

Washington State

Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

Due: September 1, 2003



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

As described in the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their September 1, 2003, consolidated applications is listed below.

Summary of Information Required for September 1, 2003 Submission

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS AND ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34)).
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).

Performance goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- 4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.
- 5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

This workbook format has been developed to facilitate preparation and submission of the information required in this September 1, 2003, submission. States may use this format or another format of their choosing provided that all required information is provided in a clear and concise manner. The deadline for submission of this application is September 1, 2003.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

Table of Contents

Glossary.....Page 5

Performance Indicator 2.1 (English Language Proficiency).....Page 6

Performance Indicator 3.1 (Highly Qualified Teachers).....Page 19

Performance Indicator 3.2 (Professional Development).....Page 26

Performance Indicator 3.3 (Paraprofessionals).....Page 27

Performance Indicator 4.1 (Persistently Dangerous Schools).....Page 29

Performance Indicator 5.1 (High School Graduation).....Page 30

Performance Indicator 5.2 (High School Dropout).....Page 33

Appendix A (Five English Language Proficiency Levels).....Page 36

Appendix B (Writing EALRs).....Page 40

Appendix B (Reading EALRs).....Page 41

GLOSSARY

Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) means challenging academic content standards. EALRs adopted in eight academic content areas include: Communication, Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, Arts, Health and Fitness.

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) is Washington State's State Educational Agency (SEA).

Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) is a nineteen member board, (appointed by the governor) that serves as an advisory body to the SEA and as the sole advisory body to the State Board of Education. The board has rule making authority for the assessment of basic skills and subject knowledge of teachers.

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) means Washington state law.

State Board of Education (SBE) is a board comprised of one member from each congressional district of the state (elected by members of the boards of directors of school districts thereof), the state Superintendent of Public Instruction as an ex officio member, and one member elected at large by the members of boards of directors of approved private schools in the state. This board holds primary rule-making authority for all matters related to teacher preparation, excepting those allocated to the PESB.

Washington Administrative Code (WAC) are rules supporting the RCW.

Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) is a criterion-referenced assessment system aligned with state standards in listening, reading, writing and mathematics administered at grades 4, 7, and 10.

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

For this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, states must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**
- **Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)**

STATE RESPONSE

Washington State's Efforts to Establish ELD (ELP) Standards

The state of Washington has currently completed a preliminary draft of our English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards for Grades K through 12, which we have renamed English Language Development (ELD) Standards. These standards are aligned with our state's academic content standards, i.e., Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs), in reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The ELD Standards are intended to provide a scaffold to help English Language Learners (ELLs) meet the state academic content standards.

The ELD Standards function as stepping-stones for ELLs at various English language proficiency levels. As students become more proficient in English, the ELD Standards more closely resemble the EALRs. The ELD Standards are intended to provide educators with the foundations for ELL curriculum, instruction, and assessment in the state of Washington. We view proficiency in the EALRs as our ultimate goal for all Washington students, inclusive of ELLs.

The EALRs in writing and listening/speaking are written with benchmarks measured at grades four, seven, and ten. The newly revised reading EALRs have been articulated with specific grade level content expectations, kindergarten through Grade ten. Upon recommendation of the ELD Standards Planning Committee, the ELD Standards are written in grade bands: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12, to reflect the state's benchmark levels.

In developing the ELD Standards and to strengthen alignment, the writing team followed the format of the state's reading EALRs, beginning with a specific academic content standard or "Essential Learning", then developing student performance expectations by grade span and language proficiency level. Five proficiency levels were defined as Beginner, Advanced

Beginner, Intermediate, Advanced, and Transitional. (Descriptions of the five proficiency levels can be found in Appendix A.) The EALRs were scaffolded with the ELD Standards to include what students should be able to do at each language proficiency level within a grade band to meet state academic content and achievement standards.

The ELD standard levels align well to the language assessments used by the state. They are:

Level	ELD	WLPT (R/W)	LAS-O (L/S)
Level I	Beginning	Beginning	Beginning
Level II	Advanced Beginner	Advanced Beginning	Intermediate
Level III	Intermediate	Intermediate	Advanced
Level IV	Advanced	Advanced (Proficient)	Proficient
Level V	Transitional	Exited	Exited

In reviewing the Title III requirements, the ELD planning committee recommended adding a “transitional” level to provide educators guidance during the two year follow-up after students exit the bilingual/ESL program to ensure continuity in instruction.

