2018–19 Learning Assistance Program (LAP)
Consolidated Program Review Technical Assistance

Purpose of the Consolidated Program Review (CPR) Process and this Document
The Learning Assistance Program (LAP) review is a regular, systematic examination of a Local Educational Agency’s (LEA’s) administration and implementation of state Learning Assistance Programs. The purpose of this document is to help LAP directors assemble the documentation required for a program review and to strengthen existing Learning Assistance Programs.

The LAP review, in conjunction with other state and federal program reviews, aims to ensure that all children in Washington have a significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education. The review provides evidence that Learning Assistance Programs exhibit a focus on improving student academic achievement and ensures LEA compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements.

The LAP review encompasses the following areas:
1. Accountability
2. Fiscal Procedures
3. Program Implementation and Evaluation

Questions about the Learning Assistance Program may be directed to LAP@k12.wa.us or 360-725-6100.

Review Process and Timeline
Each LEA in Washington State receiving LAP base and/or high poverty funds is scheduled for a program review at least once every five years. Some LEAs may be selected more than once every five years based on their size or risk factors. LAP is one program of several state and federal programs that participate in the CPR process. A schedule is available at http://www.k12.wa.us/consolidatedreview/default.aspx.

The CPR process is as follows:
1. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) notifies each LEA scheduled for a CPR review and of the timeline for submitting required materials.
2. The LEA uploads all documentation for review to the online EDS Program Monitor tool beginning 12 weeks prior to the CPR review start date. The CPR tool is locked two weeks prior to the visit and the LEA is no longer able to upload documentation for the initial review process.
3. Documentation is reviewed by OSPI Title I, Part A/LAP staff prior to the LEA’s official review start date, and staff may contact the LEA as necessary to resolve compliance issues where identified.
4. DESK REVIEWS:
   a. Review is Monday through Thursday, with phone exit on Friday or the following Monday.
   b. Final report is emailed to the LEA prior to the phone exit.
5. ON-SITE REVIEWS:
   a. Documentation is reviewed prior to the LEA on-site review date and OSPI Title I, Part A/LAP staff may contact LEA staff as necessary to resolve compliance issues where identified. This will happen either prior to the visit or during the visit.
   b. Building visits—regardless of prior notice, any school within the LEA is subject to possible review.
   c. LAP review includes interviews with key individuals who oversee and implement federal and state programs.
   d. Exit meeting to review (if applicable) noncompliance items, technical assistance and commendations.

6. Commendations, technical assistance, and noncompliant items will be listed in the CPR exit report.

7. LEAs are required to submit response(s) to noncompliant items within 45 calendar days of the visit or desk review exit phone call.

8. OSPI manages all responses within the online EDS Program Monitor tool.

9. OSPI tracks follow-up documentation until all issues are resolved. After all noncompliant items are resolved, OSPI notifies LEA via email regarding completion of the review and closes the review.

Organizing and Submitting Materials for Review

To facilitate the review, the Learning Assistance Program office asks that each LEA organize and submit documentation through the EDS Program Monitoring tool. Documentation must be uploaded to its corresponding tab under LAP.

For questions or assistance uploading documentation, please contact Timothy McNeely at timothy.mcneely@k12.wa.us. For LAP assistance, please call the Title I, Part A/LAP office at 360-725-6100.
# Learning Assistance Program: List of Required Materials by Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPR Tool Section/Item Tab</th>
<th>Item Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab 2.1</td>
<td>State Requirements and Best Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix 1: Sample best practice and LAP program description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Procedures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab 2.2</td>
<td>High-Poverty Schools Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix 2: Sample expenditure report and chart of accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Implementation and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab 2.3</td>
<td>LAP Data Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab 2.4</td>
<td>Program Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix 3: Sample description of effective implementation of best practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Materials and Required Evidence

Additional information to assist in the documentation process is provided for each item in the blue highlighted area of the “Evidence to Submit” column. Evidence, unless otherwise stated, should reflect activities for the 2018–19 school year.

