvened the Discipline Task Force during October, 2016—January, 2017.
 - OSPI is engaged in rulemaking on [Chapter 392-400 WAC](#) to provide clarity regarding provisions under Part 1 of 4SHB 1541 and improve readability of the entire chapter.

In addition, [RCW 28A.600.480](#), Aversive Behavioral Interventions—Restraint & Isolation addresses the safety of students within a school setting. This law addresses restraint or isolation of students, including students with disabilities, in public schools. Washington developed state special education regulations to implement the restrictions on the use of isolation and restraint for students with disabilities eligible for special education on January 29, 2016. However, the provisions of [RCW 28A.600.480](#) apply to all students. Districts must report incidents of restraint or

isolation that occur while a student is participating in school-sponsored instruction or activities. Restraint or isolation may only occur when the student’s behavior poses an imminent likelihood of serious harm and the least amount of restraint or isolation appropriate must be taken to protect the safety of students and staff.

For each school, the school district shall include (in a report to OSPI):

- The number of individual incidents of restraint and isolation
- The number of students involved in the incidents
- The number of injuries to students and staff
- The types of restraint or isolation used

OSPI will continue to support districts as they move to implement Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).

LEAs in the implementation of MTSS to ensure the provision of equitable access to a well-rounded education for all students. MTSS is a framework for continuous improvement that is systemic, prevention-focused, and data-informed, providing a coherent continuum of supports (e.g., evidence-based/evidence-informed practices) responsive to meet the needs of all learners.

Instituting multi-tiered systems of support impacts educational outcomes (e.g., academic, social, emotional, mental, behavioral, and physical) of students. Schools that have instituted systems that focus on positive student supports find that the following outcomes are achieved:

- A positive school climate is achieved.
- A highly qualified workforce that is trained in engaging academic, climate and culturally relevant education is available to students.
- Adequate academic, social, emotional, and behavioral health supports and interventions are available.
- Coordinated systems for engaging, identifying, referring, and addressing student needs in a positive and proactive manner are followed.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding Sources
Behavior Menu of Best Practices and Strategies	Ongoing	LAP funds Title I, Part A Title IV, Part A
Discipline Data Analytics	Yearly	State
Continued Professional Learning for Districts through ESDs	At least annually	State
High School and Beyond Plan	Starts in 8th grade and is	State

Strategy	Timeline	Funding Sources
	reviewed throughout high school	
MTSS Training and District Implementation	Ongoing	LAP funds Title I, Part A Title IV, Part A

A.7 School Transitions

(ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(D)):

Describe how the State will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school), including how the State will work with such LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out.

Washington has a long history of focusing on education reform. Past and current legislation has led to bold reforms to the state’s entire educational system. The goals of the state’s education system remain consistent: to educate all students to a higher level; to focus on the individualized instructional needs of students; to strive toward closing the achievement gap and reduce dropout rates; to provide effective teachers; and to prepare students for a constantly evolving workforce and increasingly demanding global economy. (RCW 28A.198).

Washington’s education system provides students with the opportunity to become responsible and respectful global citizens, to contribute to their economic well-being and that of their families and communities, to explore and understand different perspectives, and to enjoy productive and satisfying lives. Washington provides a public school system that is able to evolve and adapt in order to better focus on strengthening the educational achievement of all students, which includes high expectations for all students and gives all students the opportunity to achieve personal and academic success. To achieve this intent, the goals of each school district, with the involvement of families and community members, provides opportunities for every student to develop the knowledge and skills essential to:

1. Read with comprehension, write effectively, and communicate successfully in a variety of ways and settings and with a variety of audiences.
2. Know and apply the core concepts and principles of mathematics; social, physical, and life sciences; civics and history, including different cultures and participation in representative government; geography; the arts; and health and fitness.

3. Think analytically, logically, and creatively, and to integrate technology literacy and fluency as well as different experiences and knowledge to form reasoned judgments and solve problems.
4. Understand the importance of work and finance and how performance, effort, and decisions directly affect future career and educational opportunities.

Washington’s schools focus on the individualized instructional needs of students; strive toward closing achievement gaps and reducing dropout rates; and prepare students for a constantly evolving workforce and increasingly demanding global economy.

Further, Washington’s laws require that students have the opportunity to develop basic education knowledge and skills, that school districts provide instruction of sufficient quantity and quality, and give students the opportunity to complete graduation requirements that are intended to prepare them for postsecondary education, gainful employment, and citizenship. The law requires that the instructional program of basic education provided by each school district include:

1. Instruction in the essential academic learning requirements.
2. Instruction that provides students the opportunity to complete twenty-four credits for high school graduation, beginning with the graduating class of 2019.
3. Opportunities to learn languages other than English and to provide instruction in one or more American Indian languages.
4. Supplemental instruction and services for underachieving students through the Learning Assistance Program.
5. Supplemental instruction and services for eligible and enrolled students and exited students whose primary language is other than English through the transitional bilingual instruction program.
6. The opportunity for an appropriate education at public expense for all eligible students with disabilities.
7. Programs for highly capable students.

The State Superintendent has set four top priorities that guide the OSPI’s work in assisting students as they move through the K–12 system. They include:

1. Increase basic education funding.

Our state [Constitution](#) clearly states that it is Washington’s **paramount duty** to amply fund basic education for every child residing within our borders. In January 2012, the state Supreme Court upheld that concept in its [McCleary v. Washington decision](#). This is more than a legal obligation – it is critical that we support our students so they can achieve their dreams and our state can sustain our economy.

Since the *McCleary* decision, the state has increased the amount of basic education funding, but there is still work ahead of us. We must revise the local levy system, which creates inequality across districts, and our compensation system, which keeps beginning teachers from earning a livable wage. This is challenging work that will require bipartisan support, and we believe we can get there.

Update: On June 30, 2017, the state Legislature passed the 2017-19 operating budget for a new education funding plan which added \$7.3 billion in state funds to be expended over the next four years. This primarily addresses the state Supreme Court's requirement, in *McCleary v. Washington*, that basic education funding come from the state. It is an important investment in Washington's public schools.

2. Improve academic achievement and close opportunity gaps.

About 79 percent of students in the Class of 2016 graduated after four years of high school. We are increasing graduation rates, but we have more work to do.

Students who drop out of school have higher unemployment rates, higher health-care costs, lower life expectancy, and they rely on government assistance more often. Every Washingtonian has a vested interest in improving graduation rates.

Our work in this area is both exciting and challenging. We will close [opportunity gaps](#) that exist for our students of color, low-income, and from other populations who have faced systemic barriers to their success.

To see the whole picture, we must look beyond test scores. We are evaluating and designing strategies to address chronic absenteeism, student success in ninth grade classes (a common predictor of graduation rates), and advanced course taking, among other factors. Our aim is to identify schools that are breaking the mold in support of student success. We want to highlight schools and districts that are doing great work in helping every student succeed, no matter the student's race, ethnicity, income level, or primary language. From this, we can support schools that are struggling to close opportunity gaps.

3. Increase pathways to graduation.

Though overall graduation rates are climbing, we must open up multiple pathways to graduation for our students. [Career and technical education](#) (CTE) programs and [Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics](#) (STEM) opportunities give students a chance to apply classroom learning to daily life and engage students who learn better in hands-on environments. One-third of our students will attend a four-year university after high school, so we must continue to build diverse pathways for the two-thirds of Washington's students who want more than a high school diploma.

4. Improve our statewide assessment system.

Standardized assessments are an important way to measure system progress, but they are not the best, or only way to determine whether a student is ready for life

beyond high school. We should uphold our standards and use assessments to measure state, district, and school progress, but we should not use assessments as a barrier to student growth and achievement. Standardized testing is a federal obligation, but even the U. S. Department of Education does not require standardized tests to be linked to graduation. Instead, we should emphasize our rigorous high school diploma with multiple pathways that meet the unique needs of our students and communities.

Washington has adopted a standards-based approach to learning, supplemented with technical assistance and the alignment of programs and funds, to support a student’s education. These services begin with early childhood programs and extend through to postsecondary education and careers. OSPI provides support and guidance to LEAs and schools regarding most current student data (i.e., graduation, proficiency, chronic absenteeism, drop-out rates), and effective implementation of educational practices to ensure students attain mastery of grade-level standards to be able to move through the transitioning from preschool programs to elementary school, from elementary school to middle school, from middle school to high school and from high school to post-secondary options. As Washington moves from No Child Left Behind to meeting requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act, OSPI will expand opportunities available to local school districts to support their work in assisting students as they transition from Early Childhood Education (ECE) to post-secondary options, careers, and life.

A.7.A Transition from Early Childhood Education to Elementary School

During the past decade, the state, school districts, and communities have embraced the importance of the early years in preparing students to be successful in school and life. In addition, many actions have been taken to better align our early learning and K–12 systems so that children will be better prepared for kindergarten.

Summarized below are major initiatives the state has undertaken, and in some cases, is continuing to work on.

Creation of the Department of Early Learning⁷ and Thrive Washington: In 2007, at the request of Governor Christine Gregoire, the Washington State Legislature created the Washington Department of Early Learning (now Department of Children, Youth, and Families) and a public-private partnership, Thrive Washington (formerly Thrive by Five Washington). In creating the department, the Legislature’s intended purpose was to “establish a robust birth-to-three continuum of services for parents and caregivers of young children in order to provide education and support regarding the importance of early childhood development.” The goal of Thrive Washington is supporting “government’s

⁷ As of the 2017 Legislative session, the Department of Early Learning (DEL) has been incorporated under 2E2SHB 1661 into the newly established Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF).

investments in early learning and ensuring that every child in the state is prepared to succeed in school and in life.” Since creation of this formal partnership, these two organizations have placed a spotlight on the importance of early learning and created and implemented numerous initiatives to expand services for children and improve child care quality.

Washington State Early Learning Plan: One of the first tasks of these two organizations was to create a statewide early learning plan designed to ensure school readiness for all children in Washington. This plan was based on the premise that efforts to ensure an opportunity for every child to succeed in school and in life must address the needs of the whole child—i.e., physical and mental health and well-being, as well as intellectual and social-emotional development skills. The plan was built in collaboration with OSPI and many other organizations and individuals across the state, and is intended to guide the work of everyone who cares for, works with, or is concerned about young children, so that the adults in children’s lives work collaboratively and toward unified goals.

Washington Early Learning Partnership: In 2010, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the CEO of Thrive by Five Washington, and the Director of the Department of Early Learning signed an “Early Learning Partnership Joint Resolution,” which formalized the relationship among these cross-sector partners and provided a forum for prioritizing and implementing actions in the Early Learning Plan. The membership expanded to include leaders from the Washington State Department of Health and the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services. The group coordinates actions needed to implement the plan, improves alignment between the sectors represented in the partnership, and takes other actions to improve the lives and education of children from birth through age three.

Washington State Early Learning and Development Guidelines: In an effort to support and enhance the learning and development of children, the Washington State Department of Early Learning, OSPI, and Thrive Washington—in collaboration with a Guidelines Development Committee—created early learning and development guidelines that are intended to provide assistance to caregivers and families of children from birth through age three. The guidelines include practical strategies for serving children at different stages of growth, suggestions for accessing additional assistance, and embrace the tremendous diversity and variation that exists for families and children in our state. Thousands of copies of the guidelines have been distributed and are being used by early learning professionals across the state.

Ready and Successful Schools Action Plan: In 2012, OSPI convened a 37-member panel to identify high impact statewide actions that can be taken by school districts to increase learning opportunities and improve quality for children in

school-district-operated early learning programs. According to the most recent data available, school districts serve more than 33,000 children between birth and age five.

The recommendations include actions pertaining to: 1) growing and supporting leaders in cultivating robust Pre-K through 3rd grade cultures and strategies; 2) strengthening and aligning instruction for students; 3) engaging families and communities in their child’s education and transitions from Pre-K through 3rd grade; 4) expanding access to education, services, and instructional time that support the “whole-child” development and learning of all young learners; and 5) aligning and supporting effective, developmentally and culturally appropriate Pre-K through 3rd grade systems.

Expansion of the State’s Preschool Program: The Washington State Legislature has established a goal to provide all eligible low-income 3- and 4-year-old children access to the state’s Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program by the 2022–23 school year, which will nearly double the number of children served by the program compared to the 2014–15 school year.

Funding was increased in the past two biennial budgets in order to meet this goal of serving additional children, and additional funds have been requested by the Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) for the next biennial budget.

A “blueprint” for expanding the program was created by a workgroup and was co-chaired by representatives of OSPI and DCYF. This program uses a “mixed delivery” system that includes a variety of different types of providers, including community colleges, non-profit and community preschool centers, Educational Service Districts, and school districts. Currently more than 60 percent of students are served in school district classrooms, and this percentage is likely to grow as the program is expanded because of the ability of school districts to build and remodel facilities and staff programs.

Expansion of Full-day Kindergarten: In recognition of the value of full-day kindergarten, especially for lower-income children, the Washington State Legislature adopted a bill in 2007 that phased in funding for full-day kindergarten by the 2017–18 school year. Full funding was provided one year early, and is currently available to all 295 school districts in our state.

Full-day Kindergarten Professional Development: As a condition of receiving full-day kindergarten funding, school districts are required to create classrooms that are developmentally appropriate, promote social emotional growth, provide experiences in many different disciplines and content areas, promote creativity and provide hands-on learning experiences. In addition, teachers are to connect

and communicate with early learning providers in order to improve transitions for children entering kindergarten.

To assist school administrators and kindergarten teachers in creating these classrooms, OSPI contracted with two School District Early Learning Coordinators to create the *Washington State Full-day Kindergarten Guide*. The guide is intended to provide information on effective practices and encourage discussion among kindergarten teachers and administrators in how to design high quality, developmentally appropriate, rigorous kindergarten classrooms.

In addition to the Guide, OSPI worked with a former kindergarten teacher and a national expert in developmentally appropriate kindergarten classrooms to create three professional development “modules” on child development, the kindergarten learning environment, and learning centers. Full-day professional development sessions using these three modules have been conducted across the state and more than five hundred kindergarten teachers and administrators have attended these sessions.

Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills: In addition to the requirement listed above, all full-day kindergarten teachers are required to administer the Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS). WaKIDS, as it is commonly known, has three major components:

1. The Family Connection welcomes families into the Washington K–12 system as partners in their child’s education by providing an opportunity for families to meet individually with their child’s kindergarten teacher at the beginning of the school year. These one-on-one meetings are intended to welcome families to school and provide a safe environment for families to speak freely with the teacher. They help families and teachers begin to build relationships so that they can work together to help children be successful in school.
2. The Whole-child Assessment helps kindergarten teachers learn about the skills and strengths of the children in their classrooms so they can meet the needs of each child. In the first weeks of school, teachers observe students using *GOLD* by Teaching Strategies in six domains, including social emotional, physical, language, literacy, mathematics, and cognitive.
3. The Early Learning Collaboration aligns practices of early learning professionals and kindergarten teachers to build connections between kindergarten teachers and early learning providers, to promote smooth and successful transitions to kindergarten for children. This collaboration is supported by Thrive Washington, which has created a framework for the effort, and Child Care Aware Washington, which provides school principals lists of child care providers that have children who will attend the principal’s school.

Early Learning Feedback Reports: In an effort to provide instructional feedback to early learning providers and improve transitions for children, the Washington Education Research and Data Center, OSPI, and the Department of Early Learning completed a successful pilot program in October 2016 to share WaKIDS assessment data with preschools. The pilot, which was led by REL Northwest, created and shared reports that provide information on how children who “graduated” from state preschool programs performed as measured by *GOLD* in kindergarten. Subject to future funding, the goal is to make these reports available to all state-funded preschool centers and to other preschool providers.

Current uses of Title I Funds for Early Childhood: Approximately forty school districts have reported to OSPI that they use a portion of their Title I funds to support early childhood education. In the 2014–15 school year, school districts allocated approximately \$4 million of their Title I appropriation to prepare children to be “kindergarten ready,” which included summer “Jump Start” transition sessions for children, parental education, preschool services, home-visiting, and other activities.

Menus of Best Practices: Washington’s Learning Assistance Program (LAP) addresses transitions through their published English Language Arts, Mathematics and Behavior Menus of Best Practices. For example, the menus address transition readiness from pre-kindergarten to kindergarten. This section describes what transition readiness means and what strategies could be used to assist students as they transition to kindergarten.

Supporting kindergarten transitions is a promising practice. Transitioning through kindergarten is a time when behavioral, emotional, and social changes impact all students and their families. Communities, schools, families, and educators can increase the likelihood of a successful student transition by providing academic and non-academic support services. Kindergarten transition opportunities provide support to students and their families for successful transitions from in-home care, daycare, relative care, pre-school, ECEAP, or Head Start.

i. Future State-wide Early Learning Initiatives

While much has been accomplished in Washington in the past decade to help children be ready for kindergarten and improve the transition from early childhood to kindergarten, much work remains.

In collaboration with families/communities, school districts and regional-level partners, our state agencies will be moving forward in the years ahead with the following:

- Increasing the number of school districts that recognize the vital role early learning can play in improving the success of their future students in school and later in life.
- Designing and implementing actions to increase the percentage of students who are “ready” for kindergarten as measured by *GOLD*. DCYF has established a goal of 90 percent by 2020.
- Expanding enrollment in the state’s preschool program, Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP) so that all eligible low-income students have access to the program, and to integrate these children into school district classrooms that use other sources of funding, including Special Education, Title I, and parent-tuition funds.
- Continuing to increase the number of school districts that are actively engaging early learning providers in discussions regarding how they collaboratively can help children be ready for kindergarten, improve alignment, and create smoother transitions into the K–12 system. This will include expanding the Early Learning Feedback Report pilot mentioned above and focusing on the Early Learning Collaboration component of WaKIDS.
- Partner with Department of Children, Youth, and Families (2SSB 5107) to reduce barriers and increase efficiency for using local or private funds, or both, to provide more high quality early learning opportunities.
- Working with the legislature to increase the amount of funding available for the construction and remodeling of preschool classrooms.
- Implementing policies and increasing funding in order to increase the salaries and benefits of preschool educators.
- Encouraging additional school districts to engage the parents and families of pre-kindergarten children in activities designed to assist their children to be ready for kindergarten and to offer summer “Jump Start” programs.
- Continuing to increase the reliability of *GOLD* data in WaKIDS, especially for English learners, and to expand the use of the data to improve instruction.

ii. *ESSA and State Program Support for Transitioning from Preschool to Elementary School*

The added clarity and flexibility in ESSA to support pre-kindergarten families, educators, and children makes it possible to utilize a larger share of ESSA program funds to advance the statewide early learning initiatives listed above.

Opportunities available to school districts under ESSA include allocating additional Title I; Title II, Part A; and Title III funds for: serving low income children in pre-kindergarten early learning programs; providing additional educational services to pre-kindergarten English learners (Title II); pre-kindergarten transition programs (e.g., Jump Start summer programs); family

engagement activities (e.g., Ready for K family engagement); and shared professional development regarding kindergarten readiness and transitions for early learning and K–3 educators.

Prior to school districts making decisions regarding their utilization of ESSA program funding, OSPI will provide technical assistance to school districts regarding: The availability and use of ESSA funds for serving pre-kindergarten children (e.g., Title I, Title II, Title III); creating quality preschool programs; how to create socioeconomically diverse classrooms using multiple funding streams; transitions into kindergarten; Head Start requirements; and other related information. This state-level technical assistance will be in collaboration with regional technical assistance provided by Educational Service Districts (ESDs), Child Care Aware, and/or regional offices of DEL. This information also will be included on the OSPI ESSA website. Additionally, OSPI’s website and accompanying technical assistance will provide information on the most effective practices to use to support preschool and grades K–3 students and their families. All of these support strategies will be made in partnership with early childhood providers and ECE professional organizations.

To assist in the communication of this information, OSPI will work with the federal government and other national organizations to create a guide for school districts that summarizes the early childhood provisions in ESSA, the new opportunities school districts have to serve pre-kindergarten children and to provide professional development opportunities for early learning professionals. As part of the guide, information will be provided discussing the options school districts have in collaborating with private schools and other early learning providers in providing joint professional development and sharing ESSA funded tools and resources. In addition, OSPI will be working with the federal government to create and distribute a guide for private schools that provides information regarding assistance available to private schools through the equitable sharing provisions of ESSA.

OSPI, in collaboration with DEL, also will either identify—or develop—a process school districts and communities can use to assess the need for additional preschool opportunities, to determine how best to meet the need, and how to provide technical assistance to organizations identified as potential sources for additional opportunities.

To make it possible for school districts to utilize Title III funding for preschool children English learners (EL), OSPI and DEL staff will work with their colleagues in other states to identify or create pre-kindergarten early learning EL proficiency standards, a screener, and an assessment for preschool English learners. The screener will incorporate a home language survey and information from the guardian.

A.7.B Transitioning from Elementary to Middle School

Support of students transitioning from elementary to middle school has traditionally been under the authority of a LEA. OSPI has significant guidance for transitioning between Early Childhood Programs to elementary school; from middle to high school; and high school to career and college ready postsecondary options. This is an area that will be addressed as OSPI designs guidance to LEAs that includes research-based strategies and professional learning activities and resources.

OSPI has provided guidance to districts through the Washington State Menu of Best Practices: *Washington's Learning Assistance Program (LAP) addresses transitions in the English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics and Behavior Menus of Best Practices & Strategies*. This section describes the practices within the Menu that could be used to assist students transitioning to middle school.

Double dosing is an accepted evidence-based best practice. Double dosing provides additional time during the school day for targeted ELA and/or mathematics intervention with a certificated teacher. The intervention is closely aligned with the students' identified literacy and/or mathematical learning needs and the grade-level ELA and/or Mathematics Standards as they are being taught in the students' core instruction. The content focus of double dosing is most effective as the result of ongoing communication between the core classroom content teacher and the intervention specialist. All students in double dosing programs must participate in core instruction.

Summer school programs are also evidence-based best practices. These Out-of-School Time (OST) programs have the potential to accelerate the reading and/or mathematics development of students who are not yet at grade level and to diminish summer learning loss. Summer programs extend the school year into the summer months and provide enriching opportunities to foster a love of learning and developing speaking and listening skills. Summer learning loss disproportionately affects low-income students. An academic summer program has the potential to minimize learning loss and result in achievement gains.

Community-based student mentoring is a research-based best practice. It is defined as a positive relationship between a non-parental adult (or older youth) to a younger child or youth. Community-based mentoring usually takes place outside the school day with longer sessions and strong mentor-mentee relationships built over time. The structure of the mentoring experience requires goal setting and may include a variety of social, cultural, and academic activities. Community-based student mentors can support literacy and/or mathematics development for students who have not yet met ELA or Mathematics Standards.