The level descriptors provided below will help teachers to understand the ELD Standards. A clearer picture of the abilities of the students for which the ELD Standards were designed will help teachers to see how these ELD Standards serve as an entry point toward meeting the state’s academic content standards. Students who meet the successively higher expectations at each level of the ELD Standards develop the language skills they need to be successful in the general education classroom.

The ELD Standards are divided into three areas that reflect the four language domains: reading, writing, and listening/speaking. The reading and writing ELD Standards are aligned with the current reading and writing EALRs and reflect appropriate expectations for ELLs at each proficiency level within a grade span (K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12). The listening/speaking ELD Standards are aligned with the communication EALRs and reflect the needs for social as well as academic language development for ELLs. There is also a focus on cultural communication, which is not central to the EALRs but plays a significant role in the success of ELLs within the regular school program.

The draft of the ELD Standards will be shared with educators across the state during the 2003-04 school year. The SEA will systematically collect feedback on the content and format of these standards and release a revised version of the ELD Standards based on comments from the field by the beginning of the 2004-05 school year (See schedule below).

To address the areas of mathematics and science, the SEA is reviewing the math and science EALRs and researching the English language demands in order to link ELD Standards with these content areas.

ELD Standards Implementation Plan:

September 2003	Develop training modules. Develop ELD feedback processes
October 2003	Release draft standards, Washington State Promising Practices Conference. Publish on the SEA website in multiple formats. Distribute feedback form.
January 2004	Release draft standards at Washington State Education Reform Conference. Distribute feedback form.
February 2004	Ten-hour training series on second language acquisition and ELD Standards.
Spring 2004	Revisit ELD Standards with feedback from the field. Plan for Year Two of implementation. Continue researching math and science ELD Standard linking.
Summer 2004	Provide three-hour training components on ELD Standards at Washington State Summer Institutes.
September 2004	Release revised draft of ELD Standards. Begin writing math and science ELD Standards.

The standards were developed by language development educators, based on their knowledge of research and experience in the field. Standards were written to directly link to state EALRs. However, because ELL tests were chosen before the ELD Standards were written, some discrepancies would not be surprising. We expect a large-scale test to align with a subset of academic content standards with the remainder of the standards assessed in the classroom. An alignment study was conducted to see whether reading, writing, and listening/speaking test questions matched intended ELD standards sufficiently for content validity on large-scale instruments.

On July 16 and 17, 2003, a committee convened and examined the ELL assessment instruments approved for the state. These assessments were the:

- Washington Language Proficiency Test (WLPT): Reading and Writing
- Language Proficiency Test Series – Oral (LPTS – O)
- Language Assessment Scale – Oral (LAS-O) and LPTS-O

The committee examined each item or task and identified which ELD Standards(s), if any, it addressed. The findings for each subject are listed below.

Writing:

The writing component of the WLPT had fairly good content coverage for three of the four writing Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs):

- Grades 3-12 matched all of EALRs 1 and 2, and part of 3.
- Grades K-2 matched part of EALR 1 and all of EALR 2 and part of 3.

(For a description of these EALRs, see appendix B.)

The WLPT Writing assessment follows a writing process that models classroom instruction where students are involved in preplanning and prewriting activities prior to their final draft. As a result, it parallels with the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) writing assessments, which is currently given to all students in Grades 4, 7, and 10. Although the writing WASL has good directions, the WLPT needs more clear and concise directions to encourage students to use the writing planning process to write at their proficiency levels. The discrimination between the levels of proficiency on the WLPT writing test could improve. This is likely because the rubric was written describing lower scores as deficient, rather than descriptive of levels of language development.

MetriTech, the publisher of the WLPT, has signaled its willingness to work with the state to make the test fit our needs. The results of the alignment study show that if the rubric and directions were redesigned, the test would be a better fit.

