



NCLB Compliance Report 2007: Washington School Districts in "Improvement" Status FINAL REPORT

Since the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001, the federal government has assumed a stronger role in education. This law clearly sets forth an expectation that all children achieve their state's academic standards and that schools, districts and states be more accountable for student learning. Under No Child Left Behind, schools and districts that receive federal education dollars (Title I) and miss making achievement goals, commonly referred to as Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), face specific consequences. In our state, reading and math scores from the Washington Assessment of Student Learning are used to calculate AYP.

Schools are expected to make AYP in up to 37 different categories, and districts are evaluated in as many as 111 categories. Any school or district not making AYP for two consecutive years the same subject area (e.g., reading in 2006 and 2007) is identified for "improvement" status. And until AYP is achieved in every category for two years in a row, schools and districts continue to be identified as needing to improve. Making it one year but missing it the next means a school or district stays on the federal "improvement" list and restarts the two-year cycle of making AYP.

This report includes the names of all districts identified for federal "improvement" based on assessment data analyzed by OSPI. Most school districts receive federal Title I education funds and therefore face federally-mandated consequences if they are in improvement status. All districts on the list receive Title I funds.

While federal law may require our state to apply a specific definition of "needs improvement," our education system is based on the premise that *all* schools and districts strive to make continuous improvements to help students experience academic success.

Updated information from preliminary release: There were no changes in the number of districts identified for school improvement from the August release, however, the number of categories in which a district made AYP may have changed.

Districts in Improvement –

There are 30 districts identified for "improvement" status based on the preliminary data. Each category is complex, with some districts making AYP this year but needing another year of success to exit "improvement" and others not making enough gains this year to meet the goal.

NCLB Compliance Report 2007: Washington School Districts in "Improvement" Status FINAL REPORT

Step 1 (12 districts)

Districts in Step 1 must develop a district improvement plan and have the option to accept technical assistance from OSPI.

There are three reasons why districts are in Step 1: 1) they were in Step 1 last year, made AYP in 2007 and need to make AYP in 2008; 2) they did not make AYP but made AYP in enough categories and grades to avoid moving to step 2; or 3) they missed AYP for a second year in a row and are now identified for improvement.

District	Status in 2006	Met AYP in 2007	Progress to Next Step?	Status in 2007	# of "YES" groups in 2007	# of "NO" groups in 2007	Percent YES groups
Kennewick	Step 1	No	No	Step 1	56	11	83.6%
Lake Chelan	Step 1	No	No	Step 1	58	3	95.1%
Longview	Step 1	No	No	Step 1	47	8	85.5%
Mount Adams	Step 1	No	No	Step 1	35	14	71.4%
North Thurston	Step 1	No	No	Step 1	72	3	96.0%
Quincy	Step 1	No	No	Step 1	59	6	90.8%
Sedro-Woolley	Step 1	No	No	Step 1	54	9	85.7%
Toppenish	Step 1	No	No	Step 1	50	17	74.6%
Walla Walla	Step 1	No	No	Step 1	57	12	82.6%
Warden	Step 1	No	No	Step 1	54	3	94.7%
Clover Park		No	Yes	Step 1	66	17	79.5%
Tukwila		No	Yes	Step 1	70	23	75.3%

NCLB Compliance Report 2007: Washington School Districts in "Improvement" Status FINAL REPORT

Step 2, District Improvement (18 districts)

In this step, districts must work in collaboration with OSPI to address the targeted areas with reading and mathematics programs and instructional interventions that are effective in improving student learning.

Once districts enter Step 2, they remain in this step until they make AYP across all tested grades for two consecutive years.

District	Status in 2006	Met AYP in 2007	Progress to Next Step?	Status in 2007	# of "YES" groups in 2007	# of "NO" groups in 2007	Percent YES groups
Bethel	Step 1	No	Yes	Step 2	60	11	84.5%
Burlington-Edison	Step 1	No	Yes	Step 2	54	13	80.6%
Grandview	Step 1	No	Yes	Step 2	47	20	70.1%
Granger	Step 1	No	Yes	Step 2	31	16	66.0%
Sunnyside	Step 1	No	Yes	Step 2	42	21	66.7%
Vancouver	Step 1	No	Yes	Step 2	64	13	83.1%
Yakima	Step 1	No	Yes	Step 2	49	22	69.0%
Highline	Step 2	No	No	Step 2	70	19	78.7%
Marysville	Step 2	No	No	Step 2	60	15	80.0%
Mount Vernon	Step 2	No	No	Step 2	53	18	74.6%
Othello	Step 2	No	No	Step 2	53	16	76.8%
Pasco	Step 2	No	No	Step 2	49	22	69.0%
Renton	Step 2	No	No	Step 2	69	18	79.3%
Seattle	Step 2	No	No	Step 2	69	18	79.3%
Tacoma	Step 2	No	No	Step 2	67	12	84.8%
Wahluke	Step 2	No	No	Step 2	43	21	67.2%
Wapato	Step 2	No	No	Step 2	59	20	74.7%
Wenatchee	Step 2	No	No	Step 2	53	16	76.8%