

**Washington State Plan for Data Collection and Public Reporting
Under the ARRA State Stabilization Program
Part 3B of the Application for CFDA 84.394**

Introduction

This is an application for funding under Section 14005(d) of Division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) from the State of Washington. In order to receive funding under the Stabilization program, this application presents assurances in four key areas of education reform: (a) achieving equity in teacher distribution, (b) improving collection and use of data, (c) standards and assessments, and (d) supporting struggling schools. These documents contain the specific assurances on the ability to meet data or information requirements and documentation listing the public websites by which data may be viewed (Part 3A). For those areas where Washington State is not currently able to meet the specific data and information requirements, this State plan describes how the requirements of each assurance indicator and descriptor will be met as soon as possible, or no later than September 30, 2011 (Part 3B).

To the degree applicable, this application presents data and information that has been coordinated across the programs supported with ARRA funds, including the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund, the Washington Race to the Top application which is currently being formulated; the current funding and new application for School Improvement, and the recently submitted Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant application. Furthermore, data or information presented has been reviewed and aligned with federal reporting requirements under the Washington's Consolidated Plan for programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Part 1: Application Cover Sheet – Provided on Application for CFDA 84.394

Part 2: Maintenance of Effort Data – Provided on Application for CFDA 84.394

Part 3A: Data Collection, Public Reporting, and Planning – Provided on Application for CFDA 84.394

Part 3B: Data Collection & Public Reporting Plan – Provided within this state plan document. (Pages 2-27)

Part 3C: General Requirements – Provided within this state plan document. (Page 28)

I. Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

Washington State will take actions to improve teacher effectiveness and comply with section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA) (20 U.S.C. 6311), in order to address inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers between high- and low-poverty schools and to ensure that low-income and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers.

Currently, the State makes the information publically available on the Office of Superintendent of Public instruction website; however, it is *updated less than annually*. The Washington State plan for updating this information annually is delineated below.

Indicator (a)(2) State Plan

The Title II Section of the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) is responsible for the development, implementation and oversight of strategies to ensure Washington's Teacher Equity Plan is annually updated and publicly reported. Teacher Equity Plans dated September 2006 and November 2008 are currently reported on the OSPI website. Future public reporting plans for progress reports include a mid-year report and annual reporting of the updated Teacher Equity Plan on the OSPI website at <http://www.k12.wa.us/TitleIIA/HighlyQualifiedTeachers.aspx>.

Washington is redefining the Teacher Equity Plan and will include stakeholder participation of organizations including the Professional Educator Standards Board, teacher unions and statewide school district personnel organizations representing teachers, principals, human resource staff and other central office administrators.

Technical assistance is provided to school district personnel and other public entities by staff persons from the OSPI offices of Title II, Title I and School and District Improvement. No increase in budget for continued development and implementation of this requirement is anticipated because it is currently factored into the Title II Section responsibilities. The federal funds are provided through the ESEA Title II Part A Teacher Principal Quality program and cover staff time, meeting costs for stakeholder input, technical assistance to school districts and printed resource materials.

The following six-step plan addresses strategies, activities and the overall timeline to ensure that the Washington State Teacher Equity Plan is publicly reported annually beginning no later than May 2010.

Process and Timeline:

Step 1: Review progress of November 2008 Teacher Equity Plan – complete by January 30, 2010.

Step 2: Report progress of November 2008 Teacher Equity Plan on state education agency website – March 2010.

Step 3: Redefine critical definitions with stakeholder groups - complete by March 2010
(Critical definitions include: high poverty, high minority, experienced teachers and equitable distribution.)

Step 4: Evaluate ongoing strategies and identify additional strategies aligned to re-defined definitions with stakeholder group – complete by May 2010.

Step 5: Publicly report revised state plan aligned to re-defined definitions – May 2010.

Step 6: Monitor and report progress of May 2010 revised state plan – November 2010.

Descriptor (a)(1) and Descriptor (a)(2) and Indicators (a)(3) through (a)(7) Plan

The State of Washington does not currently collect data on how teacher and principal performance is evaluated and how the results of those evaluations are used for decisions regarding compensation, promotion, retention, and removal; and on the distribution of performance evaluation ratings or levels among teachers and principals. The plan for providing that information is provided below.