School/Building Selection Guidance for Evidence Documentation

1. **Desk Review**
   - Local Educational Agency’s (LEAs) with student enrollment of 5,000 and under: Submit documentation for up to 3 LAP schools with the highest per pupil expenditure (PPE). NOTE: Unless noted below (item 2.2), please follow these directions for determining building level evidence.
   - LEAs with student enrollment of 5,001 and over: Submit documentation for up to 6 LAP schools with the highest PPE. NOTE: Unless noted below (item 2.2), please follow these directions for determining building level evidence.
   - The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) staff may request documentation for additional buildings based on initial review.

2. **On-site Review**
   - Submit building documentation only for the buildings identified by OSPI for on-site reviews. NOTE: Unless noted below (item 2.2), please follow these directions for determining building level evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evidence to Submit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>State Requirements and Best Practices</td>
<td>LEA Level and Building Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | *To the extent they are included as a best practice or strategy in one of the state menus or an approved alternative, services and activities for LAP must be consistent with the provisions of RCW 28A.165.035 and RCW 28A.165.015.* | □ A. Identify the best practice(s) from the Menus of Best Practices the LEA is utilizing for LAP services in English language arts, mathematics, and/or behavior.  
□ B. Describe the LAP program(s) for English language arts, mathematics, behavior, and/or graduation assistance implemented in the LEA buildings.  
Questions to consider:  
  - How are students identified for service?  
  - How often are students progress monitored?  
  - How often and what type of services are provided to students at the various grade levels?  
  - What is the focus of service and how is that focus determined? |

Required of: Only schools selected for CPR review.
Background Information: LEAs must use practices or strategies from the state Menus of Best Practices and Strategies to assist students struggling at all grade levels in English language arts, mathematics and behavior. LEAs may only use a practice or strategy that is not on a state menu for two years initially, with prior OSPI approval. If the LEA is able to demonstrate improved outcomes for participating students over the previous two years at a level commensurate with the best practices and strategies in a state menu, OSPI shall approve use of the alternative practice or strategy by the LEA for one additional school year. Annual approval by OSPI to use the alternative practice or strategy is dependent on the LEA continuing to demonstrate increased improved outcomes for participating students.

Resources:
See Appendix 1 for a sample best practice and LAP program description
ELA, Math, and Behavior Menus of Best Practices

2.2 High-Poverty Schools Allocation

LEAs must distribute the high poverty-based (LAP) allocation to the schools that generated the funding allocation. RCW 28A.150.260(10)(a)(ii)

An LEA’s high poverty-based allocation is generated by its qualifying school buildings and must be expended by the LEA for those buildings. This funding must supplement and not supplant the LEA’s expenditures under this chapter for those school buildings. RCW 28A.165.055

LEA Level

☐ A. Provide an expenditure report for each building receiving a high poverty school-based allocation in the 2017–18 school year. The reports provided must show the amount of high poverty school-based funds allocated to the building, expenditures, and the amount remaining.

☐ B. Provide an LEA chart of accounts, which includes location and program account codes.

Note: Demonstrate that buildings received their school-based LAP allocation by showing the amount budgeted to each building. LEAs must establish a process to track high poverty school-based LAP funds with sub-coding. Providing a report with only LEA expenditures does not sufficiently demonstrate compliance with this requirement.

Required of: All schools receiving a LAP high poverty-based allocation in school year 2017–18.

Background Information: LEAs are required to allocate LAP high poverty-based funds to the buildings generating the funds. The funding must supplement and not supplant the LEA’s LAP Base funds in those schools. Track the high poverty-based funds throughout the year.
### 2.3 LAP Data Reporting

The primary purpose of program monitoring is to evaluate the effectiveness of an LEA’s allocation and expenditure of resources and monitor school LEA fidelity in implementing best practices. RCW 28A.165.065

To the extent they are included as a best practice or strategy in one of the state menus or an approved alternative, services and activities for LAP must be consistent with the provisions of RCW 28A.165.035 and RCW 28A.165.015.

### LEA Level

For this section, OSPI staff will use evidence from the 2017–18 LAP Data Report. If a comment from OSPI is present below, additional evidence is needed for 2.3.B. OSPI program monitors will let you know if information is needed via an email through the Program Monitor tool. Provide additional information related to the area requested only. Otherwise, this item is Compliant.