OSPI will also rely on LEAs that have implemented successful transition practices for their students as they move from elementary school to middle school.

Additionally, OSPI will provide guidance to LEAs as they apply for ESSA Title Program funds that could be used to support students transitioning between elementary schools and middle schools. The ESSA focus on providing support to homeless, migrant, and foster care students will become part of OSPI's transition plan, incorporated into transition support services for students moving from elementary into middle school and beyond.

A.7.C Transitioning from Middle School into High School

OSPI has taken three major actions to assist students as they transition from middle school to high school.

The first action was to institute an Education Reform practice that requires 8th grade students who are at risk of dropping out of school or not meeting academic standards to have a Student Learning Plan (SLP). The intent of the SLP is to assist the student by clearly outlining the requirements that must be met to be successful in high school.

State legislators developed the concept of a SLP as a way to help 8th grade students progress steadily and effectively on the path to academic achievement and high school graduation.

SLPs are developed to both inform and guide students and families regarding the respective role of the school, families and the student to systematically plan and monitor student academic success. Educators work with the student and the family to facilitate two-way communication and cooperative efforts to support the child's success. Learning plans address individual needs with a step-by-step plan and results-focused activities designed to help students meet the state's learning standards and stay on course for on-time graduation.

A second action taken by the state legislature established a requirement for students in middle school to complete a High School and Beyond Plan. That requirement was recently updated and expanded in legislation passed by the 2017 Legislature.⁸

The High School and Beyond Plan is a graduation requirement. It is a collection of written documents designed to help students think about their future and choose coursework that prepares them for their goals after high school.

The Washington State Board of Education (SBE) established the High School and Beyond Plan as a graduation requirement in 2000. The requirement is effective for students in the graduating class of 2008 and beyond, through [WAC⁹ 180-51-](#)

⁸ See Section 4 of new legislation for an update on the requirements of the High School and Beyond Plan: lawfilesext.leg.wa.gov/biennium/2017-18/Pdf/Bills/Session%20Laws/House/2224-S.SL.pdf

⁹ Washington Administrative Code (WAC). Regulations of executive branch agencies that are issued by authority of statutes.

061, WAC 180-51-066, and WAC 180-51-067. Please visit the [SBE High School and Beyond Plan](#) website for more information.

Starting in middle school (7th or 8th grade), students work with their families and school staff to create their High School and Beyond Plan based on their own Personalized Pathway Requirement. The process starts with a career interest and skills survey. The plan must identify available interventions and academic support or courses that are designed for students who have not met the high school graduation standard to enable them to meet the standard. It must be updated to reflect high school assessment results, transcript review, assessed progress toward identified goals, and must be revised as necessary to reflect a student’s changing interests, goals, and needs. A school district must update the High School and Beyond Plan for each student who has not earned a score of Level 3 or Level 4 on the middle school mathematics assessment by ninth grade, to ensure that the student takes a mathematics course in both ninth and tenth grade. The mathematics courses may include career and technical education equivalencies in mathematics.

The High School and Beyond Plan must include:

- Identification of career goals, aided by a skills and interest assessment.
- Identification of educational goals.
- A four-year plan for course taking that fulfills state and local graduation requirements and aligns with the student’s career and educational goals, and
- By the end of the twelfth grade, a current resume or activity log that provides a written compilation of the student’s education, any work experience, and any community service.

The High School and Beyond Plan could also include:

- The student's interests and abilities, and the relationship to his/her current career goals.
- A list of exams the student needs to graduate from high school and for post-secondary goals (ACT, SAT, etc.).
- Research on postsecondary programs related to the student's goals.
- A budget for life after high school.
- Demonstration of preparedness through presentation of a personal plan.

The third action enacted was a change to the state’s Learning Assistance Program that required menus of best practices and accompanying funding to support programs for students transitioning from middle to high school, to support the goal of every 9th grader completing their freshman year on-track for graduation.

Transitioning in or out of high school is a significant experience for students. Providing additional supports to ease the transition process can improve student outcomes. The Washington State Legislature recognized the importance of high school transitions and specifically promoted extended learning opportunities programs for 11th and 12th grade students at risk of not graduating or meeting state standards as well as students needing assistance to successfully transition from 8th grade into high school for their 9th grade year ([RCW 28A.320.190](#)).

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Youth in the process of adjudication could benefit from additional education opportunities, such as skill centers, while they transition into their regular high school setting.
- Youth already experiencing transition as a result of homelessness, military relocation, medical treatment, or foster care placement may require a variety of additional support services as they transition into or out of high school.
- Students at risk for low performance in high school mathematics courses may lack motivation, self-efficacy, mathematical skills, and conceptual understanding. A study skills program like Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) may be particularly effective for this population, in addition to a focus on developing a growth mindset.

OSPI has also provided the opportunity for LEAs to participate in Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) through a competitive grant process. AVID is an example of a systematic approach to intervention designed to close the opportunity gap and bridge the academic transitions between grade levels. AVID is not only a college-readiness system focused on raising achievement for all students, it also provides training and resources to districts, schools, and educators. Ongoing professional learning is critical to supporting student and teacher success.

Following are additional opportunities that have been provided to LEAs and their schools:

- Academic Youth Development (AYD) [[see AYD Factsheet](#)]. AYD helps develop students' academic identities, engages them in their learning, and focuses on their achievement.
- Development programs focusing on mindset, motivation, and engagement like AYD and extended-period courses like Intensified Algebra are two resources that can support students who struggle in mathematics. College Spark Washington is providing competitive grant opportunities to schools to implement these programs.

- OSPI Career Guidance Washington. Career Guidance Washington is a framework for career and college readiness that provides support for students and their advisors to develop a plan for high school and beyond.

A.7.D Transition from High School to Post-Secondary Education and Careers

OSPI has set the mission of the agency and it reads:

The State will provide funding, resources, tools, data, and technical assistance that enable educators to ensure students succeed in our public schools, are prepared to access post-secondary training and education, and are equipped to thrive in their careers and lives.

The state legislature has provided significant support to ensuring that high schools support their students as they move into post-secondary opportunities. These opportunities include:

The Building Bridges Workgroup, a multi-agency taskforce created by the legislature in 2007, was tasked with developing recommendations to improve graduation rates and reduce dropouts in Washington. The taskforce created the following three primary recommendations:

- a. Set an educational goal for youth- and family-serving agencies and coordinate efforts to achieve it.
- b. Build local dropout prevention and intervention systems and practices at every grade level. Response to Intervention is a school-based, multi-level prevention system to maximize student achievement and reduce behavior problems.
- c. Implement a reengagement system for students that have left the educational system, in an effort to reconnect them to education services and supports.

Bridge to College transition courses for English language arts (ELA) and mathematics are fourth-year (senior-level) courses designed for students scoring a Level 2 on the Smarter Balanced high school assessment (11th grade). Students who earn a “B” or better in the Bridge Course are eligible to enter credit-bearing coursework in any of the Washington Community and Technical Colleges, all 4-year public universities, and most private 4-year universities.

The courses are grounded in essential career and college readiness expectations as reflected in the Washington State K–12 Learning Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics (the Common Core State Standards) to ensure that students passing the course are fully prepared for college-level coursework. The courses were developed by collaborating higher education faculty, high school teachers, and curriculum specialists from multiple colleges and school districts. The 2017 legislature reinforced the importance of transition courses as

an objective alternative assessment for graduation. See [Substitute House Bill 2224](#) for more information.

Why Bridge Courses?

“The thinking process in this class helps you think in a way that will be valuable to you as you pursue further education. The class really allows students to engage in the material they wouldn’t be able to in a more traditional setting.”

Carolyn—Mathematics Teacher

“The course gives students a lot of the writing, critical thinking, and analysis that they’ll use with any program they go into. It’s a rigorous course that gives students what they need to be successful in all other post high school endeavors.”

Michele—English Teacher

- Increase student engagement in mathematics and ELA.
- Save money in college by not having to enroll in remedial courses.
- Deepen student understanding of crucial knowledge and skills needed to be successful in college.

Career and Technical Education and General Education Statewide

Equivalencies. Washington law directs the state to develop course equivalencies for career and technical high school courses offered to students in high schools and skill centers. Career and technical courses determined to be equivalent to academic core courses, in full or in part, by the high school or school district shall be accepted as meeting core requirements, including graduation requirements. Course equivalencies may be statewide or local. School district boards of directors must provide high school students with the opportunity to access at least one career and technical education course that is considered equivalent to a mathematics course or at least one career and technical education course that is considered equivalent to a science course as determined by the office of the superintendent of public instruction and the state board of education.

Equivalency course work provides greater flexibility for students to pursue graduation requirements consistent with their high school and beyond plans, creating a bridge to post high school career and education opportunities. One example of a program that has attained math, science, and English Language Arts statewide equivalencies is called Core Plus, a program developed collaboratively with industry and OSPI.

Core Plus help prepare high school students for entry-level jobs and careers in advanced manufacturing and other high-skill industrial sectors. The program is supported by a written curriculum based on input by a broad cross section of industrial employers. Curriculum development costs were paid for by The Boeing Company which donated the curriculum to OSPI. “Core” skills are those

applicable to all industrial sectors. “Plus” skills are required for a specific sector. The existing curriculum includes plus skills specific to aircraft manufacturing.

Curriculum adaptations are now underway to add “plus” programs for maritime and construction trades. Program plans include a future curriculum adaptation for agricultural technology. OSPI supports program implementation by local schools through a grant program to help pay equipment start-up costs and a professional development program that includes industry input to help instructors learn how to teach the curriculum. The existing curriculum was approved for credit equivalencies in science, math and language arts by OSPI and the Washington State Board of Education. Ability to award credit equivalencies is expanding and enhancing options for local school instruction programs. Availability of a written curriculum facilitates articulation agreements with post-secondary education and training programs. Industry engagement in curriculum development supports efforts to place students in fulltime jobs, internships and other work-based learning opportunities.

Exploring the Paths to Your Future

Every Career and Technical Education (CTE) class falls into one of 16 “career clusters.” A career cluster is a group of jobs and industries that are related by skills or products. Within each cluster, there are cluster “pathways” that correspond to a collection of courses and training opportunities to prepare for a given career.

The 16 clusters were established at the national level through Washington’s Career Clusters Initiative and are recognizable across the United States in middle schools, high schools, community and technical colleges, and the workforce. The career clusters include:

- Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources
- Architecture & Construction
- The Arts, A/V Technology & Communications
- Business, Management & Administration
- Education & Training
- Finance
- Government & Public Administration
- Health Science
- Hospitality & Tourism
- Human Services
- Information Technology
- Law, Public Safety, Corrections & Security
- Manufacturing
- Marketing
- Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics

- Transportation, Distribution & Logistics

Career Counseling and Exploration

Career exploration and life skills planning form the foundation of Career and Technical Education programs across the state. Students in the 7th, 8th or 9th grades benefit from learning about the world of work and planning for their education.

There are also a number of support services for students as they transition between grade spans into post-secondary opportunities. Here are a few of those opportunities:

General Support Services for Washington’s Students (K–12)

Project AWARE (Advancing Wellness and Resilience in Education)

Increases awareness of mental health issues among school-aged youth, including training in mental health for school personnel, families and community members.

Children and Youth from Military Families

This program is housed within the OSPI K–12 Education/System and School Improvement Division and serves as a resource for educators in Washington who work with our 136,000 military families. OSPI has been a member of the Interstate Compact on the Educational Opportunities for Military Children since 2009. The Compact aims to reduce the educational and emotional issues encountered when the children of military personnel are required to transfer from schools in one state to another. The goal of the law is to provide as much consistency as possible with other states relative to school policies and procedures, while honoring the existing laws that govern public education in our state.

Count Me In

Count Me In is Washington’s school attendance initiative with the long-term goal to decrease chronic absenteeism by creating a shared communications plan for youth- and family-serving agencies addressing chronic absenteeism. This is a state commitment to build capacity and collaboration between education and community agencies to reduce chronic absenteeism.

GATE (Graduation a Team Effort)

Through effective local and statewide partnerships, the GATE collective impact initiative works to remove barriers to services and learning, improve academic success, reduce dropouts and increase graduation rates. GATE is working to develop a comprehensive dropout prevention, intervention and reengagement system by working collectively to:

- Reduce and eliminate academic and non-academic barriers to learning.
- Align vision and outcomes across youth-serving organizations and agencies.
- Coordinate efforts and share information about successful programs
- Advocate for the needs of children and youth in Washington.

Future Work on Title I, Part A Data Analytics

The agency is currently preparing data on the impact of Title I, Part A services on the achievement of Title I schools. This information will be available fall 2018.

ESSA and State Program Support for Transitioning from Elementary to Post-Secondary Education

Even though Washington has provided funding for many programs to assist students as they transition from preschool to post-secondary opportunities, there are many support structures that are still needed. OSPI will work through federal ESSA program guidance as released from the United States Department of Education (ED) to further identify transition strategies that may be funded by ESSA. These opportunities will then be provided to LEAs across the state. As the state moves to full implementation of ESSA, OSPI will continue to require LEAs to provide information in their ESSA Consolidated Application addressing the support strategies they have in place to assist students transitioning across grade spans into secondary opportunities. One system that LEAs and the state supports is the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). This system has been implemented in K–12 LEAs and has a significant impact on student learning. This system impacts the successful transition of students between grade spans. OSPI will provide guidance documents and professional learning opportunities to districts on how ESSA Title Program funds may be used to supplement state and local funds as LEAs determine the transition strategies that will be provided to their students. In addition, Washington has added Indicator 14 data from the state performance plan required under the IDEA, as a performance indicator for LEA determinations issued on November 1, 2016.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding Sources
Full Day Kindergarten	Implementation in 2016–17	State funds
Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Advanced Skills Includes Family Connection to welcome families into the Washington K–12 system as	Beginning of each school year as students enter kindergarten and the inventory may be given three times throughout	State funds

Strategy	Timeline	Funding Sources
<p>partners in their child’s education.</p> <p>Early Learning Collaboration aligns practices of early learning professionals and kindergarten teachers to support smooth transitions for children into public schools.</p>	<p>the year to determine student success.</p>	
<p>Bridge Courses</p>	<p>Annually for fourth year (senior-level) courses in ELA and mathematics.</p>	<p>State funds</p>
<p>Expand CTE and STEM courses/opportunities</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>State and Federal CTE ; Title I, Part A; Title VI, Part A; Title III: Title I, Part C</p>
<p>Expand Early Childhood Programs</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Title I, Part A, Title III, Title IV, Part A, State</p>
<p>Multi-Tiered System of Supports/Universal Design</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>State and Federal (Title IV, Part A, Title I, Part A)</p>
<p>Career Counseling and Exploration</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>State and Federal</p>
<p>Menus of Best Practices</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>State LAP funds with Title I, Part A, and Title IV, Part A</p>

B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

B.1 Supporting Needs of Migratory Children

(ESEA section 1304(b)(1)):

Describe how, in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs and projects assisted under Title I, Part C, the State and its local operating agencies will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are identified and addressed through:

- i. The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;*

As part of the needs assessment and sub-grant application process, OSPI identifies the needs of migrant students in alignment with the State Service Delivery Plan and to ascertain the most appropriate programs to provide academic and support services for migrant students from local, State, or Federal programs.

Assessing Needs:

OSPI provides guidance on the use of academic and support rubrics LEAs may use to identify the educational and support needs of migrant students, including preschool (Pre-K) and out-of-school youth (OSY). OSPI then analyzes the assessment results including Pre-K and OSY.

Unique Educational Needs:

- OSPI Migrant Education Program (MEP) utilizes state or local developed rubrics and assessments such as WaKIDS (Pre-K readiness inventory) to gauge the level of Kindergarten readiness for migrant students as compared to their participation in Early Learning Programs.
- OSPI MEP reviews student transcripts and conducts student interviews to determine whether it is feasible for an OSY student to return to high school to graduate or pursue an Alternative Education Program.
- OSPI MEP analyzes student academics, assessments, language, attendance and discipline data of currently enrolled migrant students to determine the type of supplemental support students may need as well as the most effective support resource(s) and systems available to support their needs.

The OSPI Migrant Education Program will develop a measurable program outcome (MPO) for migrant OSY/dropouts using baseline data established in 2017–18. The MPOs for the migrant OSY/dropouts may include the provision of

preparation resources and counseling of dropouts for GED programs and/or the delivery of social and support services to migrant dropouts.

To ensure that the Washington MEP addresses the unique needs of migratory preschool children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, the following activities are coordinated at the state level, in regional migrant-funded Educational Service Districts (ESDs), within the MSDRS state migrant data system, and throughout MEP-funded school districts:

- The SEA MEP coordinates with the McKinney-Vento Program to ensure reciprocity of identification processes for migrant McKinney-Vento eligible students. The cross- program collaboration between McKinney-Vento and the Washington MEP is continued in the MEP-funded ESDs and actively included in local migrant project school districts.
- The Washington Title I, Part A and Language Assistance Program (LAP) coordinates with the Title I, Part C and Title III programs at the SEA level to ensure the instructional and support services required by migrant students leverage federal funding appropriately and to provide guidance to school districts.
- The Title I, Part C and Title III federal programs at OSPI are jointly housed in the Migrant and Bilingual Education section at OSPI which allows program staff to collaborate on a daily basis. Quarterly webinars are conducted by program staff to address both the migrant and bilingual statewide programs.
- The SEA MEP collaborates with the Office of System and School Improvement to design technical assistance to school districts for migrant students who are dually classified as English learners and students with disabilities.
- Washington has revised the migrant program model to include the addition of four out-of-school youth (OSY)/Health Coordinators at the regional ESD level. The OSY/Health Coordinators will be trained on migrant Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) and will serve the identified OSYs with referrals to health care agencies and educational services.
- The regional OSY/Health Coordinators, district migrant student advocates and migrant graduation specialists counsel drop outs to return to school to receive a high school diploma, or encouraged the enrollment in GED programs.

- The Washington MEP has developed partnerships with the Washington State Department of Health to create a migrant health system that includes all migrant students, including preschool and those that have dropped out, and facilitates the provision of health related services from all community, state and federal programs for which they may be eligible.
- The MSDRS state migrant data system generates a monthly list of newly turned three-year olds and sends to recruiters to verify residence in the state and offer services in the program.
- The Washington MEP implements a variety of instructional and support programs designed to meet the needs of migrant students including supplemental instructional services during the regular school year, summer school programs, secondary credit accrual opportunities, parent involvement activities and Parent Advisory Committee meetings, and professional development designed to increase staff ability to provide high quality instruction.
- Washington contracts with external evaluators to ensure objectivity and to review the implementation of the new Service Delivery Plan (SDP).
- The Washington MEP conducts statewide recruiting and year-round Identification and Recruitment (ID&R activities). In all regions of the state, recruiters and liaisons work together to ensure collaboration, coordination, and a statewide perspective to ensure all eligible migrant students have the opportunity to meet the same academic and content standards as non-migratory students.

Coordination of Services: Districts must identify coordinated services to be provided to migrant students by non-migrant programs/projects and describe the coordinated services to be provided to migrant students including:

- Transitional Bilingual Instructional Programs (State EL funding- similar to Title III)
- Title III
- Title I Part A
- Language Assistance Program (State Literacy funding source- Similar to Title I)

Instructional Resources: Districts must identify instructional resources to be purchased with migrant funds. They describe how they will be used to meet the needs of migrant students identified in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and State Service Delivery Plan. Districts document the activity and object on the

budget page where these purchased items are listed, e.g., instructional technology or supplies, instructional resources, and non-capitalized outlay.

Preschool: By the end of the 2018–19 program period, 85 percent of district staff (PK–3) who receive Migrant 101 training with an early learning focus will report on a training survey that they are better prepared to deliver services to migrant preschool-age students.

By the end of the 2017–18 school year, 48 percent of migrant students entering kindergarten who received MEP supplemental preschool instruction will demonstrate skills typical of entering kindergarteners in four or more domains on the WaKIDS.

By the end of the 2017–18 program period, 75 percent of families of preschool migrant children who received training in school readiness (e.g., early reading, early math) will report that they are better prepared to support their child’s learning at home, as measured by a rating of 3 or 4 rating (out of 4) on the Parent Training Evaluation.

OSY/Graduation: Upon completion of the 2017–18 performance period, 75% of migrant students enrolled in credit-bearing courses will obtain credit toward high school graduation.

By the end of the 2017–18 performance period, the percentage of migrant students in grades 9–12 receiving MEP instructional and/or support services will increase by 2 percent over the previous performance period.

By the end of the 2017–18 performance period, 79 percent of migrant students in grades 9-12 who received support from Migrant Graduation Specialist (MGS) will be promoted to the next grade level or graduated.

Academic Support Services High School aged and OSY youth: In the State’s District IGrant Application the use of Migrant funds in support of OSY are addressed:

The local Migrant Education Program provides supplemental support and reporting on services to OSY and High School Migrant youth delivered to migrant students in the following areas:

- OSY- Credit accrual/retrieval
- Current Graduation Rate for District
- Current Graduation Rate for Migrant Students in the District
- Percent of credits earned during the 2015-16 school year
- Percent of migrant students enrolled during the 2015-16 school year who received MEP-funded **instructional** services

- Percent of migrant students enrolled during the 2015-16 school year who received MEP-funded **support** services
- Percent of migrant students enrolled in or Highly Capable (Gifted) Programs, Advanced Placement, College in the High School, Running Start
- Services migrant students are provided with Migrant Education Program funds:
 - Credit retrieval
 - Academic support focused on individual student need
 - Competency-based high school credit options aligned to WA Standards (e.g., STAMP)
 - Dual Credit
 - Career and Technical Education (CTE) applied credit
 - Testing fees for AP, Seal of Biliteracy, ACT, PreSAT, etc.

Evaluation of Planning and Implementation of Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children: Under the newly developed State Service Delivery Plan, OSPI will conduct the following activities for program evaluation:

- The evaluation of the Washington MEP will be completed by the state with the assistance of an external evaluator knowledgeable about migrant education, evaluation design, federal reporting requirements and OME guidelines, the state context, and the operation of the Washington MEP. The evaluation will systematically collect information to improve the program and to help the state make decisions about program improvement and success.
- The evaluation will report both implementation and outcome data to determine the extent to which the measurable outcomes for the MEP in reading, mathematics, school readiness, and high school graduation have been addressed and met.

Questions answered by implementation data include the following examples:

- What academic support is delivered and how is it provided?
- How is student academic growth monitored?
- To what extent are students engaged in instructional services?
- What parent support opportunities are provided?
- What professional development are staff participating in?
- How are unique needs of migrant students and families assessed?
- To what extent are services provided matched to needs?
- How are the needs of PFS students assessed?
- To what extent are PFS students prioritized in the delivery of services?