Process and Timeline:

The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), a state education agency, will issue a Request for Information (RFI) to the state's 295 school districts on January 1 of each year seeking information for Descriptors (a)1 and (a)2 and Indicators (a)(3) through (a)7. The proposed Request for Information will include the following data elements:

Washington State SFSF II Plan for Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution LEA Request for Information

Descriptor (a) (1):

Describe the system used in your district to evaluate the performance of teachers. If available, include in the description the following information:

- Evaluation criteria;
- Evaluation rubric(s) and/or weighting formula(e);
- Descriptions of each performance rating or level;
- Frequency of evaluations;
- Purpose of evaluations;
- Methodology;
- Participants;
- Implementation; and
- Feedback protocols.

Indicate whether the results from the evaluation system are used in decisions regarding each of the following processes.

- a. Teacher development (Yes/No)
- b. Teacher compensation (Yes/No)
- c. Teacher promotion (Yes/No)
- d. Teacher retention (Yes/No)
- e. Teacher removal (Yes/No)

Indicator (a) (3):

Respond Yes or NO to the following question: Does the teacher evaluation system described in (a) (1) include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion?

Indicator (a) (4):

If the district's evaluation system provides teachers with performance ratings, list the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance level for the last evaluation cycle. Respond with teacher head count per category rather than full-time equivalent (FTE).

Indicator (a) (5):

If the district's evaluation system provides teacher performance ratings, respond Yes or NO to the following question: Is the number and percentage of such ratings publically reported for each school in the district?

Descriptor (a) (2):

Describe the system used in your district to evaluate the performance of principals. If available, include in the description the following information:

- Evaluation criteria;
- Evaluation rubric(s) and/or weighting formula(e);
- Descriptions of each performance rating or level;
- Frequency of evaluations;
- Purpose of evaluations;
- Methodology;
- Participants;
- Implementation; and
- Feedback protocols.

Indicate whether the results from the evaluation system are used in decisions regarding:

- a. Principal development (Yes/No)
- b. Principal compensation (Yes/No)
- c. Principal promotion (Yes/No)
- d. Principal retention (Yes/No)
- e. Principal removal (Yes/No)

Indicator (a) (6)

Does the principal evaluation system described above include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion? (Yes/No)

Indicator (a) (7)

If the principal evaluation system provides performance ratings, list the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating category. Respond with principal head count, not fulltime equivalent (FTE).

Dates by which Washington State expects to reach each milestone:

On or before April 1 of each year, OSPI will post on its website (<http://www.k12.wa.us/>) the information received each school district on the descriptors and indicators listed in the RFI. Information posted will reference the previous school year. For example, information posted on April 1, 2011 will reference data from the 2009-10 school year.

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction cannot foresee any obstacles that would prevent the agency from completing this task by September 30, 2011.

The report will be posted on the OSPI website annually on or before April 1.

The overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of this section of the plan is as follows: .10 FTE for program supervisor (\$7,000) plus technology, supplies, and materials necessary to complete assigned tasks (\$2,000). Total Budget = \$9,000 per year, federal funds.

The Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction is the state agency responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the data collection and public reporting of the elements of the plan. The OSPI will also oversee the implementation of the plan and provide direct technical assistance to school districts who must respond within the annual timeline. Technical assistance provided will include providing a program supervisor to respond to questions. In addition technical assistance materials including definitions, references to the law and frequently asked question guidance will be developed and posted on the agency website. The OSPI has the organization capacity to successfully administer and manage large-scale data collection and reporting for federal and state programs and discretionary grants and has an exemplary record of meeting all reporting requirements. The recently redesigned website, <http://www.k12.wa.us> will be used for the public reporting of data.

Internet technology services are made possible through a statewide network infrastructure and up-to-date hardware and software and certified and trained staff of over forty persons. The OSPI uses fiber optics technology for extended data documentation with districts and the public. The statewide K-20 network which connects all state education entities is a major component of this system and it is used extensively to provide real-time technical assistance with low travel and meeting costs.

Washington OSPI will publicly report the plan and the state's progress on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on the OSPI website on or before April 1, 2010.

II. Improving Collection and Use of Data

The State of Washington will address education reform area (b), improving collection and use of data by establishing a statewide longitudinal data system that includes the elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act (20 U.S.C. 9871).

These elements are: (1) a unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system; (2) student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information; (3) student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete P-16 education programs; (4) the capacity to

communicate with higher education data systems; (5) a State data audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability; (6) yearly test records of individual students with respect to assessments under section 1111(b) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)); (7) information on students not tested by grade and subject; (8) a teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students; (9) student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned; (10) student-level college readiness test scores; (11) information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework; and (12) other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education.