Reading:

The WLPT differentiates between levels by the complexity of the text. There are four EALRs in reading. The WLPT reading test addressed three of the four. (For a description of the reading EALRs, see Appendix C.) Although the WLPT addressed selected ranges of proficiency levels within the same grade band as the ELD Standards, Grades 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12 were found not to assess beginning skills well. Test items at these grades most closely addressed EALR 2, which deals with comprehension skills. The K-2 test assessed beginning skills; however, the amount of text for kindergarten students was too difficult for them. In some cases, the passage had appropriate difficulty, but the stems had extremely complex text. For the time being, the WLPT Reading is deemed as a satisfactory match with the Washington ELD Standards. These revised standards will be presented to the field over the next year for comment.

Oral Tests (Speaking/Listening):

Washington has not yet approved a single test for measuring growth in oral proficiency.

Currently, the LPTS-O and LAS-O are approved for:

1. Determining if students are eligible to be served within the state Bilingual/ESL program.
2. Determining year-to-year growth in listening and speaking English proficiency skills.

There was little correspondence between the LPTS-O and the ELD Standards. This was partly because part of the test is a reading task. As designed by the test publisher, MetriTech, the LPTS-O is primarily a screener for the WLPT reading and writing task. The category labeled “Proficient” on the LPTS-O means that the student is proficient enough to take the WLPT reading and writing tests, not that they are at an exit level. Consequently the test does not assess skills with the range needed to cover both beginning and exit levels.

The LAS-O provided better alignment to the ELD Standards and had a greater variety of tasks spanning a larger difficulty range than the LPTS-O. Although it has more range than the LPTS-O, the LAS-O may still show a ceiling effect. The LAS-O and other LAS assessments are undergoing a rewrite. The test may improve within the next year or two as the publisher is undertaking a total redesign of the LAS.

Conclusion:

The conclusion of this study is that there is considerable misalignment between the ELD Standards and some of the existing approved Washington Language Proficiency Tests. There is not enough content validity here to engage in the task of setting cut scores that delineate the proficient levels. As an interim plan we will use publisher described cut scores that adequately distinguish between beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels. Our long term strategy is to look for or develop assessments that have a better match to the standard.

The ELD standard levels align well to the language assessments used by the state. They are:

Level	ELD	WLPT (R/W)	LAS-O (L/S)
Level I	Beginning	Beginning	Beginning
Level II	Advanced Beginner	Advanced Beginning	Intermediate
Level III	Intermediate	Intermediate	Advanced
Level IV	Advanced	Advanced (Proficient)	Proficient
Level V	Transitional	Exited	Exited

Aligned Assessment Plan:

September 2003

- Standards development groups meets with assessment experts to decide how to handle assessable elements of the standard.

November 2003–March 2004

- Review existing instruments, looking for a better match.
- Work with MetriTech to write new items, change the writing rubric, pilot test new items.
- Research the underlying content structure of emerging instruments.
- Explore consortia dedicated to ELP instruments.
- Look at new and revised commercial instruments.
- Assess relative advantages, costs of different assessment strategies, keeping in mind that assessment costs come directly from bilingual instructional budgets which are already small.

April 2004

- Write RFP for development/adoption OR join one of the consortia.

May 2004–September 2004

- Review responses to RFP; see if MetriTech instruments can be modified adequately.
- Choose a contractor/consortium.

October 2004–January 2005

- Item development or adaptation/test design.

Fall 2005

- Pilot testing.

Spring 2006

- Operational test.

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. English language proficiency baseline data should include all students in the state who were identified as limited English proficient by state-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each state-selected ELP assessment(s).
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by state ELP standards and ELP assessments.
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

2. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency.
- Be aggregated at the state level.
- If a state is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the state must:
 - Describe how the composite score was derived.
 - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score.
 - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

STATE RESPONSE

Baseline data for the Oral Language Proficiency Tests (OLPTs) were not available due to lack of infrastructure capacity in the data collection system at the state level. However, this capacity will be in place by the end of October 2003, allowing the collection of this data at that time. The SEA will provide its final baseline data to the USDOE no later than January 15, 2004, following its collection and verification process. At that time, the SEA will set its annual targets.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

Baseline data for the reading and writing is included below. The numbers reported below reflect the publisher’s cut scores and may change dependent on subsequent analysis of ELD Standards. At that time, the SEA may revise its baseline and annual targets.