- What credit retrieval options are available and used?
- Questions answered by outcome data include the examples below.
- To what extent did migrant students achieve performance targets on state assessments?
- What percentage of migrant students demonstrated target gains on local ELA and mathematics assessments?
- What percentage of migrant families participating feel prepared to engage in activities for supporting learning and have conversations about learning in the home?
- What percentage of staff participating in training report being better prepared to delivery services to migrant students?
- What percentage of migrant students entering kindergarten demonstrates skill typical of entering kindergarteners?
- What is the change in the graduation rate annually?
- What is the change in the percentage of secondary students receiving support annually?

Data on migrant students and services are collected by the state from each of its LOAs. Data sources include: migrant parents, recruiters, migrant program administrators, and other staff as appropriate. In addition, the state uses a Fidelity of Strategy Implementation (FSI) rubric to rate the extent to which the local implementation of strategies aligns to the strategy descriptions in the SDP.

Data will be collected using surveys, focus groups, structured interviews, and records reviews (including assessment results reported through the state data collection and reporting system). Data analysis procedures will include descriptive statistics based on Washington migrant student demographics, program implementation, and student and program outcomes. Means and frequencies will be calculated. Tests of educational significance will be completed, and trend analyses done.

To comply with federal guidelines, OSPI will prepare an annual results evaluation. Through the evaluation, data will be collected annually and reviewed by the state to systematically and methodically improve the program. Further, a written report on the progress made by the OSPI MEP toward meeting its MPOs will be prepared annually by the external evaluator. This report will include recommendations for improving services to help ensure that the unique educational needs of migrant students who are served in Washington are being met.

Student Assessment and Progress Monitoring Plan

For program improvement purposes and in accordance with the evaluation requirements provided in 34 CRF 200.83(a)(4), the evaluation data and

demographic information will be collected, compiled, analyzed, and summarized for the OSPI MEP. These activities will help the state determine the degree to which the MEP is on target to reach the stated performance targets and effective based on the chosen measurable program outcomes. Data collection will occur through standard data reporting to the migrant-specific data system (MSIS) and an annual program evaluation data collection.

Specifically, data will be collected to assess student outcomes, monitor student progress, and evaluate the effectiveness of the MEP. Examples of Migrant Program Objectives include:

- By the end of the 2017–18 school year, 50 percent of migrant students in grades K–8 who received regular term supplemental reading/math instruction will show a gain of at least one point or one level on pre/post district reading/ELA assessments.
- Upon completion of the 2018 summer program, 75 percent of migrant students in grades K–8 who received summer reading/math instruction will maintain or increase their score by 2 percent on pre/post district reading/ELA assessments.
- By the end of the 2017–18 program period, 75 percent of migrant families who participated in MEP family literacy services will report being better prepared to engage in activities for supporting reading in the home, as measured by a rating of three or four (out of four) on the Parent Training Evaluation.
- By the end of the 2018–19 program period, 85 percent of district staff (PK–3) who receive Migrant 101 training with an early learning focus will report on a training survey that they are better prepared to deliver services to migrant preschool-age students.
- By the end of the 2017–18 school year, 48 percent of migrant students entering kindergarten who received MEP supplemental preschool instruction will demonstrate skills typical of entering kindergarteners in four or more domains on the WaKIDS.
- By the end of the 2017–18 program period, 75 percent of families of preschool migrant children who received training in school readiness (e.g., early reading, early math) will report that they are better prepared to support their child’s learning at home, as measured by a rating of three or four rating (out of four) on the Parent Training Evaluation.
- Upon completion of the 2017–18 performance period, 75 percent of migrant students enrolled in credit-bearing courses will obtain credit toward high school graduation.
- By the end of the 2017–18 performance period, 79 percent of migrant students in grades 9–12 who received support from Migrant Graduation Specialist (MGS) will be promoted to the next grade level or graduated.

Demographic Data and Program Compliance Information will be reported on ID&R efforts, student participation, program coordination activities, staff, and parent surveys about program services, professional development, monitoring and technical assistance, and program strengths and areas needing improvement.

Determining progress and making adjustments in the MEP are activities that are focused on increasing migrant student achievement. OSPI will support local MEPs in their efforts to use evaluation results for making mid-course corrections and improving program services through:

- Rating strategy implementation on a FSI rubric; and
- Distributing materials to support professional development activities among Washington MEP staff during regional meetings and statewide workshops; and
- Providing opportunities for local MEPs to share ideas and discuss the use of evaluation results for improvement during regional and statewide meetings; and
- Reviewing program monitoring results and actions for the use of evaluation results for improvement; and
- Sharing information and providing consultation on increasing the reliability of data collection and reporting, interpreting data, and student progress monitoring for improving instruction; and
- Coordinating with the state’s contracted external evaluator to review processes, procedures, and supports provided to local MEPs.

ii. Joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A;

As part of continuous improvement model, OSPI continues identifying areas where migrant students would benefit from joint planning with other local, state, and federal educational programs including Title I, Part A and Title III.

iii. The integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs; and

Through joint planning and use of the continuous improvement model, OSPI continues to provide opportunities for integrated services that are within the supplemental allowable activities.

iv. Measurable program objectives and outcomes.

Under the development of the State Service Delivery Plan 2017–20, continue to expand integration of services for Pre-K and dropout students with measurable objectives and outcomes.

The most recently completed State Service Delivery Plan identified the following Measurable Program Objectives:

1. English Language Arts

- 1.A. By the end of the 2017–18 school year, 50 percent of migrant students in grades K–8 who received regular term supplemental reading instruction will show a gain of at least one point or one level on pre/post district reading/ELA assessments.
- 1.B. Upon completion of the 2018 summer program, 75 percent of migrant students in grades K–8 who received summer reading instruction will maintain or increase their score by two percent on pre/post district reading/ELA assessments.
- 1.C. By the end of the 2017–18 program period, 75 percent of migrant families who participated in MEP family literacy services will report being better prepared to engage in activities for supporting reading in the home, as measured by a rating of three or four (out of four) on the Parent Training Evaluation.

2. Mathematics

- 2.A. By the end of the 2017–18 school year, 50 percent of migrant students in grades K–8 who received regular term supplemental math instruction will show a gain of at least one point or one level on pre/post district math assessments.
- 2.B. Upon completion of the 2018 summer program, 75 percent of migrant students in grades K–8 who received summer math instruction will maintain or increase their score by 2 percent on pre/post district math assessments.
- 2.C. By the end of the 2017–18 program period, 75 percent of migrant families who participated in MEP family math services will report being better prepared to have conversations about math with their children, as measured by a rating of three or four (out of four) on the Parent Training Survey.

3. Readiness (Preschool)

- 3.A. By the end of the 2018–19 program period, 85 percent of district staff (PK–3) who receive Migrant 101 training with an early learning focus will

report on a training survey that they are better prepared to deliver services to migrant preschool-age students.

- 3.B. By the end of the 2017–18 school year, 48 percent of migrant students entering kindergarten who received MEP supplemental preschool instruction will demonstrate skills typical of entering kindergarteners in four or more domains on the WaKIDS.
 - 3.C. By the end of the 2017–18 program period, 75 percent of families of preschool migrant children who received training in school readiness (e.g., early reading, early math) will report that they are better prepared to support their child’s learning at home, as measured by a rating of three or four rating (out of four) on the Parent Training Evaluation.
- 4. Graduation/Dropout**
- 4A. Upon completion of the 2017–18 performance period, 75 percent of migrant students enrolled in credit-bearing courses will obtain credit toward high school graduation.
 - 4B. By the end of the 2017–18 performance period, the percentage of migrant students in grades 9–12 receiving MEP instructional and/or support services will increase by two percent over the previous performance period.
 - 4C. By the end of the 2017–18 performance period, 79 percent of migrant students in grades 9–12 who received support from Migrant Graduation Specialist (MGS) will be promoted to the next grade level or graduated.
 - 4D. By the end of the 2018–19 performance period, the number of migrant students in the four-year cohort dropout rate will decrease by two percent.

B.2 Promote Coordination of Services

(ESEA section 1304(b)(3)):

Describe how the State will use Title I, Part C funds received under this part to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year.

1. **The OSPI Migrant Education Program (MEP) participates in national and state activities to promote interstate and intrastate coordination/collaboration.** The state program consistently participates in Consortium Incentive Grants including the Graduation and Outcomes for Success for Out-of-School Youth (GOSOSY) grant, the Innovative Educational Technologies to Improve Interstate Coordination and Support Educational Continuity and Achievement for Eligible Binational Migrant Students (InET) grant; and the Preschool Initiative (PI) grant to name a few. The state director is a member of the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME) and a member of the Interstate Migrant Education Council (IMEC).
2. **The OSPI MEP works with other in-state and out-of-state organizations and agencies that foster common goals and assistance for migrant students to meet state academic standards** and ensure access to services and programs for which the student is eligible and entitled to receive. The State Program has expanded its partnerships in health to access the most up-to-date immunization information and reduce the duplication of reporting within the Migrant Education Program while at the same time ensuring migrant students are enrolled in school at the earliest possible moment.
3. **The OSPI MEP maintains a state migrant student database system that provides for the timely transfer of health and academic records of migrant students** which has a web-based interface with the National Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to ensure regular year-round uploads and downloads for the most current academic and health information. LEAs are guided to report migrant student enrollment, services received, and health information at the end of the program session (regular and/or summer) or when the student withdraws from the local school district – whichever is sooner.

B.3 Use of Funds

(ESEA section 1304(b)(4)):

Describe the State's priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds, and how such priorities relate to the State's assessment of needs for services in the State.

The state's Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program (MEP) has prioritized the use of funds in alignment with the recently completed Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the State Service Delivery Plan in the following manner:

- Academic Achievement in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics
 - Program services will include summer and regular terms targeted at migrant students, including Priority for Service migrant students, most at-risk of not meeting state standards.

- Utilizing the developed ELA and Mathematic Suites developed by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction to ensure migrant students are receiving academic support in alignment with state standards and research based best practices.
- Enhancing and increasing family access to literacy opportunities in the areas of ELA and mathematics.
- School Readiness/Preschool
 - Provide opportunities for migrant students to access Early Learning Program services.
 - Provide professional learning opportunities for Early Learning instructors to develop culturally responsive instruction and materials to be delivered to migrant students.
 - Develop a series of culturally appropriate, research-based best practices family engagement trainings to enhance readiness in the home.
- Graduation
 - Provide wrap-around systems to ensure migrant students have access to the support and resources they need to stay on course to graduate.
 - Provide multiple opportunities for migrant students to access credit retrieval courses, including on-line and dual credit.
 - Make available instructional staff who have received training in effective instructional strategies that have demonstrated an academic increase for migrant students.
 - Provide access to graduation support or advocacy specialists that have been specially trained to identify the needs of migrant students and know the strategies needed to provide on-going support.
- Health Support
 - Ensure migrant students and their families have access to health and other medical resources needed to reduce the barriers to academic success.
 - Establish partnerships and collaborations with local, state, and federal resources to maximize the resources available to migrant students and their families.
 - Continue to identify the social-emotional needs of migrant students and their families to connect them to available resources.
- Identification and Recruitment
 - Ensure all the required Identification and Recruitment (I/R) components under Title I, Part C Migrant Education are addressed and strategies are in place for statewide implementation in alignment with ESSA.
 - Ensure state and LEA staff employed to conduct statewide I/R undergo regular and thorough training in all aspects of student program eligibility.

- Parent Involvement/Engagement
 - In order to meet the parent advisory council requirement, Parent Advisory Councils are established at the local and state level to ensure appropriate engagement of migrant parents in the decision-making process.
 - Ensure migrant parents are kept informed of the various academic and support services migrant students may receive from MEP.
 - Provide opportunities for parents/guardians of migrant students to develop literacy skills to support learning in the home.

Table 15. Funding formula breakdown for program services.

Funding Component	Amount	Notes
State MEP Administration	No more than 1%	General administration costs (e.g. application review, compliance monitoring, dissemination of information, etc.)
Unique State Administration	27%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Assistance Unique to MEP • Identification and Recruitment • Data Collection System and Transfer of Student Records • Comprehensive Needs Assessment/Service Delivery Plan • Evaluation • Health Services • State Parent Advisory Council • Research/Analytics • State level student activities • Professional development unique to MEP
Third Party Providers	12%	<p>OSPI will reserve migrant funds to engage third party providers in the conduct of special projects to facilitate statewide services that cannot most effectively and efficiently be managed centrally (e.g., professional development, direct student services, parent participation activities.)</p> <p>Activities conducted under this part will be delineated out with specific deliverables and timelines set to costs that are reasonable and necessary to achieve identified outcomes.</p>

Funding Component	Amount	Notes
Direct funding to LOAs	60%	Provide regular and summer program sub-grants to local operational agencies to provide services in alignment with state identified priorities.

C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

C.1 Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs

(ESEA section 1414(a)(1)(B)):

Provide a plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

Children and youth who are neglected, delinquent, or at-risk will directly benefit from the focus of Washington’s ESSA plan to address opportunity gaps in the education system, and to promote equitable access and opportunity for all Washington students. Our responsibility as educators is to prepare every student – regardless of background, household income, or race/ethnicity – for post-secondary aspirations, careers, and life. In addition, our focus on a more comprehensive set of student success variables that go beyond standardized tests (chronic absenteeism, ninth-grade class failure, suspension and expulsions, and dual credit opportunities) creates a framework to improve conditions for learning for some of our most vulnerable students.

The overarching goals for Washington State’s Title I, Part D are to:

1. Improve educational services for children and youth in local, tribal and State institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth so that they have the opportunity to meet the same challenging State academic content and State student achievement standards that all children in the State are expected to meet;
2. Provide these children with services to enable them to transition successfully from institutionalization to further schooling or employment; and
3. Prevent at-risk youth from dropping out of school as well as to provide dropouts and children and youth returning from correctional facilities or institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth, with a support system to ensure their continued education.

To accomplish these goals, state agencies and districts that receive funds and conduct a program under Title I for children and youth who are neglected or delinquent are required to:

- Meet the educational needs of neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth, and assist in the transition of these students from correctional facilities to locally operated programs,

- Ensure that these students have the same opportunities to achieve as if they were in local schools in the state, and
- Evaluate the program and disaggregate data on participation by gender, race, ethnicity, and age, not less than once every 3 years.

OSPI assesses the effectiveness of programs that serve neglected and delinquent children and youth by monitoring and evaluating data related to improving academic, career, and technical skills. Neglected and delinquent programs should be designed with the expectation that children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the same challenging state academic content and academic achievement standards that all children in the state are expected to meet. To the extent feasible, evaluations will be tied to the standards and assessment system that the state or school district has developed for all children.

State agencies and local education agencies receiving Title I, Part D funds must:

- Submit an annual count of eligible students to OSPI by December of each year;
- Submit program applications for approval to OSPI in July that comply with the Consolidated Plan;
- Submit a program evaluation to OSPI at least once every three years to determine the impact on participants in:
 - Maintaining and improving educational achievement;
 - Accruing school credits that meet state requirements for grade promotion and secondary school graduation;
 - Making the transition to a regular program or other LEA-operated juvenile justice educational programs;
 - Completing secondary school or equivalency requirements and employment after leaving the correctional facility or institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth participating and/or enrolling in postsecondary education and job training programs;
- Use multiple and appropriate measures of student progress.
- Submit an annual report to OSPI with student progress results.
- Use evaluation results to plan and improve subsequent programs.

Additionally, annually grantees must track the number of youth who are:

- Enrolled in school;
- Enrolled in GED preparation courses;
- Enrolled in postsecondary programs;
- Entering the workforce and earning a wage;
- Demonstrating responsible citizenship;
- Completing high school diplomas; and
- Completing GEDs.

OSPI monitors the Title I D program both independently and as part of OSPI’s Consolidated Program Review system using onsite visits, desk reviews of selected documents to be submitted by all grantees, and collection of data submitted in the annual report and three-year evaluation.

These monitoring tools help us maintain focus on successful transitions for neglected, delinquent or at-risk youth. OSPI also hosts quarterly meetings for leaders of each of the state and local institution education programs and their instructional staff, as well as state and local juvenile justice system leaders, to facilitate coordination and communication, problem-solve, and engage in both tactical and strategic planning. Meetings are typically organized around the key features of the Title I Part D program, including educational assessments, records transfer, re-entry planning, credit transfer, timely re-enrollment and reentry opportunities, family involvement, and successful graduation.

Since 2009, Washington has directed a portion of the Subpart 2 funding to support our Education Advocate program. This regionally delivered program targets transitioning students with the greatest need to increase the likelihood of sustained success in their new educational setting. It functions as a bridge between the continuum of services offered within the institutional programs and those offered by local education programs. As students transition between institutions and local education agencies, the Education Advocate supports their transition and then stays engaged with the student over time to ensure ongoing success.

In an effort to foster continuous quality improvement, OSPI is working with a group of local school district representatives of juvenile justice schools and other stakeholders to develop guidance for all LEAs serving juvenile justice youth. With that guidance, each grantee will be required develop a local plan for youth transitions between both juvenile justice facilities and local school programs. Each grantee will work to create their individual plan in accordance with their individual school district needs and specific youth population needs in mind. They will work

with their fellow juvenile justice schools as well, to develop a plan for when youth move between facility schools. The goal of this planning and implementation effort is to ensure that all children and youth successfully transition out of one juvenile justice facility and move either to another juvenile justice facility or transition to a local school program.

C.2 Program Objectives and Outcomes

(ESEA section 1414(a)(2)(A)):

Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program.

For Washington programs, in 2017–18, the following objectives and outcomes will be utilized to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D:

C.2.A Subpart 1 Program Objectives and Outcomes

1. To address improving academic grade levels in mathematics and reading: 50 percent or more of students served with Title funds in reading and/or mathematics courses will gain at least one grade level in the area(s) they receive classroom services in after 90 days.
2. To address increasing high school credit achievement: Students will earn credit at a rate of not less than .1 credit for every 15 hours of class in at least 80 percent of all classes.
3. To address increasing enrollment in school after exit: At least 50 percent of students enrolled for 90 days or more will either enroll in a high school diploma program, a GED preparation course, or be reenrolled in an education program upon their release from the institution.
4. To address improving the career and technical skills of children in the program:
 - a. Transition specialists or Education Advocates will work with youth to help assess career needs, create employment readiness documents, communicate with parole and probation, and coordinate intake and release of students.
 - b. All students will engage in career exploration in their first days of residency using such programs as Career Bridge/Where are you Going? and Career Guidance Washington.
 - c. Continue to build collaborations with colleges and universities, along with K–12 public school skill centers, to increase their presence in the long term facility schools with the goal of co-enrolling eligible youth while in the facility in career and technical training opportunities, and maintaining enrollment at release.
 - d. Ensure each student has a state-mandated “High School and Beyond Plan” that is developed, or reviewed and revised as appropriate, in

consultation with the student, parent/guardian and appropriate team of professionals in the facility.

- e. Continue efforts to improve student data collection and analysis in order to better target measurable general education and career and technical education credit achievements.
- f. Collaborate with Juvenile Rehabilitation, LEAs, and other counterparts to expand career and technical education offerings within the facilities.

C.2.B Subpart 2 Program Objectives and Outcomes

1. To address improving academic grade levels in mathematics and reading: At least 50 percent of students enrolled in the school program for 90 school days or more will increase their reading and/or mathematics scores by one grade level or more.
2. To address increasing high school credit achievement: 100 percent of students who are enrolled and completing school work for 10+ consecutive days will earn school credit hours or seat time hours.
3. To address increasing enrollment in school after exit: At least 50 percent of students releasing to the community will be enrolled into community education programs within 30 days after their release from the facility. To address improving the career and technical skills of children in the program:
4. To address improving the career and technical skills of children in the program:
 - a. Transition specialists or Education Advocates will work with youth to help assess career needs, create employment readiness documents, communicate with parole and probation, and coordinate intake and release of students.
 - b. All students will engage in career exploration in their first days of residency using such programs as Career Bridge/Where are you Going? and Career Guidance Washington.
 - c. Continue to build collaborations with colleges and universities, along with K–12 public school skill centers, to increase their presence in the detention facility schools with the goal of enrolling youth prior to and at release in career and technical training opportunities.
 - d. Ensure each student has a state-mandated “High School and Beyond Plan” that is developed, or reviewed and revised as appropriate, in consultation with the student, parent/guardian and appropriate team of professionals in the facility.
 - e. Continue efforts to improve student data collection and analysis in order to better target measurable general education and career and technical education credit achievements.

D. Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

D.1 Use of Funds

(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(A) and (D)):

Describe how the State educational agency will use Title II, Part A funds received under Title II, Part A for State-level activities described in section 2101(c), including how the activities are expected to improve student achievement.

In addition to continuing to implement Washington’s Equity Plan, Title II, Part A allows OSPI to reserve up to four percent of the amount reserved for subgrants to the local education agencies for state level activities to support teachers, principals and other school leaders. Of the four percent, up to three percent can be used for activities for principals and other school leaders.

OSPI reviewed the recommendations of the Effective Educator Workgroup and the Consolidated Plan Team, and adopted their recommendations for the state level reservation, prioritized several areas that will both support the new definition of effective educators and address the critical teacher shortage in Washington.

Specifically, the workgroup prioritized three percent of the four percent to go to principals, due to a lack of state funding provided to training principals. Of the three percent focused on principals, they identified training on teacher and principal evaluation to be a priority (SEA Activity 2), as principals are the evaluators of teachers and little state funding has been provided for their training to date. Additionally, they also focused on professional development for principals (SEA Activity 8) to allow for future flexibility to fund professional learning for state and federal initiatives that involve principals.

One percent of the four percent will be used for recruitment and retention of effective teachers, principals and other school leaders, evidence based professional development of effective teachers and training and support for instructional leadership teams (SEA Activity 5).

However, given the reduction of the Title II, Part A allocation to Washington, OSPI will not reduce school district allocations with the state level reservation in the 2017–18 school year in order to not to further reduce their grants.