Plan Element Verification: Per the instructions in Part 1, the following elements are addressed in the Washington State plan:

<u>COMPETES Element</u>	<u>Must be addressed in plan</u>	<u>Does not need to be addressed in plan</u>
1		X
2		X
3		X
4		X
5		X
6		X
7		X
8		X
9		X
10		X
11		X
12	X	

Indicator (b) (1) Plan for Element 12

An Employment Data Handbook will be developed to help strengthen and standardize analyses on wage and employment outcomes of students. This handbook will be designed for other states and organizations based on Washington’s extensive experience working with employment data and developing standardized follow-up protocols. Multiple Washington agencies have collaborated in developing employment analyses. The manual would include topics such as organizational and governance issues; technical issues, methods and solutions; and functionality and products. It will provide background information on Unemployment Insurance data, describe the information that is typically available from state labor market information agencies and the research that can result, as well as will outline the steps needed to clean, refine, and standardize the information. It will outline the process of analyzing workforce outcomes as a way to provide feedback to postsecondary education institutions.

Using the methodologies outlined in the handbook across all education sectors will complete the element; it will help strengthen and standardize analyses on wage and employment outcomes of students.

Without the grant, the process will be ad-hoc but can be completed within currently available resources.

**Employment Data Handbook Development and Projected Completion Dates
(Data Element #12)**

Milestone	Completion Date
Solicit input from agencies with data and relevant experience	3/31/2011
Compile handbook	6/30/2011

Progress reports on the completion of the system will be made according to the schedule established for the completion of major milestones as established in an approved application, or no less than twice per year, beginning in June 2010 (with subsequent reporting each January and June). Reports will be posted on the ERDC website <http://www.erd.c.wa.gov/arraslds2009/>

The amount of funds to be used for each process is:

\$32,070 - Create an employment data handbook outlining procedure to use when analyzing employment data (**Element #12**)

Agency responsible for plan implementation: The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction will work with the Education Research and Data Center to conduct collaborative analyses of early learning, K-12, and higher education programs and education issues across the P-20 system. ERDC will work directly with the higher education agencies, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and the public higher education institutions for the implementation of the full system.

The agency providing technical assistance to all parties involved will be ERDC.

Given the limited amount of funding needed to complete #12, no additional budget request is necessary.

Indicator (b)(2) Plan

Activity Description (Milestone)	Outcome/Accomplishment	Milestone Achieved (Timeline)	Budget/FTE Resource
Comparative review of growth models	The state and its National Technical Advisory Committee are in the process of reviewing growth models for state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics	March 31, 2010 (Jan – Mar 2010)	\$0/0.05 FTE
Select growth model for statewide assessment	National TAC approves selected growth model	April 30, 2010 (Apr 2010)	\$0/0.01 FTE
Revise web-based tool and roster reports to reflect	Design requirements documented for vendors	Nov 30, 2011 (Aug – Nov 2011)	\$30K/0.01 FTE

growth data			
Provide growth data to teachers on roster reports	Growth data from Spring 2011 assessments available on roster reports for teachers to access data on current students	July 15, 2011 (Jan – July 2011)	\$25K/0.2 FTE
Provide growth data to teachers in web-based tool	Growth data for Spring 2011 assessments available in Query for teachers to access data on current and former students	August 15, 2011 (Jan – Aug 2011)	\$10K/0.1 FTE

Total estimated cost for Indicator (b) (2) is \$65,000, funding is a combination of state and federal assessment dollars.

OSPI is the agency responsible for the implementation of this plan.

Progress reports will be posted each June and January at:

<http://www.k12.wa.us/Communications/StimulusPackage/FiscalStabilization.aspx>.

Indicator (b)(3) Plan

Activity Description (Milestone)	Outcome/Accomplishment	Milestone Achieved (Timeline)	Budget/FTE Resource
Link student assessment data to classroom teacher	Classroom teachers identified by content area assessed, and matched to student assessment scores from Spring 2010	Sept 30, 2010 (Jan – Sept 2010)	\$10K/0.01 FTE
Revise web-based tool and roster	Design requirements documented for	Nov 30, 2011	\$25K/0.01 FTE

reports to reflect growth data	vendors	(Aug – Nov 2011)	
Provide growth data to teachers on roster reports	Growth data from Spring 2011 assessments available on roster reports for teachers to access data on current students	July 15, 2011 (Jan – July 2011)	\$30K/0.2 FTE
Provide growth data to teachers in web-based tool	Growth data for Spring 2011 assessments available in Query for teachers to access data on current and former students, by teacher	August 15, 2011 (Jan – Aug 2011)	\$10K/0.1 FTE

Total estimated cost for Indicator (b)(3) is \$75,000. Funding is part of the recently adopted SB6696.