- **A.** After reviewing the LAP Data Report, no additional evidence is needed at this time.
- **B.** After reviewing the LAP Data Report, additional evidence of the services provided by the LEA in 2017–18 is needed in the following areas:
  - Professional learning
  - Family engagement
  - Readiness to learn
  - Graduation assistance
  - K–4 ELA focus

**Required of:** All LEAs receiving a LAP allocation

**Background Information:** LEAs must report to OSPI the specific practices, activities, and programs used by each school building that received LAP funding. The primary purpose of program monitoring is to evaluate the effectiveness of a LEA’s allocation and expenditure of resources and monitor LEA fidelity in implementing best practices. OSPI may provide technical assistance to LEAs to improve the effectiveness of Learning Assistance Programs.

Additionally, LEAs implementing a Learning Assistance program must focus first on addressing the needs of students in grades K–4 who are deficient in reading or reading readiness skills to improve reading literacy. A LEA may meet this requirement during the regular school year by ensuring that of the total number of students in grades K–4 served by LAP, approximately fifty percent are students receive ELA services.
### Program Implementation and Evaluation

The primary purpose of program monitoring is to evaluate the effectiveness of an LEA’s allocation and expenditure of resources and monitor LEA fidelity in implementing best practices. RCW 28A.165.065

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Resources</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to learn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LEA and Building Level

- A. Describe how the LEA ensures buildings effectively implement best practices from the Menus of Best Practices for LAP services.

Questions to consider:
- How do you evaluate programs using the cycle of inquiry?
- How are services reviewed for effectiveness?
- Who is involved in the review?
- How often are modifications made to services provided?
- How is it determined if a service is effective or needs modification?
- How do you ensure educator effectiveness within the implementation of services provided?

**Required of:** All LEAs receiving a LAP allocation

**Background Information:** The primary purpose of program monitoring is to evaluate the effectiveness of an LEA’s allocation and expenditure of resources and to monitor LEA fidelity in implementing best practices. OSPI may provide technical assistance to LEAs to improve the effectiveness of Learning Assistance Programs.

**Resources:**
See Appendix 3 for a sample descriptions of effective implementation of best practices.
Appendices:
Sample Documents
Appendix 1: Sample best practice and LAP program description

Sample 2.1 A – Identify the best practice(s) from the Menus of Best Practices the LEA is utilizing for LAP services in English language arts, mathematics, and/or behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School(s)</th>
<th>Elementary School 1</th>
<th>Elementary School 2</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice(s)</td>
<td>Tutoring by an adult, Targeted professional learning, Consultant teachers/Instructional coaches</td>
<td>Tutoring by an adult, De-escalation</td>
<td>Grade 8 to high school transitions</td>
<td>Credit retrieval, After school tutoring by an adult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples of the four schools listed show how LAP funds are utilized in different ways at each school.

List all of the best practices implemented from the Menus that are supported with LAP funds. You will describe the strategy/program listed here for each practice below in 2.1 B.
Sample 2.1 B – LAP schools with the highest PPE (see Guidance for Evidence Documentation)