Based on the historical Title II, Part A allocations, four percent of the LEA allocation would be approximately \$1,440,000 for state level OSPI activities per federal fiscal year. OSPI intends to leverage this opportunity to use federal funding to support both the implementation of the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP) and the teacher shortage; however it is Washington Legislature’s responsibility to fully fund TPEP, compensation for educators and provide supports to recruit and retain educators during this teacher shortage.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding Sources
<p>Principal State Level Activities:</p> <p>Developing, improving, or providing assistance to local educational agencies to support the design and implementation of teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support systems that are based in part on evidence of student academic achievement, which may include student growth, and shall include multiple measures of educator performance and provide clear, timely, and useful feedback to teachers, principals, or other school leaders, such as by—</p> <p>(I) developing and disseminating high-quality evaluation tools, such as classroom observation rubrics, and methods, including training and auditing, for ensuring inter-rater reliability of evaluation results;</p> <p>(II) developing and providing training to principals, other school leaders, coaches, mentors, and evaluators on how to accurately differentiate performance, provide useful and timely feedback, and use evaluation results to inform decision making about professional development, improvement strategies, and personnel decisions; and</p> <p>III) developing a system for auditing the quality of evaluation and support systems.</p>	<p>2017–18</p> <p>Create Principal Training Design Team (PTDT) with Title II, Part A, and the Association of Washington Principals. PTDT will prioritize and design state level activities for principals, create content and disseminate to LEA’s</p>	<p>Reservation of 3% of the Title II, Part A LEA funding for OSPI state activities for principals</p>
<p>Providing assistance to local educational agencies for the development and implementation of high-quality professional development programs for principals that enable the</p>		

Strategy	Timeline	Funding Sources
principals to be effective and prepare all students to meet the challenging State academic standards.		
<p>Teacher State Level Activities:</p> <p>Developing, improving, and implementing mechanisms to assist local educational agencies and schools in effectively recruiting and retaining teachers, principals, or other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement, including effective teachers from underrepresented minority groups and teachers with disabilities, such as through;</p> <p>(I) opportunities for effective teachers to lead evidence-based (to the extent the State determines that such evidence is reasonably available) professional development for the peers of such effective teachers; and</p> <p>(II) providing training and support for teacher leaders and principals or other school leaders who are recruited as part of instructional leadership teams.</p>	<p>2017–18</p> <p>Create Teacher Training Design Team (TTDT) with Title II, Part A, and the Washington Education Association. TTDT will prioritize and design state level activities for teachers, create content and disseminate to LEA’s</p>	<p>Reservation of the 1% of the Title II, Part A LEA funding for OSPI state activities for teachers</p>

D.2 Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools

(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(E)):

If an SEA plans to use Title II, Part A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers, consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), describe how such funds will be used for this purpose.

1. Reforming teacher, principal, or other school leader certification, recertification, licensing, or tenure systems or preparation program standards and approval processes to ensure that:
 - (i) teachers have the necessary subject-matter knowledge and teaching skills, as demonstrated through measures determined by the State, which may include teacher performance assessments, in the academic subjects

- that the teachers teach to help students meet challenging State academic standards;
- (ii) principals or other school leaders have the instructional leadership skills to help teachers teach and to help students meet such challenging State academic standards; and
 - (iii) teacher certification or licensing requirements are aligned with such challenging State academic standards.
2. Developing, improving, or providing assistance to local educational agencies to support the design and implementation of teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support systems that are based in part on evidence of student academic achievement, which may include student growth, and shall include multiple measures of educator performance and provide clear, timely, and useful feedback to teachers, principals, or other school leaders, such as by:
 - (i) developing and disseminating high-quality evaluation tools, such as classroom observation rubrics, and methods, including training and auditing, for ensuring inter-rater reliability of evaluation results;
 - (ii) developing and providing training to principals, other school leaders, coaches, mentors, and evaluators on how to accurately differentiate performance, provide useful and timely feedback, and use evaluation results to inform decision making about professional development, improvement strategies, and personnel decisions; and
 - (iii) developing a system for auditing the quality of evaluation and support systems.
 3. Improving equitable access to effective teachers.
 4. Carrying out programs that establish, expand, or improve alternative routes for State certification of teachers (especially for teachers of children with disabilities, English learners, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, or other areas where the State experiences a shortage of educators), principals, or other school leaders, for:
 - (i) individuals with a baccalaureate or master's degree, or other advanced degree;
 - (ii) mid-career professionals from other occupations;
 - (iii) paraprofessionals;
 - (iv) former military personnel; and
 - (v) recent graduates of institutions of higher education with records of academic distinction who demonstrate the potential to become effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders.
 5. Developing, improving, and implementing mechanisms to assist local educational agencies and schools in effectively recruiting and retaining teachers, principals, or other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement, including effective teachers from underrepresented minority groups and teachers with disabilities, such as through:

- (i) opportunities for effective teachers to lead evidence-based (to the extent the State determines that such evidence is reasonably available) professional development for the peers of such effective teachers; and
 - (ii) providing training and support for teacher leaders and principals or other school leaders who are recruited as part of instructional leadership teams.
6. Fulfilling the State educational agency's responsibilities concerning proper and efficient administration and monitoring of the programs carried out under this part, including provision of technical assistance to local educational agencies.
 7. Developing, or assisting local educational agencies in developing:
 - (i) career opportunities and advancement initiatives that promote professional growth and emphasize multiple career paths, such as instructional coaching and mentoring (including hybrid roles that allow instructional coaching and mentoring while remaining in the classroom), school leadership, and involvement with school improvement and support;
 - (ii) strategies that provide differential pay, or other incentives, to recruit and retain teachers in high-need academic subjects and teachers, principals, or other school leaders, in low-income schools and school districts, which may include performance-based pay systems; and
 - (iii) new teacher, principal, or other school leader induction and mentoring programs that are, to the extent the State determines that such evidence is reasonably available, evidence-based, and designed to:
 - a) improve classroom instruction and student learning and achievement, including through improving school leadership programs; and
 - b) increase the retention of effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders
 8. Providing assistance to local educational agencies for the development and implementation of high-quality professional development programs for principals that enable the principals to be effective and prepare all students to meet the challenging State academic standards.
 9. Supporting efforts to train teachers, principals, or other school leaders to effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction, which may include training to assist teachers in implementing blended learning (as defined in section 4102(1)) projects.
 10. Providing training, technical assistance, and capacity-building to local educational agencies that receive a subgrant under this part.
 11. Reforming or improving teacher, principal, or other school leader preparation programs, such as through establishing teacher residency programs and school leader residency programs.
 12. Establishing or expanding teacher, principal, or other school leader preparation academies, with an amount of the funds described in subparagraph (A) that is not more than 2 percent of the State's allotment, if:

- (i) allowable under State law;
 - (ii) the State enables candidates attending a teacher, principal, or other school leader preparation academy to be eligible for State financial aid to the same extent as participants in other State-approved teacher or principal preparation programs, including alternative certification, licensure, or credential programs; and
 - (iii) the State enables teachers, principals, or other school leaders who are teaching or working while on alternative certificates, licenses, or credentials to teach or work in the State while enrolled in a teacher, principal, or other school leader preparation academy
13. Supporting the instructional services provided by effective school library programs.
 14. Developing, or assisting local educational agencies in developing, strategies that provide teachers, principals, or other school leaders with the skills, credentials, or certifications needed to educate all students in postsecondary education coursework through early college high school or dual or concurrent enrollment programs.
 15. Providing training for all school personnel, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, regarding how to prevent and recognize child sexual abuse.
 16. Supporting opportunities for principals, other school leaders, teachers, paraprofessionals, early childhood education program directors, and other early childhood education program providers to participate in joint efforts to address the transition to elementary school, including issues related to school readiness.
 17. Developing and providing professional development and other comprehensive systems of support for teachers, principals, or other school leaders to promote high-quality instruction and instructional leadership in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics subjects, including computer science.
 18. Supporting the professional development and improving the instructional strategies of teachers, principals, or other school leaders to integrate career and technical education content into academic instructional practices, which may include training on best practices to understand State and regional workforce needs and transitions to postsecondary education and the workforce.
 19. Enabling States, as a consortium, to voluntarily develop a process that allows teachers who are licensed or certified in a participating State to teach in other participating States without completing additional licensure or certification requirements, except that nothing in this clause shall be construed to allow the Secretary to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over State teacher licensing or certification requirements.

20. Supporting and developing efforts to train teachers on the appropriate use of student data to ensure that individual student privacy is protected as required by section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (commonly known as the ‘Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974’) (20 U.S.C. 1232g) and in accordance with State student privacy laws and local educational agency student privacy and technology use policies.
21. Supporting other activities identified by the State that are, to the extent the State determines that such evidence is reasonably available, evidence-based and that meet the purpose of this title.

D.3 System of Certification and Licensing

(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(B)):

Describe the State’s system of certification and licensing of teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

OSPI delegates authority to the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) to identify minimum standards for certification and licensing of teachers, principals, and other school leaders. Educators submit an application to OSPI for a new certificate or renewal. An initial certificate is valid for three years, and a continuing certificate is valid for five-year periods.

Detailed requirements for certification can be found on OSPI’s website at www.k12.wa.us/certification. In general, there are multiple pathways an educator can use to become certified. Factors that influence the process include what advanced degree the educator has, where the degree was obtained, other experience, and what subjects and/or levels the educator plans to teach. Washington State allows for an alternative route to teacher certification for educators. Alternative routes cater to specific populations, including paraeducators with Associate’s degrees, classified staff or career changers with Bachelor’s degrees that are not education degrees, and for district staff with Bachelor’s degrees employed on conditional or emergency substitute certificates.

D.4 Improving Skills of Educators

(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(J)):

Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in order to enable them to identify students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels, and provide instruction based on the needs of such students.

The Title II, Part A section collaborates with System and School Improvement, Title I, Part A, Title III and Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program, Special Education, and Learning and Teaching divisions to provide a systematic approach to improving the

skills of teachers, principals, and other school leaders to enable them to identify students with specific learning needs, particularly students with disabilities, English learners, students who are Gifted and Talented, and students with low literacy levels, to provide instruction based on the needs of these students.

Supporting educators who work with students with disabilities:

The Special Education division is comprised of three collaborative sections: Program Improvement, Dispute Resolution, and Fiscal and Data. These sections partner with school districts to provide oversight regarding district data, as well as technical assistance and resources to support school leaders and educators in improving outcomes for students with disabilities. This integrated system of general supervision includes data collection around identification of students with disabilities (child find), timely evaluation, disproportionality with respect to race and ethnicity, as well as least restrictive environment, participation in state assessment, and post-school outcomes. Special Education reviews and incorporates district-level and school-level work sessions and focus groups with educators to gather qualitative information, model technical assistance resources, and provide recommendations. Educational Service Districts (ESDs) play a critical role in providing direct technical assistance and professional development opportunities to school and district personnel.

The Special Education division also funds several state needs projects that are designed to build statewide capacity through professional development opportunities; technical assistance; and consultation and training for parents, families, and educators. These projects include:

- **Center for Change in Transition Services (CCTS):**
CCTS provides secondary transition training and technical support to serve eligible students who are in need of post-school transition services.
- **eLearning for Educators:**
The eLearning for Educators Project provides statewide access to affordable online courses designed to support K–12 educators in serving students with disabilities. This includes the Special Education Consistency Index, which includes training modules and access to a platform that facilitates the calculation of an index of the congruency between a sufficient evaluation, a properly-formulated IEP, and service delivery.
- **Special Education Technology Center (SETC):**
The SETC provides training, consultation, technology loans, and resource information to help school districts and families implement assistive technology (AT) interventions in addressing the learning needs of children with disabilities.
- **Washington Sensory Disability Services (WSDS):**
WSDS supports individuals aged birth to 21 who are deaf, hard of hearing, blind, visually impaired, or deaf-blind, by providing training and other resources to service providers and families.

- **Special Education Support Center (SESC):**
SESC provides information and best practices through statewide training to families, educators, and organizations in order to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

The state special education system functions under a continuous improvement cycle based on data collection outcomes, best practices, and ongoing stakeholder input. OSPI is collaborating with the National Center on Intensive Interventions (NCII) to build State Education Agency (SEA) capacity to use data-based individualization in a comprehensive approach to ensure students with disabilities or intensive needs thrive in schools. Implementation of the Washington State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) includes technical assistance, professional learning, data collection, and parent engagement to improve early literacy outcomes for students with disabilities. Additional ongoing redesign concepts to improve outcomes for students with disabilities include:

- Leadership and increased collaboration between OSPI departments and with external stakeholders and partners;
- Growth mindset practices around increasing expectations of students with disabilities;
- Evidence-based instruction and interventions within a statewide Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework for increased access to and progress in Washington grade-level learning standards;
- Common professional development opportunities for general educators, special educators, paraeducators, and administrators;
- Resource allocation considerations (braiding, reducing costs for administrative tasks, increasing direct support to students, and data-based decision making); and
- Teacher recruitment and retention.

Supporting educators who work with English learners (ELs):

OSPI is committed to ensuring our educators in our schools and districts have access to high quality professional learning to support their ability to identify and provide instruction for English learners. We follow both Federal regulations articulated in the Title III program, and we have state level regulations defined in RCW 28A.160 and WAC 392-160 which establishes the Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program (TBIP). The commitment for quality instruction of English learners is actualized in a series of instructional resources and a menu of professional learning courses and conferences in which districts, schools and/or individual educators may choose to engage as it is appropriate for the specific learning needs of the students and the specific professional learning needs of the educator. This below list of resources and courses/conferences are supported by the Title III and the Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program team and by external stakeholders that share the common goal of closing the opportunity gap for English learners.

Professional learning workshops, trainings, and resources to improve an educator’s ability to identify and to provide instruction for English learners include:

- Resources to Provide a Continuum of Support for English Learners (EL-Special Education): <http://www.k12.wa.us/MigrantBilingual/ELResources.aspx>
- English Language Arts: Menu of Best Practices & Strategies: <http://www.k12.wa.us/SSEO/ELAMenuBestPractices.aspx>
- Dual Language Education (Professional Learning network, book studies, toolkits and other resources): <http://www.k12.wa.us/MigrantBilingual/DualLanguages.aspx>
- Systems and strategies used by districts with high graduation rates for ELs: <http://www.k12.wa.us/MigrantBilingual/default.aspx>
- Academic Language Toolkit: <http://www.k12.wa.us/MigrantBilingual/AcademicToolkit/default.aspx>
- Funds of Knowledge and Home Visits Toolkit: <http://www.k12.wa.us/MigrantBilingual/HomeVisitsToolkit/default.aspx>
- Using the English Language Proficiency Standards: <http://www.k12.wa.us/MigrantBilingual/ELD.aspx>
- Asian American and Pacific Islanders English Learner Data Disaggregation Grant (disaggregated data is linked on page and best practices will be coming in 2018–19): <http://www.k12.wa.us/MigrantBilingual/AAPI.aspx>
- Quarterly program webinars: <http://www.k12.wa.us/MigrantBilingual/Training.aspx>
- Four new director webinars (large districts, medium districts, small districts and one for tribal and charter schools): <http://www.k12.wa.us/MigrantBilingual/Training.aspx>
- Two annual, regional cultural competence trainings for districts with increases of immigrant students.
- TBIP and Title III funded districts are required to expend a portion of their state and federal funds for professional learning to teachers of English learners.
- Regional grants manager meetings: nine meetings annually to provide professional learning specific to English learners.

Conferences for English learner educators in the 2017–18 school year include the following topics:

Conference	Date(s)	Conference Topic
Office of System and School Improvement Statewide Convening of Coaches	August 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELPA21
Migrant Education Program Annual Conference	August 17–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide on-site Technical Assistance, support and problem solving for districts attending the conference

Washington Affiliate of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (WAESOL)	October 20–21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialized Literacy for ELs
Washington Association for Bilingual Education (WABE) Institute on Dual-Served & GLAD	November 3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialized Literacy for ELs Serving ELs with Special Needs
Washington Educational Research Association (WERA) and OSPI Annual Conference	November 29–December 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dual Language: Closing the Achievement Gap for ELs Serving ELs with Special Needs
WABE Institute on Dual Language and Secondary Education	January 26–27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dual Language: Closing the Achievement Gap for ELs
WABE Annual Conference	March 22–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide on-site Technical Assistance, support and problem solving for districts attending the conference Dual Language: Closing the Achievement Gap for ELs Serving ELs with Special Needs Specialized Literacy for ELs

Supporting educators who work with students who are Gifted and Talented:

OSPI ensures students who are Gifted and Talented have equitable access to high quality programs through legislation articulated in RCW 28A.185 and were put into WAC 392-170. The programs defined in WAC must be taught by a ‘Special Teacher’ who has training, experience, advanced skills, and knowledge in the education of highly capable students including knowledge of the following: Identification procedures, academic, social and emotional characteristics, program design and delivery, instructional practices, student assessment, and program evaluation.

In order to ensure educators have access to high quality professional learning, OSPI applied for and received a grant from the Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Program and the U.S. Department of Education. This grant enabled OSPI to create modules for professional learning for ‘Special Teachers’ who serve Gifted and Talented students. The modules were piloted in eight school districts and are now ready for distribution to the rest of the state in the spring of 2018. The modules include identification procedures, academic, social and emotional characteristics, program design and delivery, instructional practices, student assessment, and program evaluation.

Supporting educators who serve students with low literacy levels:

A commitment to ensuring each student has access to effective instruction in literacy development, OSPI Learning and Teaching department in collaboration with the Learning Assistance Programs (LAP) and with the Educational Service Districts (ESDs) around the state have made the following resources and professional learning opportunities available for teachers, schools, and districts to access:

- OSPI and the Washington State Legislature through ESSB 5946 provide the ESDs with funding to support K–4 Literacy Coordinators, who provide one on one Coaching and On-Demand (Bespoke) Professional Learning for schools, districts, and regional educators.
- OSPI along with the State Board of Community Technical Colleges have created the Bridge to College Program that brings educators together in the summer for multi-day professional learning to teach the Bridge to College Curriculum and expand their practice. Throughout the year the Bridge to College Teachers come together as a community of practice to support each other as they teach the Bridge to College Curriculum.
 - <http://bridgetocollegecourses.org/>
 - <http://www.k12.wa.us/CurriculumInstruct/BridgetoCollege/>
- OSPI provides full day workshops to educators and administrators on how to use the Menu of Best Practices in English Language Arts. The workshops focus on understanding implementation science, system work, how to successfully engage with parents and families, and most importantly: what instructional practices used by educators, schools, and districts will yield the highest outcomes for students who are not yet meeting the English Language Arts (ELA) standards for their grade band.
- **Student-specific strategies:**
For any student scoring Below Basic (Level 1) OR Basic (Level 2) on the 3rd grade ELA assessment the prior year, the district must implement an intensive reading and literacy improvement strategy from the state ELA Menu of Best Practices or an alternative practice or strategy as described below. (RCW 28A.655.235)

For any school where more than 40 percent of tested students score Below Basic (Level 1) OR Basic (Level 2) on the 3rd grade ELA assessment the prior year: the district must implement an intensive reading and literacy improvement strategy for students in grades K–4 at the school(s) from the state ELA Menu of Best Practices. School districts may use an alternative practice or strategy not on the menu for two school years. After two years, to continue with an alternative, districts will need to demonstrate to OSPI it resulted in improved student outcomes at levels consistent with practices on the menu. (RCW 28A.655.235)
(<http://www.k12.wa.us/SSEO/K4LiteracyData.aspx>)

- The Learning and Teaching division along with the ESDs have created the Washington State Fellows Network of teacher leaders who meet four times a year with their colleagues in the arenas of math, science, early learning, and English Language Arts. The English Language Arts Convening’s focus on strengthening educator understanding and instructional practice to increase the implementation of the WA State Learning Standards and student outcomes.
(<http://www.k12.wa.us/CurriculumInstruct/Fellows.aspx>)
- The Learning and Teaching division supports the ESDs with their annual Starting Strong Summer Conference. The Conference starts the school year off with PK–3rd grade educators from around the state coming together to learn about the latest research, practices and ideas to support their instruction.
(<http://www.startingstrong.net/>)
- The ELA Office offers technical support through various mediums of communication to educators, schools, and districts needing support.
(<http://www.k12.wa.us/ELA/default.aspx>)

Finally, OSPI will utilize four percent of the Title II, Part A LEA allocations to develop additional technical assistance to teachers, principals, and other school leaders to strengthen their capacity to identify and to serve students with different learning needs. The focus will be on strengthening the Teacher Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP) process and feedback mechanisms that principals give to teachers on differentiation, pedagogy, and content under TPEP criteria in order to more effectively support children with disabilities, English learners, Gifted and Talented students, and students with low literacy levels.

D.4.A Evaluation and Support Systems

If the SEA or its LEAs plan to use funds under one or more of the included programs for this purpose, describe how the SEA will work with LEAs in the State to develop or implement State or local teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support systems consistent with section 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii) of the ESEA.

Washington uses an evaluation and support system for teachers and principals, the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Program, (TPEP). TPEP is the result of a collaboration among OSPI, the Washington Education Association, the Association of Washington School Principals, Washington Association of School Administrators, Washington State PTA, and the Washington State School Directors Association.

The core principles of TPEP include:

- Quality teaching and leading is critically important.
- Professional learning is a key component of an effective evaluation system.
- Teaching and leading is work done by a core team of professionals.

- Evaluation systems should reflect and address the career continuum.
- An evaluation system should consider and balance “inputs or acts” with “outputs or results.”
- Teacher and principal evaluation models should coexist within the complex relationship between district systems and negotiations.

TPEP uses direct observation, student growth measures, and other evidence to evaluate professional staff. Evaluation criteria include:

1. Centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement
2. Demonstrating effective teaching practices
3. Recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs
4. Providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum
5. Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment
6. Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning
7. Communicating with parents and school community
8. Exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focus on improving instructional practice and student learning

School districts can use one of three evaluation rubrics for teachers and certificated educational staff, described below.

1. Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson. Danielson’s Framework for Teaching includes four domains: planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities.
2. 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric by the Center for Educational Leadership (CEL) at the University of Washington. The CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Framework uses five dimensions for evaluation, including purpose, student engagement, curriculum and pedagogy, assessment for student learning, and classroom environment and culture.
3. Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model. Marzano uses four domains, including classroom strategies and behavior, preparing and planning, reflecting on teaching, collegiality and professionalism.

Each framework is used by approximately one-third of the 295 school districts in Washington. Because of size differences, the percent of state students per framework varies, with 53 percent of the students served by Danielson’s Framework for Teaching, 33 percent by CEL’s 5D+ rubric, and 14 percent by the Marzano model.

Student growth includes multiple measures of student learning, not just test scores. In each district, teachers and principals work together, using data, to set appropriate baseline scores and achievement goals. The goals must be aligned with curriculum,

measured in a specific timeframe, and related to state, district, and school goals. School districts use a combination of state-based tools (formal assessments), district and school-wide tools, and classroom-based tools to determine student growth.

Each of three frameworks, when applied, results in a rating for the educator of:

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Basic
3. Proficient
4. Distinguished

Provisional teachers, with three or fewer years of experience receive a comprehensive evaluation every year, then every fourth year thereafter. During the years in which a comprehensive evaluation is not scheduled, every teacher and educational staff member receives a focused evaluation that looks at one of the eight criteria, includes student growth data, and is approved by the teacher’s evaluator.