OSPI is the agency responsible for the implementation of this plan.

The Washington State Legislature recently adopted SB6696 regarding a new teacher evaluation system, that addresses using student and other data to measure and evaluate teachers. SB6696 requires OSPI to lead a workgroup to research and study methods currently used by school districts to measure teacher impact and effectiveness.

Progress reports will be posted each June and January at:

<http://www.k12.wa.us/Communications/StimulusPackage/FiscalStabilization.aspx> .

Indicator (c)(4) Plan

SEA will manage entirety of project, but will require assistance from its present testing contractor(s) (Data Recognition Corporation and Measured Progress) plus the state LEAs in gathering related data. SEA expects to support efforts through a combination of federal and state funds; if plausible SEA will look to encompass findings of other states' efforts in this area to inform own state decisions.

Accommodation Data Collection & Analysis - Spring 2010 data collection	Provide statewide data that links specific accommodations with student performances. This will allow for a	June 30, 2010 (Jan – Jun 2010)	\$50K/0.05 FTE
---	--	-----------------------------------	----------------

(potential additions to contractor programming)	deeper pool of information and provide potential inferences regarding accommodation success when evaluated in conjunction with the test day observations.		
Accommodations vs. Performance Analysis (2 stage effort): - Pilot (field data collection) - Longitudinal data (from existing state data sources)	At the conclusion of this milestone, state will be positioned to demonstrate through comparison of accommodations to performance data, which accommodations appear more appropriate and most effective.	February 28, 2011 (Oct 2010 – Feb 2011)	\$25K (conduct pilot) / 0.3 FTE
Stakeholder/Expert Review – outcomes of data collection efforts	Along with Special Education Assessment TAC, state will bring other advocates and educators together to review data from process and provide feedback on potential conclusions to be drawn or courses of action to be taken.	March 31, 2011 (Mar 2011)	\$15K (30 people, 1 day, \$500 ea.) / 0.05 FTE
Report Out/Modify Guidelines & Policies	Report drafted and released for public access; briefing conducted with education committees of the state legislature; copy of report included with next submission of Peer Review materials. Report will be posted to OSPI website. State’s guidelines for accommodations updated based on outcomes of activities.	July 31, 2011 (May – July 2011) July 31, 2011 (Apr – Jul 2011)	\$15K (contract for psychometric services to assist with report drafting). / 0.05 FTE

<p>Accommodation Data Collection & Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spring 2010 data collection (potential additions to contractor programming) 	<p>Provide statewide data that links specific accommodations with student performances. This will allow for a deeper pool of information and provide potential inferences regarding accommodation success when evaluated in conjunction with the test day observations.</p>	<p>June 30, 2010 (Jan – Jun 2010)</p>	<p>\$50K/0.05 FTE</p>
<p>Accommodations vs. Performance Analysis (2 stage effort):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pilot (field data collection) - Longitudinal data -existing state data sources) 	<p>At the conclusion of this milestone, state will be positioned to demonstrate through comparison of accommodations to performance data, which accommodations appear more appropriate and most effective.</p>	<p>February 28, 2011 (Oct 2010 – Feb 2011)</p>	<p>\$25K (conduct pilot) / 0.3 FTE</p>
<p>Stakeholder/Expert Review – outcomes of data collection efforts</p>	<p>Along with Sp. Ed. Assessment TAC, state will bring other advocates and educators together to review data from process and provide feedback on potential conclusions to be drawn or courses of action to be taken.</p>	<p>March 31, 2011 (Mar 2011)</p>	<p>\$15K (30 people, 1 day, \$500 ea.) / 0.05 FTE</p>
<p>Report Out/Modify Guidelines & Policies</p>	<p>Report drafted and released for public access; briefing conducted with education committees of the state legislature; copy of report included with next submission of Peer Review materials. Report will be posted to OSPI website. State’s guidelines for accommodations updated based on outcomes of activities.</p>	<p>July 31, 2011 (May – July 2011)</p> <p>July 31, 2011 (Apr – Jul 2011)</p>	<p>\$15K (contract for psychometric services to assist with report drafting). / 0.05 FTE</p>