Describe the LAP program(s) for English language arts, mathematics, behavior, and/or graduation assistance implemented in the LEA buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School(s)</th>
<th>Elementary School 1</th>
<th>Elementary School 2</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Description of LAP program(s)** | Tutoring by an adult  
The LAP teacher and paraeducators provide small group intervention for students in ELA at grades K–4. Students are pulled out of the general education setting for 30 minutes, three times a week. Skills targeted during intervention vary depending on the largest need as identified by assessments in phonemic awareness, alphabet knowledge, phonics, vocabulary and comprehension, as appropriate.  
**Targeted professional learning**  
After looking at our needs assessment and LAP-served student performance on early literacy assessments, we determined the need to support teacher knowledge in the areas of vocabulary development and comprehension. We have planned four professional development sessions throughout the year.  
**Consultant teachers/Instructional coaches**  
LAP is funding an instructional coach in ELA to work with general education staff who teach LAP-served students. The coach provides follow-up support for our professional development days (see above). | Tutoring by an adult  
A LAP-funded paraeducator provides push-in intervention for 4th graders in math. Services are done in small groups within the classroom two times per week for a 25-minute math period. The paraeducator works with students based on collaboration with the general education teacher around formative assessment results.  
**De-escalation**  
After looking at Office Discipline Referral (ODR) and Antecedent-Behavior-Consequence (ABC) data, we determined the need for professional learning for educators working with LAP-served students. We provided a training of trainers for our administrators and support staff in September. In addition, de-escalation trainings are periodically built into our staff meetings over the course of the year. | Grade 8 to high school transitions  
Based on grades and SBA scores, we identified students who may be at risk for significant challenges in high school. These students work with a LAP-funded counselor. Activities are scheduled monthly and focus around school culture and habits of success needed for high school. | Credit retrieval  
A highly qualified teacher works with students in a zero period who need support retrieving science credit.  
**After school tutoring by an adult**  
We provide an after school program to 9th and 10th graders who are not yet performing at grade-level standards. A certificated teacher provides instruction focused on goal setting, time management, study skills, and strategies for reading across the disciplines. Students attend for one hour twice per week. |

The examples provided describe the LAP program(s) funded at each school as listed above in 2.1 A. If multiple LAP programs occur, describe each. Please include the following features, as applicable: frequency and duration of student services, grade levels served, staffing, how the service was determined.
## Appendix 2: Sample expenditure report and chart of accounts

**Sample 2.2 A** – Provide an expenditure report for each building receiving a high poverty school-based allocation in the 2017–18 school year. The reports provided must show the amount of high poverty school-based funds allocated to the building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2017-18 Allocation</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Encumbrance</th>
<th>2017-18 Balance</th>
<th>18-19 Carryover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAP Hi Pov Elem</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>104,431.00</td>
<td>104,216.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>214.89</td>
<td>214.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAP Hi Pov Middle</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>46,038.00</td>
<td>44,515.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,522.89</td>
<td>1,522.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAP Hi Pov High</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55,175.00</td>
<td>50,897.88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,277.12</td>
<td>4,277.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include the building codes on the expenditure report, or provide a separate chart of accounts (see example below).

**Sample 2.2 B** – Provide an LEA chart of accounts, which includes location and program account codes.

[Chart of Accounts_Redacted.pdf](Chart of Accounts_Redacted.pdf)
Appendix 3: Sample descriptions of effective implementation of best practices

Sample 2.4 A – Describe how the LEA ensures buildings effectively implement best practices from the Menus of Best Practices for LAP services.

Sample 1 – English Language Arts: The Learning and Teaching department coordinates quarterly meetings for LAP staff and literacy coaches to measure whether ELA interventions are being implemented as planned. To measure effectiveness of our programs, we start by looking at the students’ progress monitoring data. The literacy coaches also observe LAP staff and use an observational tool to provide feedback and improve implementation fidelity. This data is reviewed at our quarterly meetings. LAP staff also share effective practices and workshop problems of practice. We set clear milestones for student academic progress in order to make responsive changes to the content, environment, frequency and duration when needed.

Sample 2 – Behavior: The district PBIS facilitator and school PBIS team (which includes the LAP teacher) meets monthly to evaluate whether the Check-In/Check-Out (CICO) program is being implemented according to the plan. The team looks at LAP-served student progress using CICO data in conjunction with progress monitoring data in ELA and mathematics.

Sample 3 – Math: Our high school math department teams, district math coaches, and the district LAP coordinator meet quarterly during PLC time. During these meetings, teams look at progress of students who receive a double dosing intervention to see if students are making growth towards grade-level standards. Instruction and curriculum in these interventions is designed to engage students with mathematics through project-based learning activities. The additional course provided in the double dose intervention offers teachers more time to scaffold students’ mathematical discourse and support foundational skills. Staff revise individual goals for students after reviewing student work. An unexpected benefit of this intervention is teachers’ stronger understanding of the learning progressions for mathematical understanding.

Include information about: team members, frequency of meeting, goals and expectations of the meetings, improvement benchmarks, data sources and use, processes for ensuring implementation fidelity and evaluating impact.