Principals are evaluated using the Washington State Principal Leadership Framework, developed by the Association of Washington State Principals, or the Marzano School Leadership Evaluation Model. There are eight evaluation criteria for principals:

1. Creating a school culture that promotes the ongoing improvement of learning and teaching for students and staff.
2. Demonstrating commitment to closing the achievement gap.
3. Providing for school safety.
4. Leading the development, implementation, and evaluation of a data-driven plan for increasing student achievement, including the use of multiple student data elements.
5. Assisting instructional staff with alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with state and local school district learning goals.
6. Monitoring, assisting, and evaluating effective instruction and assessment practices.
7. Managing both staff and fiscal resources to support student achievement and legal responsibilities.
8. Partnering with the school community to promote student learning.

Like teachers, principals and assistant principals must be evaluated using a comprehensive evaluation during their first three years. Districts are strongly encouraged to continue to conduct comprehensive evaluations annually thereafter, or at least every fourth year. At minimum, districts are required to perform a focused evaluation in any year that a comprehensive evaluation is not performed.

OSPI is implementing a few changes to TPEP, described below. Districts can choose to implement the changes in the 2016–17 or 2017–18 school year. The score from the most recent Comprehensive evaluation will be carried forward through the Focused evaluation. This will encourage teachers and principals to address areas of challenge during the Focused evaluation process. Observation, which is an integral part of the process, is expanded to include activities that may take place outside the classroom or school day. This change allows for a more sensible fulfillment of the required observation time where it makes sense both for the criterion being observed and for the role of the teacher.

Educator Data Suppression

In Title II, Part A there is a limitation that any data in “the reports and information provided in the state report shall not reveal personally identifiable information about any individual.”

Additionally, it specifies that in the state report “for a state that implements a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation and support system, consistent with section 2101 (c) (4) (B)(ii), using funds under this part, the evaluation results of teachers, principals or other school leaders, except that such information shall not provide personally identifiable information on individual teachers, principals or other school leaders.”

Per Revised Code of Washington 28A.150.230(2)(a), OSPI collects evaluation data for certificated, classified, and other administrative employees. This includes teacher evaluation scores, aggregated by school, and principal evaluation scores, aggregated by district. This information is suppressed to prevent any individual identification. It is posted on the TPEP website, and an analysis of the evaluation data, along with the other information collected, is performed by an outside entity. This, too, is published on the website. The most recent data displayed is from 2014–15, which is before full implementation of TPEP. The agency is currently collecting 2015–16 data, the first year of full implementation, which will provide baseline data.

In order to publicly report effective educator data, the following data suppression rules will be applied to both the school district and school levels:

Table 16. Educator data suppression rules for districts and schools.

Type	Suppression Rule
School district	Report effectiveness data with an n-size of 10.
School districts with less than 10 teachers or principals	Report data from school districts with individual n-sizes of less than 10 teachers or principals together in an

Type	Suppression Rule
	aggregate small school district group, with a label that indicates which school districts are within the group.
School	Report effectiveness data with an n-size of 5.

Paraeducator Requirements

Additionally, within Title I, Part A, under the Parents Right to Know requirements, it outlines that school districts must notify parents of their right to request and be provided in a timely manner the professional qualifications of their student’s classroom teachers, including paraeducators:

Whether the student’s teacher:

- Has met state qualification and licensing criteria for the grade levels and subject areas in which the teacher provides instruction;
- Is teaching under emergency or other provisional status through which state qualification or licensing criteria have been waived; and
- Is teaching in the field of discipline of the certification of the teacher.
- Provides the child services by paraprofessionals and, if so, their qualifications.
- Provides timely notice that the student has been assigned, or has been taught for 4 or more consecutive weeks by, a teacher who does not meet applicable State certification or licensure requirements at the grade level and subject area in which the teacher has been assigned to.

Washington does not currently have certification and licensure requirements for paraeducators. The Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) was authorized by [Substitute Senate Bill 6129](#) in 2014 to convene a Paraeducator Work Group to create recommendations for:

1. Minimum employment standards for paraeducators who work in English language learner, transitional bilingual, federal limited English proficiency, learning assistance, and federal disadvantaged programs;
2. Minimum employment standards for paraeducators who work in basic education and special education programs
3. A career ladder that encourages paraeducators to pursue advanced education and professional development as well as increased instructional ability and responsibility; and

4. Professional development for certificated employees that focuses on maximizing the success of paraeducators in classrooms.
5. The work group must also report on proposals for an articulated pathway for teacher preparation
6. Professional development and training to help paraeducators meet the employment standards.

Based on the recommendations of the Paraeducator Workgroup, in the 2017 session, the Washington State Legislature passed [House Bill 1115](#), which created a Paraeducator Standards Board and a paraeducator certificate and licensure system. It also established the following minimum employment requirements for paraeducators which will be effective September 1, 2018:

Must be at least eighteen years of age and hold a high school diploma or its equivalent AND:

1. Have received a passing grade on the education testing service para educator assessment; or
2. Hold an associate of arts degree; or
3. Have earned seventy-two quarter credits or forty-eight semester credits at an institution of higher education; or
4. Have completed a registered apprenticeship program.

Due to this, for the 2017–18 school year, OSPI will maintain the paraeducator qualifications required under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) until the effective date of the minimum employment requirements for paraeducators.

Under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), paraeducators have been required to have a high school diploma, GED or its equivalent. With this credential in place, there are three educational pathways and one evaluation option a potential paraeducator can take to meet federal requirements.

1. Two years of study at an institution of higher education. The institution you choose must meet five criteria of the Higher Education Act, Section 101(a). All classes must be at level 100 or higher.
2. Associate degree or higher. All associate degrees are acceptable.
3. Pass the ETS ParaPro Assessment. The assessment measures skills, and content knowledge related to reading, writing and mathematics.
4. Washington paraeducator portfolio or apprenticeship program — completed previously. Those meeting the apprenticeship requirements must present a journeycard or certificate. The portfolio and apprenticeships are no longer offered for enrollment, however OSPI will continue to honor this pathway.

D.5 Data and Consultation

(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(K)):

Describe how the State will use data and ongoing consultation as described in ESEA section 2101(d)(3) to continually update and improve the activities supported under Title II, Part A.

Title II, Part A has created extensive data dashboards and reports to school districts identifying equity gaps by student subgroups and programs to inexperienced, out-of-field and not-Highly Qualified teachers.

In order to assess the quality of OSPI and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward improving student outcomes, the data dashboards link educators' quality information to student level data and annually show the access rates and disproportionalities to particular qualifications of educators from each student subgroups in state level, Educational Service District level, district level, and school level. The student level data includes five student groups used in our state for federal accountability: All Students (ALL), Free and Reduced Price Lunch status (FRL), Students with Disabilities (SWD), English learner (EL), and Minority (MNR; aggregated number of Race/Ethnicity subgroups excepting White). Race/Ethnicity is further broken down by subgroup (White, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Black/African American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races).

The data dashboards analyze these data including the distributions of excellent educators and the access rates and disproportionalities to each teacher category from each student subgroups to evaluate association with geographic locations, the percentage of Title I schools, average total salary, average base salary, and average supplemental compensation to identify trend(s) of equity gaps-student access rates occurrences.

These data are also used to assist LEA to close equity gaps-student access rates to particular qualifications of educators by using Title II, Part A fund as well as provide LEA consultations to support excellent educators.

OSPI will create additional data dashboards and reports including the access rates of students to ineffective educators with the new n-size data suppression requirements. These will be used to guide school district use of Title II, Part A grants to support inexperienced educators with induction and mentoring programs; out-of-field educators gain the necessary coursework and requirements to obtain an endorsement in their assigned subject areas and ineffective educators to focus sub criteria within the TPEP rubrics that received a basic or below basic score. School districts are required to address the identified equity gaps explaining how districts will support inexperienced and out-of-field teacher equity gaps. The Title II, Part A program staff provide technical assistance to districts to walk them through the equity gap profiles, help them understand how their Title II, Part A funding could be used to address identified equity gaps and answer questions.

Based on the identified equity gaps of inexperienced, out-of-field and ineffective educators, OSPI will differentiate technical assistance to each school district to respond to their unique equity gaps. As part of the implementation of Washington’s Equity Plan, Title II, Part A is in the process of creating human resource training modules differentiated for the recruitment and retention needs of rural, suburban, and urban school districts. The human resource training modules are being developed collaboratively with the Professional Educators Standards Board (PESB).

During the 2016–17 Consolidated Program Review cycle, OSPI will continue to monitor teacher qualifications and collect data about teacher certification, endorsements, teaching assignments, and years of experience and monitor all paraeducators for ESEA requirements currently working in Title I programs. OSPI will also continue to analyze and offer technical assistance to districts to help them understand their equity gaps-student access rates to particular qualifications of educators (inexperienced-less than 5 years of teaching experience and out-of-field-teaching endorsement not matching teaching assignment), disaggregated by student race/ethnicity, poverty status and by students with disabilities and students receiving ELL services.

Additionally, Title II, Part A will continue to collaborate with other federal programs to develop training and technical assistance to school districts on the new ESSA Requirements and how federal and state funding can be leveraged locally to address the different needs of school districts.

OSPI has created an Educator Workforce Development Workgroup for ongoing consultation and to develop policy and funding initiatives and give input on the implementation of the Equity Plan, recent teacher shortage legislation and other state level initiatives to increase the teacher workforce within Washington. One of the tasks of the Workgroup is to develop recommendations from a broad and diverse group of stakeholders on differentiated technical assistance for OSPI and PESB to provide to school districts to support effective educators, close equitable educator access gaps and provide support educators in the stages of the career continuum describe in the equity plan, from attracting into the profession, recruiting and retaining in specific geographic and content areas, and providing robust professional learning and support for continual growth in effectiveness.

D.6 Teacher Preparation

(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(M)):

Describe the actions the State may take to improve preparation programs and strengthen support for teachers, principals, or other school leaders based on the needs of the State, as identified by the SEA.

OSPI is not planning to use funds under one or more of the included programs to support education preparation programs. OSPI has delegated authority for

overseeing education preparation programs to the state's Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB). The PESB oversees requirements for preparing future educators, supporting professional development of the current educator workforce, and creating and implementing state policies through stakeholder engagement.

PESB works closely with the Washington Association of Colleges for Teacher Education to ensure future educators are qualified to teach and to ensure that the pipeline is not unduly restricted for teachers who have pursued alternative paths to developing content expertise.

OSPI supports the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) through the inclusion of the following strategies in the Equity Plan to strengthen teacher preparation, attract educators into the profession and to address student equitable access to educators.

1. Attract Multiple Pathways into the Teaching Profession
2. Alternative Routes to Certification
3. Educator Retooling and Scholarship Program
4. Paraeducator Pipeline
5. Recruiting Washington Teachers Program
6. Development of a Teacher Loan Forgiveness and Scholarship Program

Additionally, OSPI supports inexperienced educators by providing state funding for induction and mentoring through the Beginning Educator Support Team (BEST) program. Washington is in the fifth year of offering a competitive grant to fund new teacher induction through the Beginning Educator Support Team (BEST) program. BEST grants are used by districts to create and implement systems of support that attract, train, and retain novice teachers. BEST program components include: well-trained, carefully selected, and well-matched mentors to enhance the instructional effectiveness of first year teachers; an instructional orientation; professional development designed to meet the unique needs of novice teachers; release time for observations and ongoing, formative feedback; and the formation of a district stakeholder's team to collaborate on induction program design and assess program impact. Currently, BEST is serving 145 districts (of 295), 2226 first year teachers (of about 3600 eligible), 1700 second year teachers, and 245 education support associates (school counselors, psychologists, social workers, etc.) with \$9million of state support. OSPI will be seeking additional funding from the 2017 legislature to continue to increase the number of novice teachers served, and to fully support the key elements of an effective new teacher induction program.

E. Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

E.1 Entrance and Exit Procedures

(ESEA section 3113(b)(2)):

Describe how the SEA will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures, including an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.

Entrance criteria

Students are identified as English learners based on their home language survey and their score on the state-approved English language proficiency screener. Washington is a member of the English language proficiency assessment (ELPA21) consortium and uses the English language proficiency assessment. The WELPA screener currently used will be replaced by the ELPA21 screener when it is available in fall 2017. The ELPA21 screener with accommodations will be the alternate assessment used to identify potential ELs with significant cognitive disabilities. No other measures are used to determine eligibility.

- A home language survey is completed for all students in Washington when they enroll in school.
- If the student's primary language is not English, districts are required to administer the state English language proficiency assessment within ten days of enrollment (per RCW 28A.180.090). The state English language proficiency screener is provided to school districts at no cost. In fall 2017 potential ELs will be assessed with the ELPA21 screener. Potential ELs with significant cognitive disabilities will be screened with the ELPA21 with accommodations. The ELPA21 screener is aligned to the state's English Language Proficiency standards, which correspond to Washington State Learning Standards for English language arts. The screener assesses the language domains of reading, writing, listening, and speaking.
- The scoring rubric for the screener will be developed by the ELPA21 consortium and will be used by all districts to ensure uniform criteria are used to identify English learners.
- Students whose score is below the proficient or transitional level qualify for English language development services.

Exit Criteria

English learners are tested annually on the state-approved English language proficiency assessment; ELPA21. ELPA21 with accommodations is the alternate annual assessment for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities. ELPA21 is based on

the state’s English language proficiency standards and addresses the language demands needed to reach college and career readiness. ELPA21 assesses the language domains of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The student’s overall score on the annual assessment is the single criterion used to measure proficiency in English and exit the student from English language development services. The assessment is scored by the ELPA21 consortium’s vendor and districts are notified of students’ results.

Within each of the four domains (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) there are five performance levels (1–5). These performance levels offer additional details as to student performance within each domain.

Based on these performance levels, ELPA21 has established three categories of proficiency status—Emerging (the beginning level of English language acquisition), Progressing, and Proficient. The score files present proficiency by status rather than numerically to better reflect the intent of the proficiency rules.

Proficiency Status Rules:

- Emerging = students with all domains levels \leq two
- Progressing = students with domain level combinations that fall in between the criteria for Proficient and Emerging
- Proficient = students with all domain levels \geq four

Student Proficiency Status represents the following:

- Emerging (continues to qualify for the English language development program at the beginning level of English language acquisition)
- Progressing (qualifies for the English language development program) or
- Proficient (exits the English language development program)

Students with an Emerging or Progressing determination will continue to receive English language development services, while Proficient students no longer receive language development services.

For two years after students exit English language development services, districts receive additional state funds to monitor their academic progress and provide them with academic support if they are below grade level or not meeting standard on the annual English language arts, mathematics or science assessments.

E.2 SEA Support for English Learner Progress

(ESEA section 3113(b)(6)):

Describe how the SEA will assist eligible entities in meeting:

- i. *The State-designed long-term goals established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goals, based on the State’s English language proficiency assessments under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); and*
- ii. *The challenging State academic standards.*

Meeting Long-term Goals and Measures of Interim Progress

Recognizing that all ELs are not the same, Washington has established reasonable and rigorous student growth and proficiency goals that consider these differences. Age and English language proficiency when entering the English language development program are variables that will mark the long-term expected growth trajectories. OSPI will continue to develop and add to existing data tools to assist LEAs with interim progress monitoring. The Title I, Part A accountability section of the plan provides details about the goals and measures of interim progress.

Meeting Challenging State Academic Standards

OSPI will support LEAs with meeting challenging state academic standards by providing required academic assessments in native languages to the full extent allowable under ESSA Title I, Part A. Full translations rather than stacked translations will be provided to ensure equity across language groups.

OSPI will also provide direct and virtual technical assistance to assist LEAs in refining policies and practices that increase EL academic achievement and English language proficiency. In addition to regular, direct technical assistance to LEAs through phone, email and virtual meetings, OSPI staff will provide in-person and online professional learning activities and web-based toolkits on topics such as supporting struggling ELs in core instruction, addressing the unique needs of newcomers, avoiding EL disproportionality in special education and building dual language programs for ELs.

E.3 Monitoring and Technical Assistance

(ESEA section 3113(b)(8)):

Describe:

- i. *How the SEA will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English proficiency; and*
- ii. *The steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as providing technical assistance and modifying such strategies.*

Monitoring and Technical Assistance with EL Attainment of English Proficiency

Beginning with the 2017–18 annual grant application, Washington requires LEAs to provide a data-driven program evaluation prior to receiving Title III funds. The annual evaluation requires LEAs to analyze student outcome data and describe how funds are used to build capacity to continue to offer the English language development program to all eligible students. LEAs will describe the English language development program models used and effectiveness of each model based on EL attainment of English language proficiency and academic achievement. Based on the program models approved in the 2017–18 application, LEAs will provide evidence of effective instructional strategies, professional learning and family engagement beginning with the program evaluation in the 2018–19 grant application.

Monitoring and Technical Assistance if the LEA's Title III Activities are Not Effective

OSPI staff will provide LEAs with differentiated technical assistance based on effectiveness of English language program models, instructional strategies and family engagement through in-person and online professional learning opportunities and web-based toolkits. Assistance will be given during the annual program evaluation and application review process and on an on-going basis throughout the duration of the grant.

Additionally, each LEA receives a comprehensive Title III review every five years to determine compliance. The four districts with the largest combined federal funds receive focused reviews annually with comprehensive reviews every three years. OSPI staff will differentiate technical assistance based on the outcomes of these comprehensive reviews.

F. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

F.1 Use of Funds

(ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(A)):

Describe how the SEA will use funds received under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 for State-level activities.

Washington will use state-level funds under this part to provide monitoring, technical assistance, and capacity building to districts to meet the goals of this program. Consistent with the purposes of Title IV, Part A, OSPI plans to work with LEAs in providing programs and activities that: 1) offer well-rounded educational experiences to all students; 2) foster safe, healthy, supportive, and drug-free environments that support student academic achievement; and 3) increase access to personalized, rigorous learning experiences supported by technology.

As with current practice for Title I and Title II, OSPI will consider what resources and programs across the state are currently in place and available and will seek to maximize effective use of Title IV, Part A funds by:

- Coordinating new plans and resources with existing resources and programs.
- Monitoring the implementation of Title IV, Part A activities and programs through OSPI's Consolidated Program Review process.
- Offering technical assistance to LEAs to help them in implementing approved program activities.
- Identifying Student Engagement and Support as the division to provide equitable access for all students to the activities supported under Title IV, Part A, including aligning those activities with the requirements of other federal laws.

F.2 Awarding Subgrants

(ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(B)):

Describe how the SEA will ensure that awards made to LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 are in amounts that are consistent with ESEA section 4105(a)(2).

Washington will use Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 funds to provide allocations to each LEA as follows:

- Calculate the percentage of funding each LEA receives based on the amount it received under subpart 2 of Title I, Part A during the preceding fiscal year.
- Ensure that no LEA receives an allocation of less than \$10,000.

- If any LEA allocation is less than \$10,000, OSPI will ratably reduce them as required by ESSA Section 4105(b).

G. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

G.1 Use of Funds

(ESEA section 4203(a)(2)):

Describe how the SEA will use funds received under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, including funds reserved for State-level activities.

A. OSPI will administer and manage the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) Program. OSPI will use ninety three percent (93 percent) of funds allocated for Title IV, Part B to award competitive 21st CCLC grants to meet the purpose of the program.

The purpose of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program is to provide opportunities for communities to establish or expand activities that:

- Provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet the challenging State academic standards during non-school hours.
- Offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities, service learning, nutrition and health education, drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, arts, music, physical fitness and wellness programs, technology education programs, financial literacy programs, environmental literacy programs, mathematics, science, career and technical programs, internship or apprenticeship programs, and other ties to an in-demand industry sector or occupation for high school students that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students.
- Offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their children's education, including opportunities for literacy and related educational development.

Programs are required to provide activities that:

1. Are offered during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session.
2. Reinforce and complement the regular academic programs attended by students served.
3. Align with challenging State academic standards.
4. Are targeted to the students' academic needs and aligned to the instruction students receive during the school day.

B. OSPI will use up to two percent (2 percent) of funds for administration of the program including the following activities:

1. Establishing and implementing a rigorous peer-review process.
2. Awarding of funds to eligible entities.

C. OSPI will use up to five percent (5 percent) of funds allocated for the following State level activities:

1. Monitoring and evaluating programs and activities for compliance and quality.
2. Providing capacity building, training, and technical assistance to program managers and staff, and service providers.
3. Annually conducting a comprehensive evaluation (through a grant or contract) of the effectiveness of programs and activities, at the state and local level.
4. Providing training and technical assistance to eligible entities that are applicants for or recipients of awards.
5. Ensuring that any such eligible entity identifies and partners with external organizations, if available, in the community.
6. Working with teachers, principals, parents, the local workforce, the local community, and other stakeholders to review and improve state policies and practices to support the implementation of effective programs.
7. Coordinating funds received with other Federal and State funds to implement high-quality programs.

State Level Activities

A. Monitoring programs for compliance and quality:

1. *Data Collection and Review*—All Programs collect and submit required federal 21APR data, student specific information, student and family attendance, and program implementation data. In addition, programs submit student, staff, and manager survey data. All programs are monitored for completion.
2. *Annual Desk Audit*—All Programs receive an annual desk audit through the 21st CCLC Data Dashboard, which provides aggregated data across several domains such as quality, compliance, performance, implementation with fidelity, and fiscal management.
3. *First Year Site Visits*—New Programs are scheduled for a monitoring/technical assistance visit on-site in year one, using the grantee Risk Assessment, and First Year Monitoring Protocol.
4. *Risk Based Monitoring for Continuation Grants*—Continuing programs are scheduled for monitoring in the second and fourth year. The Grantee Risk Assessment and the 21st CCLC Data Dashboard and are used to identify high medium and low performing projects to identify highest risk and need for

differentiated technical assistance and monitoring procedures and protocols (on site, virtual, or self-assessment).

B. Capacity building, training, and technical assistance:

1. *Data Driven Training and TA Plan*—Data and information from the Program Quality Assessment Report, Leading Indicator Reports, Continuation Funding Reports, and the State and Local Evaluation Reports are used to identify priorities for statewide training and technical assistance efforts.
2. *Professional Development Advisory Committee*—The committee analyzes the data and sets priorities for the professional development plan and activities for the year.
3. *Statewide Professional Development and TA*—Activities include: Director/Evaluator Meetings twice a year, multiple regional symposia, local trainings delivered by the OSPI statewide trainer cadre, 21st CCLC Summer Institute, and collaboration on the national Expanded Learning Opportunities conference hosted by Schools Out Washington.
4. *Regional and Local trainings, Summer Institute, Trainer Cadre Supports and Coaching Training and Supports* are provided through a collaboration and contract with Schools Out Washington, and the Forum for Youth Investment.
5. *Virtual Training and TA*—Multiple training opportunities and TA are provided through virtual options such as GoToMeeting, Ready Talk, and Zoom platforms.
6. *On-site visits, email, and teleconferencing* are utilized to meet individual grantee needs.