Indicator (c)(6)

SEA will manage entirety of project, but will require assistance from its present testing contractor (NCS Pearson) plus the state LEAs in gathering related data. SEA expects to support efforts through a combination of federal and state funds; if plausible SEA will look to encompass findings of other states' efforts in this area to inform own state decision

Activity Description (Milestone)	Outcome/Accomplishment	Milestone Achieved (Timeline)	Budget/FTE Resource
Literature Review/Other State Reviews-Inquiries Review previous Enhanced Assessment Grants (EAGs) supporting similar studies. Generate data collection plan	State will be positioned to develop applicable study/pilot through which affirmation or modification of state's accommodations guidelines supporting ELL students' access to assessments.	March 31, 2010 (Jan – Mar 2010)	\$0/0.05 FTE
	Will provide outline guiding efforts of the project. Will identify specific accommodations to evaluate based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uniqueness to Washington - Lack of consensus on efficacy amongst other studies 	April 30, 2010 (Apr 2010)	\$0/0.05 FTE
Project website established; maintained. Post: Data collection plan; Data analysis outcomes;	OSPI has website established to communicate process and milestone achievements. Provide place for public	Establishment: May 1, 2010 (Feb – Apr 2010)	\$0/0.1 FTE

Report of final determinations. All postings linked to milestones dates.	to query status of project.	Maintenance: May 2010 – Sep 2011	
Accommodation Use (Bilingual Service Plan-to-Assessment) a) Classroom observations b.)Test-Day observations c.) Audit sampling of IEPs	Provides the basis for follow-on performance data analysis comparing student performance data linked with specific accommodations. Identify areas of misapplication of accommodations.	June 30, 2010 (May – Jun 2010)	\$10K/0.2 FTE
Accommodation Data Collection & Analysis - Spring 2010 data collection (potential additions to contractor programming)	Provide statewide data that links specific accommodations with student performances. This will allow for a deeper pool of information and provide potential inferences regarding accommodation success when evaluated in conjunction with the test day observations.	June 30, 2010 (Jan – Jun 2010)	\$50K/0.05 FTE
Accommodations vs. Performance Analysis (2 stage effort): - Pilot (field data collection) - Longitudinal data (from existing state data sources)	At the conclusion of this milestone, state will be positioned to demonstrate through comparison of accommodations to performance data, which accommodations appear more appropriate and most effective.	February 28, 2011 (Oct 2010 – Feb 2011)	\$25K (conduct pilot) / 0.3 FTE
Stakeholder/Expert Review – outcomes of data collection efforts	Along with select members of the National Technical Advisory Committee, state will bring other advocates and educators together to	March 31, 2011 (Mar 2011)	\$15K (30 people, 1 day, \$500 ea.) / 0.05 FTE

	review data from process and provide feedback on potential conclusions to be drawn or courses of action to be taken.		
Report Out/Modify Guidelines & Policies	Report drafted and released for public access; briefing conducted with education committees of state legislature; copy of report included with next submission of Peer Review materials. Report posted to OSPI website. State's guidelines for accommodations updated based on outcomes of activities.	July 31, 2011 (May – July 2011) July 31, 2011 (Apr – Jul 2011)	\$15K (contract for psychometric services to assist with report drafting). / 0.05 FTE

Indicator (c)(7)

SEA will manage entirety of project, but will require assistance from its present testing contractor . SEA expects to support efforts through a combination of federal and state funds. No additional budget or staff is needed.

Milestones:

- August 2010 – scores from spring 2010 assessment will be available.
- November 2010 – submit Peer Review data on native language assessments for limited English proficient students.
- February 2011 – anticipated Peer Review approval date.

Progress Report: OSPI will update progress towards these milestones in January 2011.