C. Conducting a Comprehensive Evaluation of Program Effectiveness:

1. *Local Independent Program Evaluation*—All programs conduct an annual local Independent evaluation of their progress in meeting the needs of their students and progress in meeting the goals of the program, and submit a report to OSPI in the fall, which is also used for program improvement planning.
2. *Annual Statewide Evaluation of Effectiveness*—OSPI conducts an annual state level evaluation of effectiveness that includes student demographic and outcome data, program quality data, program implementation data, and case studies. OSPI utilizes individual student identifiers in the statewide accountability system, which allows the 21st CCLC program to export an array of student level academic and behavioral data for participating students, directly from the OSPI data system (CEDARS) impact analysis, aligned with OSPI student performance indicators.
3. *Program Quality Assessment and Intervention*—All programs complete and submit annual results for the Youth or School Age Program Quality Assessment and Quality Improvement Intervention. Site level reports are available on-line.
4. *Leading Indicator Reports*—On-line site level reports, aggregate all data collected for site and program level planning for program improvement in the fall.

5. *Statewide 21st CCLC Evaluation Advisory Committee*—Advises OSPI on the development of State Performance Indicators that align with the OSPI K-12 Accountability System, Leading Indicators, Local Evaluation Guidelines, Quality Standards, and State Evaluation activities to measure the effectiveness of the program.

D. Providing Training and Technical Assistance (TA) to Eligible Entities that are applicants for or recipients of awards:

1. Request for Proposal (RFP) materials and resources needed to complete the application are posted on-line at OSPI the website and linked to the Schools Out Washington website.
2. TA is provided as requested for all applicants via e-mail, and teleconferencing.
3. A Bidders Conference is provided through a virtual platform, and training materials are posted on the OSPI 21st CCLC website.
4. Successful applications are posted annually on the 21st CCLC website.
5. RFP review results are available to applicants regarding their scores and the strengths and weaknesses of their proposals.

E. Ensuring that Eligible Entity Partnerships include Community Based Organizations and Partners in the Community:

1. OSPI requires each applicant to demonstrate an Eligible Entity Partnership between at least one or more LEAs or ESDs and one or more community based organizations with demonstrated ability to provide quality 21st CCLC programming that promises to result in positive outcomes for students.
2. Criteria for an Eligible Entity Partnership are explicitly outlined in the 21st CCLC Grant Application Guidelines.
3. Each application must include; signed Memorandums of Agreement detailing all partner contributions, demonstrated in-kind and contractual contributions in the budget narrative, and performance data that documents the probability that the eligible entity partnership will implement a high-quality program that promotes positive student outcomes.

F. Working with teachers, principals, parents, the local workforce, the local community, and other stakeholders to review and improve State policies and practices to support the implementation of effective programs

1. 21st CCLC Advisory Committees include a variety of stakeholders.
2. 21st CCLC Program Managers at OSPI are members of the Statewide Title I Committee of Practitioners, the WA State Expanded Learning Opportunities Council, the State Advisory Committee for Schools Out Washington, and other state level committees, which provide multiple opportunities for working with all stakeholder groups to review and improve state policies and practices.

G. Coordinating funds received with other Federal and State funds to implement high-quality programs:

1. The Washington 21st CCLC Program collaborates and coordinates with other federal and state programs through the State Expanded Learning Opportunities Council, the Tile I Committee of Practitioners, the Schools Out Washington Advisory Committee, the OSPI Student Support Team, and the WA Quality Expanded Learning Opportunities Pilot as authorized by the state legislature.
2. The 21st CCLC RFP requires that applicants demonstrate how they will coordinate with other state and federal funds to implement high quality programs.

G.2 Awarding Subgrants

(ESEA section 4203(a)(4)):

Describe the procedures and criteria the SEA will use for reviewing applications and awarding 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds to eligible entities on a competitive basis, which shall include procedures and criteria that take into consideration the likelihood that a proposed community learning center will help participating students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards.

A. Procedures for a Rigorous Peer Review Process

1. A Competitive Solicitation process is used to identify a pool of peer reviewers with the desired background, experience, and knowledge to provide an informed, objective review of the applications. The review panel makes recommendations for funding high quality 21st CCLC Programs that will provide activities that are aligned to challenging state and local standards, provide well rounded learning experiences, and meet the purpose and requirements of the program.
2. Reviewers are provided training regarding CCLC federal statute, state policies and procedures, the competitive Request for Proposals (RFP), the scoring rubric and fiscal guidance prior to the review. Teams of reviewers use a scoring rubric that is aligned with the RFP to assess the quality of applications, and make recommendations for funding the highest quality applications with the most likelihood of implementing successful programs.
3. The Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction gives the final approval.
4. Applicants are offered the opportunity to appeal.

B. Criteria for Awarding Funds

1. Priority is given to applications that:
 - a. Propose to target services to students who attend schools that have been identified as in need of improvement;

- b. Enroll students who may be at risk for academic failure; dropping out of school, involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models; and the families of students;
- c. Are submitted jointly by eligible entities consisting of not less than one local educational agency (LEA) serving Title I Schools; and one community based organization;
- d. Demonstrate that the activities proposed in the application are, as of the date of the submission of the application, not accessible to students who would be served; or would expand accessibility to high-quality services that may be available in the community.
- e. Propose to serve schools with the highest poverty, highest rate of ethnic minorities, and lowest student proficiency rates,
- f. Propose to provide activities; for students who are English learners that emphasize language skills and academic achievement, that partner with in-demand fields of the local workforce or build career competencies and career readiness, that provide literacy education programs, and build skills in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), including computer science, a foster innovation.
- g. Successful applications must demonstrate the capacity to meet the program purpose and requirements and support positive outcomes for students, as determined through the rigorous review process.
- h. Grants are awarded for a five-year period, and receive a continuation award annually based on performance.

H. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

H.1 Outcomes and Objectives

(ESEA section 5223(b)(1)):

Provide information on program objectives and outcomes for activities under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2, including how the SEA will use funds to help all students meet the challenging State academic standards.

OSPI will use Rural and Low Income School (RLIS) program grants to assist rural districts to use federal resources effectively to support all students and address gaps for students that have been historically underserved by our education system. Eligible LEAs will identify unique needs to which these funds will be applied and provide a plan for collecting and reporting data to evaluate progress toward chosen objectives and outcomes.

Through partnerships with local rural education organizations, OSPI will provide support and technical assistance to LEAs that may struggle to advance student achievement. In addition, through OSPI's Office of System and School Improvement, LEAs designated as comprehensive or targeted will receive meaningful support and have more opportunities to leverage their resources to effectively reduce barriers to achievement and help all students to receive a quality, well-rounded and supportive education.

H.2 Technical Assistance

(ESEA section 5223(b)(3)):

Describe how the SEA will provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs to help such agencies implement the activities described in ESEA section 5222.

Technical assistance to eligible LEAs will be provided on an ongoing basis as a part of regular grant management, including notices to LEAs regarding application requirements, timelines, eligibility changes, support for dually eligible Small Rural School Achievement (SRSA)/RLIS grantees, and outreach to LEAs that may benefit from guidance on allowable uses of funds and innovative/best practices.

Washington's ongoing participation in the Northwest Rural Innovation and Student Engagement (NW RISE) network provides an incubator for meaningful practices to promote student engagement and support achievement for all students, applicable to the most rural and remote LEAs and those with RLIS eligibility. OSPI will continue to partner with participating LEAs and encourage other rural LEAs, such as those eligible for RLIS, to incorporate NW RISE developed best practice into their own grant activities.

The state's Consolidated Program Review process recognizes small, rural and low-income LEAs as able to benefit from reviews that are scaled and conducted with understanding of the administrative challenges that such LEAs face. OSPI employs a technical assistance approach to all reviews and specifically targets small, rural LEAs for modified and scaled processes for subrecipient monitoring.

OSPI will continue to support all eligible LEAs in identifying applicable and innovative uses for funds.

I. Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B

I.1 Student Identification

(722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act):

Describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youth in the State and to assess their needs.

OSPI uses a variety of procedures to identify homeless children and youths in the state and assess their needs. To best facilitate the identification of children and youth who are experiencing homelessness, housing questionnaires are provided at least annually to the parents of each child, and each unaccompanied youth, in every district. The dissemination of the housing questionnaire is to occur at the beginning of each school year, and also upon new enrollment for students entering the district throughout the academic year. OSPI provides a sample format, translated into multiple languages, for school districts to adopt and customize for their district. Student enrollment and the provision of supportive services are to take place immediately upon student enrollment to ensure timely attention to the needs of students who are experiencing homelessness. In addition to the use of the housing questionnaires, LEAs use an intake/interview form for all students who qualify as homeless according to the McKinney-Vento Act, to ensure that all district services and supports are identified and provided.

LEA Monitoring: To ensure program fidelity, every school district in the state is monitored through the OSPI federal program Consolidated Program Review (CPR) process. Monitoring indicators include compliance with liaison training, identification and enrollment of homeless students, the use of housing questionnaires to aid in identification, and other McKinney-Vento requirements.

Data Quality: OSPI collects homeless student data from 100 percent of Washington's LEAs through an electronic survey found in the OSPI Educational Data System. LEA's collect homeless student data locally through the use of housing questionnaires and other methods. Districts then submit the information to their district level student information systems and that data is then reported to OSPI's CEDARS. The CEDARS data and is made available to LEAs for verification and correction. Once completed, the data is reviewed by OSPI staff, certified, and submitted to ED through the Education Data Exchange Network/EdFacts system.

Training: OSPI offers routine, comprehensive training to all LEAs regarding the duties of the district, including the requirements related to the immediate identification and enrollment of homeless children and youth, the use of housing questionnaires and intake forms, the provision of all services and supports necessary for academic success in school, and the requirement for routine data collection and reporting.

Training encompasses the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Act and applicable state laws, strategies for implementation, and best practices for effectively serving children and youth in homeless situations. Information includes the duties of the LEA and the rights of homeless students including information related to runaway youth, unaccompanied youth, students who exit the juvenile justice system into homelessness, preschool aged homeless students, and other unique populations of children and youth experiencing homelessness.

Policy: OSPI worked collaboratively with the Washington State School Directors Association (WSSDA) in the fall of 2016 to develop a revised comprehensive school district sample policy pertaining to the education of homeless children and youth. All districts must adopt a policy (WSSDA 3115 or equivalent) addressing the education of homeless children and youth, which includes the identification and enrollment of homeless students, and OSPI monitors school districts to ensure compliance. The WSSDA policy 3115 outlines the requirements of school districts regarding the identification and enrollment of children and youth experiencing homelessness, per state and federal law. Along with the new homeless liaison training requirements of the federal McKinney-Vento Act, Washington passed [SSB 6074](#) in 2014 which requires OSPI to provide awareness materials posted to the OSPI website. SSB 6074 also requires school district administrators to strongly encourage all school district employees, including transportation providers, to access the training and resources made available through OSPI, thus ensuring school district staff have the necessary tools to identify and serve eligible students, and report accurate data to OSPI.

I.2 Dispute Resolution

(722(g)(1)(C) of the McKinney-Vento Act):

Describe procedures for the prompt resolution of disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youth.

OSPI developed and implemented a three-tiered [homeless dispute resolution policy](#) in 2002 to ensure that disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youths are promptly resolved. Since that time, homeless parents, or unaccompanied homeless youths, who wish to appeal a school district's decision related to the identification, enrollment, school placement or provision of services (including transportation and other support services) for homeless students, may engage in the homeless dispute resolution process. All districts in the state of Washington use the same dispute process to ensure consistency across the state in the event that students move across school district lines. The process includes specific timelines for each step of the process, elevating the dispute from the district liaison to the district superintendent and finally to OSPI if the dispute remains unresolved at the local level.

I.3 Support for School Personnel

(722(g)(1)(D) of the McKinney-Vento Act):

Describe programs for school personnel (including the LEA liaisons for homeless children and youth, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youth, including runaway and homeless children and youth.

OSPI offers a robust training program for school personnel, including liaisons, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel, to heighten the awareness of school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youths, including such children and youths who are runaway and homeless youths. The McKinney-Vento office at OSPI offers routine, comprehensive training for LEA liaisons, and all interested school district staff are welcome and encouraged to attend. Training includes information pertaining to the federal requirements outlined in the Act to ensure local districts appropriately implement the law and immediately enroll and serve children and youth experiencing homelessness. Other state and federal programs including Migrant Education; Title I, Part A; Head Start; school nutrition; Title I, Part D; foster care; and other state and federal partners routinely provide informational support through supplemental presentations at McKinney-Vento training. Multiple onsite regional training opportunities are offered throughout the school year, with additional OSPI resources such as sample forms, translated materials for families, posters, flyers, tip sheets and other resources. Live and recorded webinars are provided by the McKinney-Vento state coordinator as specific topics and issues warrant additional information for the field. Additionally, OSPI has a longstanding relationship with the National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE), which is the official clearinghouse and technical assistance center for the U.S. Department of Education. Resources including Liaison Toolkits, issue briefs, online training, webinars and other materials are routinely sourced as OSPI provides a layered approach to training and technical assistance. Telephone and email assistance through the OSPI McKinney-Vento office is available to school district personnel upon request. School districts are routinely monitored by OSPI for compliance related to liaison and staff training related to the education of homeless children and youth.

OSPI maintains a homeless liaison database which is accessible via the OSPI website. A new feature of the database allows OSPI staff to track participation in required training. The training database allows district liaisons to report attendance at trainings provided through NCHE or other approved providers, including training provided by OSPI. The liaison database was implemented during the 2016–17 school year.

I.4 Access to Services

(722(g)(1)(F) of the McKinney-Vento Act):

Describe procedures that ensure that:

- i. Homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State;*

Young homeless children in Washington have access to public preschool programs, administered by OSPI or by the LEA, as provided to other children in Washington. The McKinney-Vento program at OSPI has an ongoing collaborative relationship with DEL which creates a cross-agency support system when coordinating services and supports for early learners. The McKinney-Vento Liaison Training offered through OSPI includes input from early childhood/preschool/Head Start/ECEAP programs, including information related to the Head Start regulations related to homeless children. Additionally, the competitive McKinney-Vento grants offered through OSPI to LEAs include coordination and targeted services for early learners/preschoolers experiencing homelessness so they can enroll in, attend and succeed in preschool programs. These efforts may include reserving slots, collecting data and conducting community needs assessments related to homeless early learners. LEAs are made aware of the federal McKinney-Vento requirements related to the priority for enrollment and the provision of services for homeless preschool students, including transportation to school of origin when in the best interest of the student. With the reauthorization of the McKinney-Vento Act, LEAs in Washington recognize school of origin rights for preschool students in programs operated by the LEAs. Routine OSPI monitoring of districts through the OSPI CPR process ensures that LEAs are identifying, enrolling and serving preschool students experiencing homelessness.

- ii. Homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies; and*

OSPI ensures that youths described in the McKinney-Vento Act and youths separated from the public school are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services. The identification of homeless youth is accomplished through the use of housing questionnaires, active outreach, data collection and reporting. In an effort to eliminate barriers and facilitate the on-time grade level progression and graduation of students who are homeless or dependent during the 2017 legislative session, Washington passed into law RCW 28A.320.192. This law requires school districts to waive

specific courses required for graduation if similar coursework has been satisfactorily completed in another school district, and also requires school districts to consolidate partial credit, unresolved, or incomplete coursework and provide opportunities for credit accrual in a manner that eliminates academic and nonacademic barriers to the student. Additionally, school districts must grant partial credit for coursework completed before the date of withdrawal or transfer, and the receiving school must accept those credits and apply them to the student's academic progress or graduation, or both; and allow the student to earn credits regardless of the student's date of enrollment in the receiving school. OSPI will issue guidance related to RCW 28A.320.192 in the summer of 2017, with the rule making process to begin in November of 2017. Existing language in state law, as well as best practices pulled from well-developed Washington online learning programs, the federal Migrant Education Program, and GATE will be examined, with information provided to LEA staff to ensure homeless youth have the ability to receive credit for full or partial coursework from prior schools. Information related to this new requirement will be included in Washington's comprehensive McKinney-Vento Liaison training efforts.

- iii. Homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels.*

OSPI ensures that homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria, do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities. Children and youth experiencing homelessness are to be enrolled and able to fully participate in all school activities for which they meet eligibility requirements. Sports, including varsity level sports are school activities. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction works with the Washington Interscholastic Athletic Association (WIAA) regarding issues pertaining to student athletic eligibility. Athletic associations must comply with the McKinney-Vento Act's requirements, and remove barriers to homeless students who are otherwise eligible to participate in sports; paying special attention to participation rules related to attendance and residency. Similarly, to ensure homeless student's access to all school activities, barriers due to outstanding fees and fines are to be addressed by LEAs. Fees for extracurricular activities are to be waived or paid through donations or district funds. When considering barriers, homeless students are to be afforded the same opportunities to participate in academic and extracurricular activities as other students, but not for policies to be applied to homeless students who do not meet relevant eligibility criteria for such activities. School districts should make every effort to offer academic and extracurricular opportunities to homeless students by revising the policies and procedures that create barriers specifically related to

the student’s homelessness and not to other factors that may compromise program integrity.

Students experiencing homelessness are to have equal access to all school programs, including magnet schools, summer schools, career and technical education programs, advance placement, online learning and charter school programs. The McKinney-Vento office at OSPI has worked closely with the Washington Charter School Association over the past year and provided McKinney-Vento/ESSA training to Washington’s charter schools during the 2016–17 school year. Training included information regarding the rights of homeless students and the requirements of LEAs receiving public education funding. Similarly, the McKinney-Vento office routinely works with the OSPI Online Learning office as questions of homeless student eligibility arise to ensure equal access in school participation when students seek to enroll in virtual academies and other online learning opportunities. McKinney-Vento liaison training reinforces the elimination of barriers to school programs and special services that homeless students may need. Programs including summer programs, Advance Placement, Career and Technical Education and other specialized programs and supports must be readily available to students experiencing homelessness and immediate enrollment and access provided. Routine school district monitoring through the OSPI Consolidated Program Review process ensures that districts comply with the provisions of McKinney-Vento to allow homeless students immediate access to the programs for which they are eligible. The OSPI McKinney-Vento office works closely with the OSPI Special Education division to ensure homeless students have appropriate access to special services such as extended year services and other programs for students with special needs. Staff from the OSPI Special Education office routinely work together with the McKinney-Vento office to solve enrollment and access issues as necessary to ensure compliance with both McKinney-Vento and IDEA.

I.5 Strategies to Address Other Problems

(722(g)(1)(H) of the McKinney-Vento Act):

Provide strategies to address other problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youth, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by—

i. Requirements of immunization and other required health records;

The OSPI McKinney-Vento program works to eliminate barriers associated with immunization and other health records through ongoing, intentional coordination with local school districts as well as other agencies and entities that serve students experiencing homelessness. OSPI provides ongoing training and technical assistance to school district homeless liaisons and other school district staff, and this training includes strategies to address problems related to barriers

caused specifically by the lack of immunizations and other health related requirements. OSPI also provides technical assistance as needed to other health care providers as specific issues arise pertaining to the enrollment of students that lack immunizations or have life-threatening conditions. In addition, the OSPI McKinney-Vento program has a positive relationship with the OSPI School Nurse Corps program. The Washington State Legislature provides the funding to support the OSPI School Nurse Corps program, which consists of a group of well-trained school nurse leaders located in all regions of the state, overseen by the School Nurse Supervisor at OSPI. This group meets routinely to coordinate work in the represented regions of the state in support of the local school nurses, and focuses on addressing health issues that affect students throughout Washington.

The school district homeless liaisons work locally with school nurses to serve the needs of all students, including students experiencing homelessness. Research shows that students who suffer health problems are the same ones who struggle academically and are at higher risk for absenteeism and dropping out of school, including children and youth experiencing homelessness. This is the very population that school nurses serve, reducing the impact of students' health problems on their academic endeavors. Immediate assistance in getting medical screenings, immunizations, and other health related services occurs through collaboration between OSPI, the local school district homeless liaisons and the school nursing staff per McKinney-Vento. Routine statewide OSPI school staff training includes information related to the immediate enrollment and full participation in all school activities for all kids, including those kids who lack immunizations, medical records or have health conditions. School district homeless liaisons ensure immediate enrollment of students experiencing homelessness and work with families and unaccompanied youth to access immunizations and other medical supports after enrollment has taken place.

In addition, Washington state law (RCW 7.70.065) now allows school homeless liaisons, school nurses and school counselors to provide informed consent for non-emergency health care on behalf of minor patients who are unaccompanied youth and who meet the definition of a homeless child or youth under the federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Act. This new layer of access to medical care for vulnerable unaccompanied homeless youth, who may not have had access to routine medical and dental health care in the past, will be invaluable in addressing the health care needs of this population of youth moving forward.

ii. Residency requirements;

OSPI provides routine school district liaison training addressing enrollment barriers caused by residency requirements. All School district homeless liaisons in Washington are required to participate in OSPI approved McKinney-Vento training, therefore all district liaisons have access to accurate and up to date

information pertaining to the protections of children and youth experiencing homelessness. As part of the ongoing technical assistance and development of resources made available to school district liaisons, OSPI provides sample housing questionnaires in multiple languages and intake forms that districts may use to identify and provide services to students experiencing homelessness. The OSPI housing forms ensure immediate enrollment without requiring parents or unaccompanied youth to provide proof of residency. In addition, all school districts undergo routine federal program monitoring to ensure the immediate enrollment of children and youth experiencing homelessness. As a part of federal program monitoring, OSPI staff members review school district forms, including enrollment forms, to ensure homeless families do not encounter enrollment barriers and are not required to provide proof of address or other documents as a condition of enrollment per the requirements of McKinney-Vento. In addition to the federal McKinney-Vento Act, Washington state law prohibits school districts from denying enrollment due to the lack proof regarding residency. RCW 28A.225.215 states that a school district shall not require proof of residency or any other information regarding an address for any child if the child does not have a legal residence. Additionally, school districts must enroll any school age child that is eligible for enrollment without a legal residence at the request of the child or parent or guardian of the child.

iii. Lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation;

OSPI training and technical assistance provided to school district homeless liaisons addresses barriers related to the lack of birth certificates, school records or other documentation normally needed for enrollment. All LEA liaisons receive training regarding the state and federal requirements related to immediate enrollment of homeless students. The trained local liaisons work with families and unaccompanied youth to access any missing documentation normally needed for enrollment, and any costs associated with accessing documentation can be covered through OSPI administered McKinney-Vento sub-grants, or Title I, Part A Homeless Set-Aside funding.

iv. Guardianship issues; or

Similarly, OSPI liaison training addresses potential barriers created by guardianship or custodial issues, including questions that may arise related to children and youth living with adults other than parents or guardians, families with shared custody, and other similar situations. Liaisons receive technical assistance from OSPI and referrals to existing resources to assist in addressing barriers that arise due to these situations. In addition, routine federal program monitoring ensures that local districts address barriers related to enrollment, attendance and success in school. The McKinney-Vento and Foster Care offices within OSPI coordinate as appropriate when questions arise regarding students in state care.

v. *Uniform or dress code requirements.*

Liaisons receive training to address barriers related to school uniform requirements, and those districts that receive McKinney-Vento grant awards may use funds to provide appropriate uniforms, or other school clothing necessary to attend and participate in school. Districts that do not receive McKinney-Vento grant funds are required to set aside Title I, Part A funds for this purpose. All districts in Washington are required to complete a Title I, Part A Homeless Set-Aside needs assessment as a condition of receiving Title I, Part A funding. Districts must assess the needs of homeless children and youth enrolled in the district and set aside an appropriate amount of Title I, Part A funding to address those needs.

I.6 Policies to Remove Barriers

(722(g)(1)(I) of the McKinney-Vento Act):

Demonstrate that the SEA and LEAs in the State have developed, and shall review and revise, policies to remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth, and the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in schools in the State, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences.

OSPI worked in partnership with the Washington State School Directors Association (WSSDA) in the fall of 2016 to ensure that all Washington school districts would have a revised sample policy in place when the reauthorized McKinney-Vento Act went into effect on October 1, 2016. The policy 3115 produced by WSSDA addresses all of the requirements of the federal McKinney-Vento Act, including the elimination of barriers to identification of homeless children and youth, and the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in the state, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees, fines or absences. All school districts are required to adopt a district policy related to homeless children and youth served by the district. OSPI monitors school districts through the Consolidated Program Review federal monitoring process to ensure every district has adopted the WSSDA policy 3115 (or equivalent) to ensure the protection of homeless students' rights, and that districts meet the requirements of the federal McKinney-Vento Act. Further, homeless liaisons receive OSPI training regarding the elimination of barriers to the identification, enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in schools. Districts are to waive or pay fees or fines incurred by students who are experiencing homelessness, and district liaisons are to work closely with homeless children and youths, including unaccompanied homeless youths, who are absent or tardy due to their housing status to address and eliminate barriers to attendance. According to WSSDA policy 3115, "enrollment may not be denied or delayed due to the lack of any document normally required for enrollment, including academic records, medical records, proof of residency, mailing address or other

documentation, or denied or delayed due to missed application deadlines or fees, fines or absences at a previous school.”

I.7 Assistance from Counselors



(722(g)(1)(K)):

A description of how youths described in section 725(2) will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths, and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college.

Information and awareness pertaining to homeless students’ access to higher education is one component of the routine training and technical assistance provided by OSPI to school district homeless liaisons, school district counselors, and others. Preparation for the completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), strategies for allowing partial credit, course completion, and information regarding college support systems such as TRIO and others are included. The McKinney-Vento program provides workshops at the Annual OSPI School Counselor’s Conference to increase awareness and share the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Act with school counselors. This customized training ensures that school counselors will have an opportunity to gather relevant information and then share it with youths regarding higher education supports, including the appropriate designation of “independent student status” for unaccompanied homeless youth who are completing the FAFSA. These efforts, in addition to the supportive partnerships offered through the OSPI Graduation a Team Effort (GATE) Program, and the Building Bridges & Open Doors Program (both addressing dropout prevention, intervention and retrieval) help to build a system of support for vulnerable youth, including youth experiencing homelessness. These efforts serve to inform and support the important role of school counselors as they prepare students, including students experiencing homelessness, for college and career. Youth may access the resources and supportive services provide by school counselors in the district through the counselors’ intentional and direct outreach to youth experiencing homelessness. Youth can work directly with school counselors to complete necessary forms and applications as well as access information related to entrance tests, financial aid information and other supports related to higher education.


Another layer of support for secondary homeless students in Washington is RCW 28A.320.142 which was passed in 2016. This law requires any school district reporting more than ten unaccompanied youth to designate a building level point of contact in all middle and high schools in the district to identify unaccompanied youth and connect them with the school district’s homeless liaison. This increased staffing at the secondary level will help to support and connect college bound students with the resources needed to improve readiness for college.

Appendix A: Measurements of Interim Progress Academic Achievement



Graduation Rates

ESSA Long Term Goals for Increasing 4-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate



Measurement of Interim Progress	Progress Rate
2017 Actual (preliminary)	67%
2018	68%
2019	69%
2020	70%
2021	71%
2022	72%
2023	73%
2024	74%
2025	75%
2026	76%
2027	77%

Appendix B: Acknowledgements

On behalf of myself and my team at the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, we would like to acknowledge, and extend our gratitude to, all of those who contributed to the work of Washington’s Every Student Succeeds Act Consolidated Plan. The Plan is a result of over a year of work from 12 workgroups, a leadership team and a consolidated plan team. The workgroups contained a total of over 200 members, from education, business, legislative and parent organizations from around the state. In addition to public comments each workgroup received, our leadership team traveled throughout the state, holding regional forums for the public. Our Plan is, without a doubt, the most collaborative we’ve ever written. It is, truly, a state plan—one that will guide education policy in Washington for many years to come. We have all our stakeholders to thank for that.

Chris Reykdal
 Superintendent of Public Instruction
 Washington State

Name	Organization/Role/Representing	Workgroup
Aaron Fletcher	Liberty School District	Student Assessment System
Adam Aguilera	Evergreen School District/Washington Education Association	Report Card/Accountability System
Adam Dysart	Highline School District	Federal Programs
Alan Burke	Washington State School Directors’ Association	CPT
Alexa Allman	Bellevue School District	Effective Educators
Alex Ybarra	Commission on Hispanic Affairs	CPT
Alyssa Westall	OSPI	Federal Programs
Amanda Jewell	Yakima School District	Early Childhood Education
Amy Montanye Johnson	Snoqualmie Valley School District	School and District Improvement
Andrea Cobb	Washington State Commission on African American Affairs/Tacoma School District Board/OSPI	Accountability System/CPT
Andrea Wooster	Evergreen School District (Clark County)	Effective Educators
Andrew Eyres	Educational Service District 113	Federal Programs
Andrew Parr	Washington State Board of Education	Accountability System/Report Card/Technical Advisory Committee
Andrew Schwebke	White River School District	Learning and Teaching
Angelique Gourley	Yelm School District	Effective Educators
Ann Renker	Sequim School District	School and District Improvement

Name	Organization/Role/Representing	Workgroup
Ann Waybright	Bethel School District/Special Education Advisory Council	Students with Disabilities/CPT
Aurora Flores	Washington State School Directors' Association	English Learners
Barbara Dittrich	OSPI	Federal Programs
Barbara Sattler	Central Valley School District (Spokane)	Early Childhood Education
Becky Anderson	Northshore School District	Students with Disabilities
Becky Lee	Tacoma Public Schools	Fiscal
Ben Rarick	Washington State Board of Education	Accountability System/CPT
Bernard Koontz	Highline School District/Bilingual Education Advisory Council member	Accountability System/CPT
Beth Dykman	Sumner School District	Learning and Teaching
Beth Harrington	Richland School District	Early Childhood Education
Bill Keim	Washington Association of School Administrators	Accountability System/CPT
Bill Rasplca	Franklin Pierce School District	Students with Disabilities
Bob Butts	OSPI	Early Childhood Education
Bob Maxwell	Pullman School District	Students with Disabilities
Brad Brown	Kent School District	Accountability System
Brad Sprague	Washington Association for Learning Alternatives	Learning and Teaching/CPT
Brian Dunlap	West Valley School District	Report Card
Brian Gabele	Kent School District	Report Card
Brian Jeffries	Partnership for Learning/Washington Roundtable	Accountability System
Brian Jones	Burlington-Edison Public Schools	English Learners
Brian Rick	Bellingham School District	Technical Advisory Committee
Brittane Handricks	Chief Leschi Schools	Parent and Community Engagement
Buck Marsh	Darrington School District	Parent and Community Engagement
Caitlin Jensen	Department of Children, Youth, and Families	Early Childhood Education
Cara Patrick	OSPI	Early Childhood Education
Carrie Basas	Office of the Education Ombuds/Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee member	Parent and Community Engagement/CPT
Carrie Fannin	Children's Institute for Learning Differences (CHILD) (Renton)	Students with Disabilities
Catherine Matthews	Everett School District	Student Assessment System
Cathi Nelson	Waterville School District	Student Assessment System

Name	Organization/Role/Representing	Workgroup
Cathy Davis	Washington Education Association	Accountability System
Cathy Smith	Olympia School District	Effective Educators
Chad Gotch	Washington State University	Student Assessment System
Chad Magendanz	Washington State Legislature	Report Card/CPT
Chris Lindberg	Bellevue School District	Student Assessment System
Chris Nation	Marysville School District/Washington State School Directors Association	Report Card/CPT
Chris Rearden	Rainier School District	Early Childhood Education
Chris Willis	Federal Way Public Schools	Students with Disabilities
Chris Wyatt	Central Kitsap School District	Federal Programs
Christopher Hanczrik	OSPI	Student Assessment System
Cindy Webster-Martinson	Suquamish Tribe Education Department	School and District Improvement
Clair Chean	Tukwila School District	Parent and Community Engagement
Claire Wilson	Federal Way School District Board Member	Parent and Community Engagement
Concie Pedroza	Seattle Public Schools	English Learners
Conn McQuinn	Puget Sound Educational Service District	Federal Programs
Craig Bill	Governor's Office of Indian Affairs	School and District Improvement/CPT
Cyndy Valdez	Wenatchee School District	English Learners
Cynthia Jones	Everett School District/Committee of Practitioners	Federal Programs
Dana Anderson	Educational Service District 113	School and District Improvement/CPT
Dave Larson	Tukwila School District Board Member	Accountability System
Dave Pavelchek	Workforce Training and Education Board	Accountability System
David Powell	Stand for Children	Accountability System
David Prince	State Board for Community and Technical Colleges	Accountability System
Deb Came	OSPI	Accountability System
Deb Merle	Office of the Governor	Accountability System/CPT
Debbie Schuffenhauer	Serve Washington	Parent and Community Engagement
Deborah Duitch	Bellevue School District	Early Childhood Education
Debra Appleton	OSPI	Federal Programs
Dennis Small	OSPI	Federal Programs
Doug Gill	OSPI	Students with Disabilities
Doug Matson	West Valley School District (Spokane)	Fiscal
Doug Nelson	Public School Employees of Washington	Effective Educators/CPT

Name	Organization/Role/Representing	Workgroup
Elaine Radmer	Gonzaga University	Report Card
Ellen Kaje	Shoreline School District	English Learners
Ellen Perconti	Mary M. Knight School District	Learning and Teaching
Ellie Hutton	Parent	Parent and Community Engagement
Erinn Bennett	Seattle Public Schools	Fiscal
Fran McCarthy	Educational Service District 101	Students with Disabilities
Fengyi Hung	Tacoma Public Schools	Technical Advisory Committee
Frank Hewins	Franklin Pierce School District/Washington Association of School Administrators	Effective Educators/CPT
Frank Newman	Spokane School District	English Learners
Gary Cohn	Everett School District	Accountability System
Gary Kipp	Association of Washington School Principals	Effective Educators/CPT
Gay Vallorie Selby	Washington State University	Effective Educators
Gayle Pauley	OSPI	Federal Programs/CPT
Gene Sementi	West Valley School District (Spokane)	School and District Improvement
Gene Sharratt	Washington Student Achievement Council	CPT
George Aszkler	OSPI	Federal Programs
George Dockins	Public School Employees of Washington	Parent and Community Engagement/CPT
George Pete	Tacoma Public Schools	Parent and Community Engagement
Gerrit Kischner	Seattle Public Schools	Learning and Teaching
Gil Mendoza	OSPI	Accountability System/CPT
Ginnie Ayres	Monroe School District	Federal Programs
Glenn Malone	Puyallup School District	Student Assessment System/ Technical Advisory Committee
Greg Beck	Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction	Report Card
Gregg Taylor	North Franklin School District	Student Assessment System
Gregory King	Tukwila School District	Learning and Teaching
Gwen Harris	Spokane School District	Parent and Community Engagement
Gwendolyn Jimerson	Seattle School District/Washington Education Association	Early Childhood Education
Heather Byington	North Thurston School District/Bilingual Education Advisory Council	English Learners
Ian Linterman	Mt. Baker School District	Federal Programs

Name	Organization/Role/Representing	Workgroup
Israel Vela	Seattle Public Schools/Committee of Practitioners	School and District Improvement/CPT
Jack Archer	Washington State Board of Education	CPT
Jackie Myers	Auburn School District	English Learners
James Smith	Commission on African American Affairs	Effective Educators/Accountability System/CPT
Jan Hutton	Central Valley School District	Fiscal
Jason Greenberg Motamedi	NWREL	Technical Advisory Committee
Jean Marczynski	West Valley School District (Spokane)	Learning and Teaching
Jeff Vincent	Partnership for Learning	CPT
Jene Jones	League of Education Voters	School and District Improvement
Jennie Beltramini	Anacortes School District/Washington Education Association	Learning and Teaching
Jennifer Carrougher	OSPI	Federal Programs/Fiscal
Jennifer Kindle	Selah School District/Association of Washington School Principals	Student Assessment System/CPT
Jennifer Wallace	Professional Educator Standards Board	Effective Educators/CPT
Jeri Carlson	Federal Way Public Schools	Fiscal
Jerry Dyar	Mary Walker School District/Rural Alliance for College Success	Accountability System
Jess Lewis	OSPI	Federal Programs
Jessica Vavrus	Washington State School Directors' Association	Student Assessment System/Accountability System
Jim Kowalkowski	Davenport School District	Effective Educators
Jo Moccia	South Whidbey School District	School and District Improvement
Joe Davalos	Tribal Leaders Congress	Accountability System/CPT
John Kerr	Yakima School District	English Learners
John McCoy	Washington State Legislature	CPT
Jon Tienhaara	South Bend School District	Parent and Community Engagement
Jonathan Jackson	OSPI	Federal Programs
Josh Garcia	Tacoma Public Schools	Accountability System
Joshua Halsey	Charter School Commission	Federal Programs
Joshua Lynch	OSPI	Federal Programs
Judi Jensen	North Central Educational Service District 171/Committee of Practitioners	Federal Programs
Judith Berry	Tukwila School District	Fiscal
Julia Fallon	OSPI	Federal Programs

Name	Organization/Role/Representing	Workgroup
Julia Warth	League of Education Voters	Accountability System
Julie Kang	Washington State Commission on Asian Pacific American Affairs	Parent and Community Engagement/CPT
Justin Fox-Bailey	Snohomish School District/Washington Education Association	Student Assessment System/CPT
Kaaren Heikes	Washington State Board of Education	CPT
Kaitlyn O'Leary	Office of Catholic Schools	Early Childhood Education
Karen Mool	Puyallup School District	Students with Disabilities
Kate Davis	Office of the Governor/Office of Financial Management	School and District Improvement/CPT
Kathe Taylor	OSPI	Learning and Teaching/Federal Programs
Kathleen Sande	OSPI	Federal Programs
Kathryn Hobbs	Washington State Parent Teacher Association	Parent and Community Engagement/CPT
Kathy Hagiwara Purcell	Commission on Asian Pacific American Affairs	Accountability System
Kay Turner	Muckleshoot Tribal School/Committee of Practitioners	Federal Programs
Keisha Porcincula	Equity in Education Coalition	Parent and Community Engagement
Kelley Boyd	Coulee-Hartline School District	Student Assessment System
Kelli Bohanan	Department of Children, Youth, and Families	Early Childhood Education
Kevin Chase	Educational Service District 105	Accountability System
Kevin Foster	Valley School District	Parent and Community Engagement
Kim Brodie	OSPI	Fiscal/CPT
Kim Ewing	Wellpinit School District	Parent and Community Engagement
Krestin Bahr	Eatonville School District	Accountability System
Kristen Jaudon	Parent	Report Card
Kristin Hennessey	OSPI	Federal Programs
Kyle Rydell	Liberty School District	Effective Educators
Laura Regala	Parent	Parent and Community Engagement
Leilani Thomas	Concrete School District	Students with Disabilities
Leonard Forsman	Tribal Leaders Congress	CPT
Leslie Camden-Goold	Central Valley (Spokane) School District	Federal Programs
Linda Friberg	Evergreen School District	Federal Programs
Linda Sullivan Dudzic	Bremerton School District	Early Childhood Education
Lindsay Myatich	Mercer Island School District	Students with Disabilities

Name	Organization/Role/Representing	Workgroup
Lisa Nolan	Tacoma Public Schools	Effective Educators
Lorna Spear	Spokane School District/Committee of Practitioners member	School and District Improvement/CPT
Louanne Decker	Kent School District	Learning and Teaching
Lucy Pireto	Grandview School District	Federal Programs
Lyon Terry	Teacher of the Year, Seattle School District	Accountability System
Marci Cox	North Franklin School District	Federal Programs
Marge Plecki	University of Washington	Technical Advisory Committee
Maria Flores	OSPI	Federal Programs/Effective Educators
Marissa Rathbone	OSPI	Federal Programs
Marissa Waddell	College Place School District	Federal Programs
Mark Bergeson	Washington Student Achievement Council	Effective Educators
Mark Derby	Gonzaga University	Students with Disabilities
Marnie Allen	Educational Service District 112	Effective Educators
Marnie Maraldo	Issaquah School District Board Member	Students with Disabilities
Mary Fertakis	Tukwila School District Board Member	Early Childhood Education
Mary Jean Ryan	The Road Map Project	Accountability System
Mary Jo Buckingham	Central Valley (Spokane) School District/Committee of Practitioners	Federal Programs
Mary Jo Johnson	OSPI	Federal Programs
Mary Jo Larsen	Washington Association for Colleges of Teacher Education	Effective Educators
Mea Moore	OSPI	Federal Programs/English Learners
Megan Bale	Seattle School District/Special Education Advisory Council	Student Assessment System
Mele Aho	Washington State Commission on Asian Pacific American Affairs	Learning and Teaching/CPT
Melinda Dyer	OSPI	Federal Programs
Michael Merrin	OSPI	School and District Improvement/Federal Programs
Michael Middleton	OSPI	Student Assessment System
Michael Stone	Seattle Public Schools	School and District Improvement
Michaela Miller	OSPI	Accountability System
Michele Miller	Washington Education Association	CPT
Mick Miller	Educational Service District 101	Effective Educators
Mike Olson	Sedro-Woolley School District	Learning and Teaching

Name	Organization/Role/Representing	Workgroup
Minerva Morales	Mabton School District/Bilingual Education Advisory Council	English Learners/CPT
Mona Johnson	OSPI	Federal Programs
Mara Machulsky	Governor's Office of Indian Affairs	CPT
Mynor Lopez	Commission on Hispanic Affairs	Accountability System/CPT
Mystique Hurtado	Governor's Office of Indian Affairs	CPT
Nancy Coogan	Tukwila School District	Effective Educators
Nasue Nishida	Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession	Effective Educators
Nate Marciochi	OSPI	School and District Improvement
Nathan Gibbs-Bowling	Teacher of the Year/Tacoma School District	Accountability System
Nathan Olson	OSPI	Report Card
Neil Strege	Washington Roundtable	CPT
Nicholas French	Monroe School District	Students with Disabilities
Page Meyer	Kent School District	Early Childhood Education
Pam Estvold	Educational Service District 189	School and District Improvement
Pam Tuggle	Federal Way Public Schools	Report Card
Patrick Haggarty	Seattle Archdiocese/Private Schools	Federal Programs
Patty Finnigan	OSPI	English Learners
Patty Wood	Kelso School District Board Member	Effective Educators
Paul Wieneke	OSPI	Federal Programs
Paula Moore	OSPI	Parent and Community Engagement/Federal Programs
Paula Steinke	SOAR	Parent and Community Engagement
Pete Knittle	Othello School District	Federal Programs
Randy Spaulding	Washington Student Achievement Council	Accountability System/CPT
Rashelle Davis	Office of the Governor/Office of Financial Management	Early Childhood Education
Rebecca Fry	Bellevue School District/Washington Education Association	Students with Disabilities
Ric Pilgrim	Educational Service District 105	English Learners
Rich McBride	Association of Educational Service Districts	CPT
Rich Stewart	Nespelem School District	School and District Improvement
Rob Manahan	Lake Chelan School District	Student Assessment System
Robin Munson	OSPI	Student Assessment System

Name	Organization/Role/Representing	Workgroup
Ron Sisson	Association of Washington School Principals	Early Childhood Education/CPT
Rona Popp	Kent School District	Federal Programs
Rosalyn O'Donnell	Ellensburg School District	Effective Educators
Sally McNair	Washington Education Association	Effective Educators/ CPT
Sandra Gessner-Crabtree	Olympic Educational Service District 114	Student Assessment System
Sandra Lindsay-Brown	Tacoma Public Schools	Learning and Teaching
Sandra Szambelan	Educational Service District 101	Early Childhood Education
Sarah Butcher	Special Education Advisory Council	Accountability System/CPT
Sarah Gill	Federal Way Public Schools	English Learners
Sarah Rich	North Thurston Public Schools	Accountability System/ Technical Advisory Committee
Scott Seaman	Association of Washington School Principals	Accountability System
Scott Poirier	Washington Education Association	Technical Advisory Committee
Sebrena Burr	Washington State Parent Teacher Association	Accountability System
Shane Baguyo	Orting School District	Report Card
Shanna McBride	Department of Social and Health Services	Federal Programs
Sharon Tomiko Santos	Washington State Legislature/Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee member	Accountability System/CPT
Sharonne Navas	Equity in Education Coalition	Accountability System
Shawn Lewis	Spokane School District	Fiscal
Shawn Thurman	Yakima School District	Federal Programs
Shay Shaw	Oroville School District	Effective Educators
Sherry Krainick	Washington State Parent Teacher Association	Student Assessment System/CPT
Sly Boscovich	Franklin Pierce School District	Learning and Teaching
Stacey Klim	Parent	Parent and Community Engagement
Stephanie Hance	Nine Mile Falls School District	Fiscal
Stephen Mullin	Partnership for Learning	CPT
Steve Davidson	Washington Association of Learning Alternatives/Naches Valley Virtual Academy	Accountability System/CPT
Sue Anderson	OSPI	Effective Educators
Summer Guy	Tacoma Public Schools	School and District Improvement

Name	Organization/Role/Representing	Workgroup
Susan Sellers	Edmonds School District/Society for Health & Physical Education of Washington	Learning and Teaching
Suzie Hanson	Washington Federation of Independent Schools	Early Childhood Education
Suzy Martinez	Commission on Hispanic Affairs	Parent and Community Engagement/CPT
Sylvia Reyna	OSPI	Federal Programs
Tamara Shoup	Vancouver School District	Parent and Community Engagement
Tammy Campbell	Federal Way Public Schools	Student Assessment System
Thomas McDermott	Auburn School District	Report Card
Tim Ames	Medical Lake School District	Accountability System
Tim Garchow	Washington State School Directors Association	Accountability System/CPT
Tim Probst	Employment Security Department	Accountability System
Tim Touhey	Chehalis School District	Federal Programs
Timothy McNeely	OSPI	Federal Programs
Tom Hirsch	OSPI/NTAC	Technical Advisory Committee
Tom Venable	Methow Valley School District	Early Childhood Education
Vicki Bates	Auburn School District	Federal Programs
Victoria Hodge	Quincy School District	Federal Programs
Wanda Billingsly	Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee member	Accountability System/CPT
Wendy Rader-Konofalski	Washington Education Association	Accountability System

Note: Workgroup member organizations and roles reflect the appointing organization. Some workgroup members may belong to other organizations which were not identified upon selection of membership to each workgroup.