Indicator (c)(10)

Activity Description (Milestone)	Outcome/Accomplishment	Milestone Achieved (Timeline)	Budget/FTE Resource
Preliminary analysis of Class of 2009 completed	State is positioned to develop a preliminary analysis for graduating class of 2009, using 4 year adjusted cohort graduation rate	March 31, 2010 (Jan – Mar 2010)	\$0/0.1 FTE
Class of 2010 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate analysis	Class of 2010 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate calculated	December 30, 2010 (Nov-Dec 2010)	\$0/0.1 FTE
Class of 2010 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate posted to website	OSPI has website established to communicate graduation and dropout rates. Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate will be posted to website and used in 2010 AYP determinations for 2011-2012.	January 15, 2011 - website Aug 15, 2011 – AYP determinations	\$25K/0.1 FTE

Lead Agency: OSPI

Source of funds: Federal

Progress reports: Updated by June 30th and January 31st each year until completed at the following link:

<http://www.k12.wa.us/Communications/StimulusPackage/FiscalStabilization.aspx>

Indicator (c)(11) and (c)(12)

Indicator (c) (11) requires a report of the number of students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the number and percentage who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma. Indicator (c) (12) differs only in that it further requests the number of those students who complete at least one year’s worth of college credit within two years of enrollment in the institution of higher education.

The following information regarding the development of the plan to publically report these data is provided here.

<u>Element</u>	<u>Collection</u> <u>(check if</u> <u>applies)</u>	<u>Public</u> <u>Reporting</u> <u>(check if</u> <u>applies)</u>
C11		X
C12		X

Reports of the transition to higher education institutions and reports on number of students who stay in the system for various lengths of time will be possible as the state PK-20 longitudinal data system is completed on the timeline described below. Data from the SEA’s K-12 longitudinal data system will be matched to the National Student Clearinghouse and Washington’s IHE enrollments so both in and out-of-state IHE data will be available. Subgroup data will be readily available and reported.

Indicator (c) (11) and (c) (12) State Plan

Activity Description (Milestone)	Outcome/Accomplishment	Milestone Achieved (Timeline)
<p>(c)(11) Design state, IHE, district and school level reports on, of the number of students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the number and percentage who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>(c)(12) Design state, district and school level reports on , of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) who enroll in a public IHE (as defined in section 101(a) of the HEA) in the State within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who complete at least one year’s worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE.</p>	<p>Draft reports designed and matching process and analyses planned</p>	<p>12/31/2010 (Mar - Dec 2010)</p>
<p>Match K-12 cohorts to National Student</p>	<p>Data analyzed</p>	<p>March 31, 2011</p>

Clearinghouse data and PEECHES (4 yr) and SBCTC (2 yr) data sets		(Sept 2010- Mar 2011)
Develop preliminary reports	Preliminary reports prepared for stakeholder review	3/31/2011
Gather stakeholder input Incorporate input on findings and format	Final report design and preparation	6/30/2011 (April – June 2011)
Revise, disseminate, post reports	Dissemination of reports	9/30/2011

It is estimated that the development of (c)(11) and (c)(12) reports including annual reports to school districts and institutions of higher education will be \$111,214 of federal funds. The reports will be posted on the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction website: <http://www.k12.wa.us/Communications/StimulusPackage/FiscalStabilization.aspx> by June 30th and January 31st each year.

The agency providing technical assistance to all parties involved will be ERDC.

Indicator (d)(1) State Plan

Data are collected by the state however, have not been presented in the format spelled out through the indicator. SEA will be solely responsible for the implementation of described reporting.

Activity Description (Milestone)	Outcome/Accomplishment	Milestone Achieved (Timeline)	Budget/FTE Resource
Develop additional AYP tab for the state’s report card site to report on Title I schools in area of reading / language arts.	State will provide info on progress achieved by state and LEA regarding Title I schools in the categories of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.	November 15, 2010 (Mar – Nov 2010)	\$25K/0.2 FTE

Indicator (d)(2)

Activity Description (Milestone)	Outcome/Accomplishment	Milestone Achieved (Timeline)	Budget/FTE Resource
Develop additional AYP tab for the state’s report card site to report on Title I schools in area of mathematics.	State will provide information on progress achieved by state and LEA regarding Title I schools in	November 15, 2010 (Mar – Nov 2010)	\$25K/0.2 FTE

the categories of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.	
---	--

Descriptor (d)(1) State Plan:

1. Definition of “persistently lowest achieving”
<http://www.k12.wa.us/Improvement/FederalGrants/DefinitionPersistentlyLowestAchievingSchools.pdf>

Indicator (d)(3) State Plan:

For 2009-2010:

1. <http://www.k12.wa.us/Improvement/FederalGrants/SchoolImprovementListTierI-II-%20IIISchools.pdf>

For subsequent years:

1. By **June 30 of each year**, DSIA will generate a list of Title I schools in improvement, corrective, action, or restructuring based on data from spring state assessments.
2. By **July 15 of each year**, DSIA will apply the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” to identify and count the number of Title I schools from this list that will be designated as persistently lowest-achieving.
3. Identified schools and their districts will be notified by **August 1** of this designation.
4. This information will be placed on the OSPI website by **August 31 of each year**.
5. No budget will be required to complete this activity.