Appendix C: Glossary

Acronym	Definition
ACT	American College Testing, a college readiness assessment
AESD	Association of Educational Service Districts
AVID	Advancement Via Individual Determination
AYD	Academic Youth Development
BEAC	Bilingual Education and Advisory Committee
BEST	Beginning Educator Support Team
CCLC	21st Century Community Learning Centers
CEDARS	Comprehensive Education Data and Research System
CEL	Center for Educational Leadership
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CISL	Center for the Improvement of Student Learning
CPR	Consolidated Program Review
CPT	Consolidated Plan Team
CTE	Career and Technical Education
ED	U.S. Department of Education
DCYF	Washington State Department of Children, Youth, and Families
DEL	Washington State Department of Early Learning (now incorporated into the Department of Children, Youth, and Families)
ECE	Early Childhood Education
ECEAP	Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program
EL	English learner, formerly English language learner
ELA	English language arts
ELP	English language proficiency
ELPA21	English Language Proficiency Assessment, 21st Century
ESD	Educational Service District
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ESSA	Every Student Succeeds Act
ESSB	Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill
GATE	Graduation a Team Effort
GED	General Education Development
GOLD	Teaching Strategies' GOLD, an early learning/kindergarten assessment tool
HS	High School
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individualized Education Program
LAP	Learning Assistance Program
LEA	Local Education Agency
MEP	Migrant Education Program
MTSS	Multi-Tiered Systems of Support

Acronym	Definition
NAACP	National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
NCHE	National Center for Homeless Education
NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act
NW RISE	Northwest Rural Innovation and Student Engagement
OSPI	Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
OSSS	Office of Student and School Success
OSY	Out of school youth
PBIS	Positive Behavior and Intervention Supports
PD	Professional development
PESB	Professional Educator Standards Board
PFS	Priority for Service
PLA	Persistently lowest achieving
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
PTDT	Principal Training Design Team
RAD	Required Action District
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
RFP	Request for Proposal
RLIS	Rural and Low Income Schools
SAT	Scholastic Aptitude Test, a test measuring overall college readiness in English and mathematics.
SBE	Washington State Board of Education
SEA	State educational agency
SEES	School Employee Evaluation Survey
SGP	Student growth percentile
SIG	School improvement grant
SLP	Student learning plan
SQSS	School Quality or Student Success
SRSA	Small, Rural School Achievement
STEM	Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics
SWD	Students with disabilities
TA	Technical assistance
TPEP	Teacher/Principal Evaluation Program
TTDT	Teacher Training Design Team
UDL	Universal Design for Learning
WAC	Washington Administrative Code
WEA	Washington Education Association
WELPA	Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment
WIAA	Washington Interscholastic Athletic Association
WSSDA	Washington State School Directors Association

Appendix D: Summary of Public Engagement

Invitation to Participate

OSPI set up a website for communicating with the public regarding Washington's Plan, www.k12.wa.us/essa. This website contains information about public meetings held around the state, the teams and workgroups helping draft the Plan, a draft timeline and answers to frequently asked questions. The website contained a link by which interested individuals could subscribe to ESSA alerts.

OSPI also communicated broadly about the Consolidated Plan process via twitter, social media, email listservs, news releases, announcements at professional group meetings and at a variety of other events where stakeholders were present.

Outreach and Input


OSPI established a Consolidated Plan Team (CPT) to advise the State Superintendent and to be active members in the development of the ESSA Consolidated Plan. This team received recommendations for the Plan from the 12 ESSA workgroups and provided consultation to the State Superintendent on the plan.

The Federal Programs Team focused on ESSA implementation and enhancing the integration of programs under this ESEA/ESSA with state and local programs.

Twelve workgroups were established to address specific sections of the ESSA Consolidated Plan. Members of each workgroup had expertise in the area to be addressed. The workgroups prepared their specific parts of the plan and provided this information to the ESSA CPT for review per the Washington ESSA Consolidated Plan Timeline. The workgroups include: Accountability System, Learning and Teaching, Student Assessment System, School and District Improvement, Effective Educators, English Learners, Fiscal, Report Card, Parent and Community Engagement, Early Childhood Education, Students with Disabilities, and Federal Programs Team. The workgroups met monthly, at the discretion of the team leader.

In January of 2017, a new superintendent of public instruction took office and made the decision that Washington would not submit Washington's ESSA Accountability Plan until September 18, 2017. Superintendent Reykdal brought back the Accountability System Workgroup and implemented a Technical Advisory Committee to finalize accountability sections of the plan.

Superintendent Reykdal added a second 30-day public comment period in August 2017. A comprehensive report of the feedback received can be found at the [ESSA public comments page](#).



Special outreach was conducted to many stakeholder groups, as shown in the table below. There is a notation when a member of the workgroup was on the CPT. See Appendix B for a full listing of the CPT and the workgroup members.

Stakeholder/Group	Special Outreach
Governor Inslee and education policy advisors	The State Superintendent and his designees have held several meetings and briefings with the Governor and his staff describing ESSA and OSPI’s approach to designing and developing the Plan and securing public input. The Governor and his staff asked questions about the process, and provided input on the public process, timeline, and Plan contents. Governor Inslee’s staff were members of the CPT.
Members of the state legislature	The State Superintendent and his designees have worked closely with the House and Senate education committees and their legislative staff to brief them on ESSA, seek their input, and answer their questions. This outreach was conducted during committee meetings, one-on-one briefings, and follow-up conversations. Representative Sharon Tomiko Santos, the Chair and Representative Chad Magendanz, Ranking Minority Member, of the House Education Committee, and Senator John McCoy, were members of the CPT.
Members of the Washington State Board of Education	The State Superintendent or his designee has provided updates regarding ESSA and the design and development of the Plan at every SBE meeting. The executive director of the Washington State Board of Education was a co-facilitator on the ESSA

Stakeholder/Group	Special Outreach
	<p>Accountability System Workgroup. In addition, several SBE members were involved in various workgroups contributing to the development of the Plan. The executive director of SBE was a member of CPT.</p>
<p>OSPI Program Staff and Leadership</p>	<p>Monthly updates on the development of the Plan were provided to OSPI federal and state program staff. A number of staff were members of one or more ESSA workgroups.</p> <p>OSPI cabinet members were updated on the Plan’s process and of final decisions made to be included in the Plan. A number of cabinet members were facilitators of ESSA workgroups.</p>
<p>State Agencies/Department Staff</p>	<p>Washington State Department of Social and Health Services and Employment Security Department were represented on two of the ESSA workgroups.</p>
<p>LEAs and ESDs</p>	<p>The 295 LEAs, eight Charter schools, and four Tribal compact schools in the state are grouped into nine educational service districts (ESDs). OSPI uses multiple channels to communicate to and seek feedback from LEAs. There were over 100 school and district employees on the 12 ESSA workgroups. The ESDs receive regular briefings from OSPI and provided input into the Plan on behalf of the LEAs they serve. Administrative leaders from one LEAs and two ESD were represented on the CPT.</p>
<p>Representatives of Tribes located in Washington state</p>	<p>OSPI engaged regularly with Tribal Leaders Congress and the Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs to consult about education policy, including the design and development of the Plan. The Tribal Leaders Congress and the Office of Indian Affairs provided input on the development of the Plan.</p> <p>OSPI issued an open invitation for tribal consultation on ESSA and held two three-hour consultations around the state.</p> <p>OSPI met with the four Tribal compact schools early in the plan development process and collected their comments to be incorporated into the Plan.</p> <p>OSPI presented at the Centennial Accord meeting to brief Tribal leaders across the state on the development of the Plan. The Centennial Accord brings together all Washington state-based</p>

Stakeholder/Group	Special Outreach
	<p>tribes, the Governor, and other state leaders for government-to-government meetings.</p> <p>OSPI staff met with the Suquamish Tribal Council to review plan components and answer questions about the Plan and its implementation.</p> <p>Representatives from the tribes sat on three ESSA workgroups and the CPT.</p>
Teachers	<p>OSPI conducted significant outreach to educators across the state using multiple avenues, including communication with many education groups via focus group sessions and professional development opportunities, listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) • Washington Education Association (WEA) • Washington Family and Consumer Science Educators • Washington Science Teachers Association • Health and Fitness Educators Group • Washington Library Media Association (WLMA) • Teachers sat on several workgroups. Two representatives from the WEA sat on the CPT
Principals and other school leaders	<p>Principals and other school leaders were involved in a number of focus groups and outreach activities. The following professional groups were involved ESSA workgroups and the CPT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Washington State School Directors' Association • Association of Educational Service Districts • Association of Washington School Principals • Washington Association of School Administrators • District-level federal program leaders that administer Title I, Part A and C, Title II, Part A, Title III, Title IV, Title VI and McKinney Vento program. In addition, representatives for Students with Disabilities sat on three ESSA workgroups.
Federal and State Required Advisory Groups to OSPI	<p>OSPI engaged members from federal and state required advisory committees in the development and the final draft Plan. Information on the Plan was provided to each of the below committees. There were at least two representatives from each</p>

Stakeholder/Group	Special Outreach
	<p>committee that participated on ESSA workgroups. The committees included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee of Practitioners (COP) • Bilingual Education Advisory Committee (BEAC) • Washington State Migrant Education Advisory Committee (SAC) • Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) • Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee • State Gifted Advisory Committee for Gifted Children • Private School Advisory Committee
Paraprofessionals and specialized instructional support personnel	<p>Paraprofessionals were involved through outreach to the following professional groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Washington Education Association (WEA) • Washington State Public School Employees (PSE) <p>Both organizations had representation on the CPT and the Effective Educators workgroup.</p>
OSPI Curriculum Advisory Review Committee	<p>OSPI has a Curriculum Advisory Review Committee that has district and Educational Service District representatives as members. Time was provided at their November meeting for a presentation on ESSA and on the development of the Plan.</p>
Charter School Leaders	<p>OSPI reached out to the Washington Association for Learning Alternatives and sought input from charter school leadership. A Focus session was presented by the Deputy Superintendent and comments were provided by the group on the impact and opportunities for Charter schools under ESSA.</p> <p>The Washington Association for Learning Alternatives was represented on the CPT.</p>
Early Learning	<p>Representatives from the Department of Children, Youth, and Families, Thrive Washington, Head Start, our state preschool program, school district Early Learning Coordinators, and public and private early learning providers participated in the Early Childhood Workgroup.</p>

Stakeholder/Group	Special Outreach
Parents and families	<p>The Washington State Parent Teacher Association (PTA) received information about ESSA and the development of the Plan. Washington State PTA had three representatives on the CPT.</p> <p>OSPI reached out to the Title I Committee of Practitioners, which includes parent and family representatives.</p> <p>The 22–member Parent and Community Engagement Workgroup which includes several parent and family representatives, was actively involved in the development of the Plan.</p> <p>The Washington State Migrant Education Advisory Committee, which includes parents and family representatives, received briefings and provided input on the Plan.</p> <p>The Bilingual Education Advisory Committee held Family Engagement Nights, and discussed the Plan.</p>
Community-based organizations	<p>Several community-based organizations have been actively involved in the design and development of the Plan. The following organizations have representation on the CPT and/or on one or more of the twelve workgroups who helped develop the Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership for Learning • Washington State Parent Teacher Association • Alliance for Education • Children’s Institute for Learning Differences • Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession • Community Center for Education Results • Road Map Project • League of Education Voters • Stand for Children • Thrive Washington • College Success Foundation • GEAR UP
Civil rights organizations	<p>OSPI provided outreach through focus group presentations at which participants had the opportunity to provide comments on the plan development and contents during the early</p>

Stakeholder/Group	Special Outreach
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Association for the Advancement of Colored • Equity in Education Coalition • Urban League
<p>Institutions of Higher Education</p>	
<p>State Agencies/ State Commissions/Councils</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Washington State Commission on African American • Washington State Commission on Asian Pacific American • Commission on Hispanic Affairs • Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs • Washington Student Achievement Council • Employment Security Department • Office of Financial Management
	<p>OSPI engaged in vigorous outreach to the public. OSPI provided a dedicated website, which included the ability to sign up to receive updates via email.</p> <p>All CPT meetings were open to the public and participants could either call in or attend in person. All workgroup agendas and minutes were made public.</p> <p>OSPI sent news releases to all major papers.</p> <p>Early in the process, OSPI held ten regional public forums across the state. One of the sessions was a webinar. Each two-hour forum was open to the public, and covered opportunities and challenges that lie ahead, how the ESSA is similar to and different from the No Child Left Behind Act, and provided for</p>

Stakeholder/Group	Special Outreach
	<p>open discussion for the community to provide feedback. The presentations and the recorded webinar are on the OSPI ESSA website. Participants provided feedback verbally, through comment cards, or via email. All feedback was collected, organized and shared with OSPI leadership and to appropriate workgroups to assist in the development of the Consolidated Plan. It also actively solicited feedback via email, written comments, and web surveys.</p> <p>In mid-November, OSPI released the draft Plan for a 30-day public comment period, and engaged in another statewide review tour to discuss the draft Plan and receive input.</p> <p>Incoming State Superintendent Chris Reykdal extended the deadline for public input on the draft Plan by several months, and increased outreach to stakeholder groups and to the public via social media.</p> <p>Both the listening tour and the review tour included webinars in addition to the face-to-face sessions.</p>

The following charts show participation details for the statewide listening sessions held in June and July, 2016.




Figure 8. Total Number of Participants by location (n=350).




Figure 9. Participation roles across all forums. The number in parenthesis indicates total number of participants. Note that some participants identified more than one role.

OSPI received over 350 comments and consulted with dozens of groups during the development of the Plan. All feedback was transcribed and shared with relevant workgroups. The workgroups reviewed the comments and feedback, and made dispensation decisions on all

input. While not every comment was actionable or relevant, all received due consideration, and a majority of the comments were incorporated into the development of the Plan.

General Theme and Summary of Comments	ESSA Component	Total Number
<p>State Testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do only what is required for federal accountability; make sure assessments are developmentally appropriate and validated (72) • Delink from Graduation Requirements (21) • Consider using Alternate Assessments (ACT, SAT, ASVAB at high school; ITBS at elementary school) (20) • Reduce over-reliance on testing and anxiety for students (15) 	<i>Supporting All Students</i>	128
<p>Washington’s Process and ESSA Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forums provided opportunity to learn about ESSA Plan, learn from others and hear local concerns (52) • Process should ensure all stakeholders are represented on workgroups, including practitioners, students, parents, and communities of color (35) • Information and updates should be provided online (10) • Opportunities should be expanded for more public input, including rural/remote; provide opportunity for stakeholders to observe/comment with workgroups (10) • Make the ESSA Plan an improvement over NCLB (4) • Make the ESSA Plan as bones and basic as possible (3) 	<i>Consultation and Coordination</i>	114
<p>Personalization for Each Student</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide learning environment that is equitable and inclusive, and ensures all students are physically and emotionally safe and have access to social/emotional supports and curriculum (32) • Ensure each has access to balanced curriculum that includes full range of content areas (e.g., the arts, music, social studies) (18) • Move from one size fits all to K–12 system of innovative options and models of delivery that includes alternative paths, programs for highly capable, Running Start, dual credit, career exploration, internships, and access to advanced coursework (17) 	<i>Supporting All Students</i>	97

General Theme and Summary of Comments	ESSA Component	Total Number
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure school is student-centered and teaches to “whole child,” is inclusive, honors ALL students, and respects ALL students (17) • Prepare each student for next steps, so each is career, college (and civically) ready; ensure effective transitions for all students (16–21), including SWD and students from poverty (13) 		
<p>Supporting Excellent Educators: Recruitment, Retention, Professional Learning, Certification and Evaluation Processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide opportunities for professional learning for educators around areas such as diversity, trauma, cultural competence, equity, positive discipline and restorative justice (21) • Focus on teacher shortage; recruit especially in high-need areas (Bilingual, Special Education, teachers from communities of color) (19) • Improve TPEP process, including training for evaluators and teachers (18) • Revise the teacher certification process, requirements and ProCert process (17) • Ensure all students have access to effective educators (11) 	<i>Supporting Excellent Educators</i>	86
<p>Accountability System</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use variety of data, including student growth (18) • Ensure system holds districts, schools, and educators accountable; doesn’t allow loopholes for districts with failing schools, “How ensure accountability across 295 districts?” (17) • Use system to identify and drive funding for low-performing schools (7) • Ensure system isn’t punitive and doesn’t label schools (5) • Ensure system includes ALL students (3) 	<i>Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools</i>	50
<p>Supporting Excellent Educators: Adequate Resources/Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjust the funding formula to ensure schools are fully staffed (i.e., reduce class size) (16) • Hold the state legislature accountable to fully fund education (16) 	<i>Supporting Excellent Educators</i>	45

General Theme and Summary of Comments	ESSA Component	Total Number
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide funding to support librarians and technology, including technology to support state testing (13) 		
<p>Measurement of Success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include Growth (18) Measure in multiple ways - academic, social-emotional, climate, school capacity to meet student needs (13) Provide flexibility at the local level to use school/district determined assessments; enable teachers to assess and define success for students (13) 	<i>Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools</i>	44
<p>Challenging Academic Standards and Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure ALL students receive standards-based, rigorous, developmentally appropriate, and culturally relevant curriculum (CCSS); research-based programs; and interventions (16) Ensure ALL students have access to effective educators, teaching students to same standard (12) Set High Expectations for ALL students to achieve challenging academic standards (6) 	<i>Challenging Academic Standards and Academic Assessments for ALL Students</i>	34
<p>Students with Disabilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Testing: Use developmentally appropriate tests that measure growth; eliminate WA AIM; do only what is required for federal accountability (25) Service Model: Implement processes to identify and serve that align with IDEA (3) 	<i>Supporting All Students</i>	28
<p>English Learners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Testing: Use developmentally appropriate tests that measures growth; do only what is required for federal accountability (10) Service Model: Implement processes to identify and serve that align with Title I; blend funding and services where possible; extend learning time and opportunities (e.g., Pre-K, summer school) (6) 	<i>Supporting All Students</i>	16
<p>Parent, Family, and Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage parents in the education of their child; hold them accountable for student learning, teach them how to advocate for their child (13) 	<i>Supporting All Students</i>	13

Coordination


Throughout the Plan, OSPI took steps to ensure that coordination among education agencies at the local, state, and federal level is more efficient and streamlined. For example, the Plan describes many instances where funding streams can be combined to help students succeed. The education system in Washington has a strong culture of collaboration and transparency, and the Plan both models and enforces this level of coordination.

All of the 12 workgroups ensured that the Plan conforms with not only the ESSA, but also **aligned** with other federal and state laws, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Rehabilitation Act, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, the Head Start Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002, the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act, and the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.

The Plan improves teaching and learning by encouraging greater cross-program coordination, planning, and service delivery.

The Plan consolidates or eliminates many smaller grant programs, and streamlines rules and policies to ensure greater integration of federal, state, and local programs.

Public Input Results



At the conclusion of the extended public review period, OSPI analyzed, disseminated, and assessed the comments received from the extended public review period. OSPI received hundreds of comments during the ESSA Consolidated Plan comment period. OSPI analyzed the comments and [summarized them in this document](#). Three teams reconvened to address comments and complete unfinished work from the work period.

- [Accountability System Workgroup](#)
- [Technical Advisory Committee](#)
- [ESSA Federal Programs Team](#)

Appendix E: Image Attribution and Copyright

Except where otherwise noted, this work by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 2.0).

You are free to share and adapt this work for any purpose, as long as you attribute OSPI, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.



Photo Credits



Photo with two girls looking at notebook computer. Photo by NEC Corporation of America. [CC BY 2.0](#) Via Flickr, [flic.kr/p/qL2wPW](https://www.flickr.com/photos/14811470@N00/10111111111/).



By Matthew (WMF) (Own work) [CC BY 3.0](#), via Wikimedia Commons [commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File%3AWiki_Women's_Edit-a-thon-45.jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Wiki_Women's_Edit-a-thon-45.jpg).



By Kaushik.chug (Own work) [CC BY 3.0](#), via Wikimedia Commons [commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File%3AGears.JPG](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Gears.JPG).



Books, by Danny Nicholson, [CC BY 2.0](#), via Flickr. [flic.kr/p/9yM1p3](https://www.flickr.com/photos/14811470@N00/10111111111/).



Teacher at Chalkboard, by Cybrarian77. [CC BY 2.0](#), via Flickr. [flic.kr/p/azj5bZ](https://www.flickr.com/photos/14811470@N00/10111111111/).



School, by Andy Simonds, [CC BY 2.0](#), via Flickr. [flic.kr/p/2stMHH](https://www.flickr.com/photos/14811470@N00/10111111111/).



Students, by AFS USA, [CC BY 2.0](#) via Flickr, [flic.kr/p/e4pT7X](https://www.flickr.com/photos/14811470@N00/10111111111/).



Students participating in Science Olympiad, by NASA, commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:ScienceOlympiad.jpg.



Rural wheat fields, by Steve Buissinne, pixabay.com/en/landscape-wheat-fields-harvest-1763948/.