Indicator (d)(4) State Plan:

For 2009-2010:

<http://www.k12.wa.us/Improvement/SIG/default.aspx>

For subsequent years:

1. By **June 30 of each year**, DSIA will generate a list of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring based on data from spring state assessments.
2. By **July 15 of each year**, DSIA will apply the definitions of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” and schools that have been “turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed” to identify and count the number of Title I schools from this list that will be designated as turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.
3. Identified schools and their districts will be notified by **August 1** of this designation.
4. This information will be placed on the OSPI website by **August 31 of each year**.
5. No budget will be required to complete this activity.

Indicator (d)(5) State Plan:

For 2009-2010:

1. <http://www.k12.wa.us/Improvement/FederalGrants/SchoolImprovementListTierI-II-%20IIISchools.pdf>

For subsequent years:

1. By **June 30 of each year**, DSIA will generate a list of secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds.
This list is based on data regarding Title I designation from each district in the state.
2. By **July 15 of each year**, DSIA will apply the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” to identify and count the number of schools from this list that will be designated as persistently lowest-achieving.
3. Identified schools and their districts will be notified by **August 1** of this designation.
4. This information will be placed on the OSPI website by **August 31 of each year**.
5. No budget will be required to complete this activity.

Indicator (d)(6) State Plan:

For 2009-2010:

<http://www.k12.wa.us/Improvement/SIG/default.aspx>

For subsequent years:

1. By **June 30 of each year**, DSIA will generate a list of secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive Title I funds.
This list is based on data regarding Title I designation from each district in the state.
2. By **July 15 of each year**, DSIA will apply the definitions of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” and schools that have been “turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed” to identify and count the number of secondary schools from this list that will be designated as turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.

3. Identified schools and their districts will be notified by **August 1** of this designation.
4. This information will be placed on the OSPI website by **August 31 of each year**.
5. No budget will be required to complete this activity.

Indicator (d)(7) – Indicator (d)(12)

Washington State does not have a law authorizing charter schools. Currently, no charter schools operate in Washington State and no charter school data are collected. This information will be posted at the following link:
<http://www.k12.wa.us/Communications/StimulusPackage/FiscalStabilization.aspx>

PART3C: General Requirements

Part 3C(1)	Describe the processes the State employs to review and verify the required data and other information on the indicators and descriptors.
-------------------	---

All data reported to the public and to the US Department of Education are reviewed and verified in several ways. Data files received from LEAs are validated against business rules for incoming data and data that cannot pass the validation rules are rejected. Accepted data are then reviewed for reasonableness, and questionable data are shared with the LEA for explanation and correction. Data files from vendors (such as assessment records) are validated by two departments in OSPI (Assessment and Student Information, and Information Technology). Preliminary assessment records are posted for LEA review and editing (not scores but demographics, enrollment information, and program participation). Business rules and requirements documents are developed by program managers and business owners for Information Technology developers and as each application is developed its functionality is validated and data verified by business owners. EDEN/CSPR submissions are validated by program managers and business owners.

Part 3C(2)	Describe the processes the State employs to ensure that, consistent with 34 CFR 99.31(b), the required data and other information are not made publicly available in a manner that personally identifies students, where applicable.
-------------------	---

Washington’s SEA abides by 34 CFR 99.31(b) through adherence to governing state law Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 42.56.230 and SEA policy on the Confidentiality of Student Data. No identifiable student records are available on the public website. All confidential information made available to LEAs is maintained on a secure web-based application that requires a password protected logon. Each LEA has a district security manager who grants access to that district’s identifiable student records, as needed based on individual security roles. Aggregated or summarized data are also presented in a manner to protect unintentional identification that may arise due to information about unique or small groups of students. All cells with n<10 are suppressed.

All SEA employees also sign a non-disclosure of confidential information form upon their employment.

Final Note:

The URLs in the application document will enable Washington State to provide data and information directly to the public in a manner that is useful for stakeholders.

Upon approval of this application and plan for state reporting and updating of information, a summary of State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II information will be submitted to the Washington Recovery Team Tracking website which lists funding received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Please see: <http://www.recovery.wa.gov/>

###