TEST NAME	N/ %	Unkn	Level	Level	Level	Proficient	LEP
			I	II	III	Level IV	Total
Washington Language Proficiency Test - Reading Grades 9-12	N %	132 1%	7,212 68%	2,732 26%	497 5%	43 0%	10,616 100%
Washington Language Proficiency Test - Reading Grades 6-8	N %	64 1%	4,773 44%	3,413 32%	1,850 17%	689 6%	10,789 100%
Washington Language Proficiency Test - Reading Grades 3-5	N %	112 1%	6,806 40%	5,395 32%	3,253 19%	1,454 9%	17,020 100%
Washington Language Proficiency Test - Reading Grades K-2	N %	269 1%	14,762 59%	5,830 23%	2,457 10%	1,642 7%	24,960 100%

TEST NAME	N/ %	Unkn	Level	Level	Proficient		LEP
			I	II	III	IV	Total
Washington Language Proficiency Test - Writing Grades 9-12	N %	164 2%	8,769 83%	1,348 13%	304 3%	31 0%	10,616 100%
Washington Language Proficiency Test - Writing Grades 6-8	N %	109 1%	4,364 40%	3,909 36%	2,253 21%	154 1%	10,789 100%
Washington Language Proficiency Test - Writing Grades 3-5	N %	172 1%	1,976 12%	4,236 25%	8,243 48%	2,393 14%	17,020 100%
Washington Language Proficiency Test - Writing Grades K-2	N %	261 1%	10,626 43%	1,734 7%	4,920 20%	7,419 30%	24,960 100%

(1) List all of the state-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2002-03 school year to assess LEP students.

(2) Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s).

(3-6) Number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency, as defined by state ELP standards and ELP assessments. If the state uses labels such as Level 1, Level 2, etc., the level at which students are designated “Proficient” should be indicated. For example, in this sample format, students at Level 4 are considered proficient in English. States should use the same ELP labels as defined in state ELP standards and assessment(s). If the ELP standards and assessment(s) define more than four levels, the table should be expanded to incorporate all levels.

STATE RESPONSE

How is comprehension used in the overall score?

The Washington Language Proficiency Test (WLPT) in reading incorporates three comprehension components into the total score. Literal, implicit, and inferential comprehension items are included on each test. Student reports include a report of the raw score the student earned on each component. The test uses the one-parameter logistic (Rasch) model to estimate student proficiency, so the total score is based on performance on the entire set of items including those that measure comprehension.

Please provide the following additional information:

1. English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

STATE RESPONSE

TEST NAME	Publisher	Grades	Subject
Washington Language Proficiency Test	MetriTech, Inc.	9, 10, 11, and 12	Reading
Washington Language Proficiency Test	MetriTech, Inc.	6, 7, and 8	Reading
Washington Language Proficiency Test	MetriTech, Inc.	Kindergarten, 1, 2	Reading
Washington Language Proficiency Test	MetriTech, Inc.	3, 4, and 5	Reading
Washington Language Proficiency Test	MetriTech, Inc.	9, 10, 11, and 12	Writing
Washington Language Proficiency Test	MetriTech, Inc.	6, 7, and 8	Writing
Washington Language Proficiency Test	MetriTech, Inc.	Kindergarten, 1, 2	Writing
Washington Language Proficiency Test	MetriTech, Inc.	3, 4, and 5	Writing
Language Assessment Scales - Oral	CTB/McGraw	K - 12	Speaking and Listening
Language Proficiency Test Series - Oral	MetriTech, Inc.	K - 12	Speaking and Listening

The WLPT tests for reading and writing are given to each student receiving bilingual services. The results come directly to the SEA from the test publisher. For speaking and listening, LEAs have the choice of administering the LPTS-O or the LAS-O. Both of these instruments are approved for entry criteria into bilingual programs. LEAs have a choice of instruments so the burden of the individually administered oral tests can be eased somewhat. Nevertheless, school and LEA staff report that regardless of test utilized, it is difficult and exorbitantly expensive to annually administer, score, and report.

2. Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on state-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using state-selected ELP assessments).

STATE RESPONSE

The SEA does not collect this information at this time. LEAs submit data to the SEA on only those students who have been identified as needing services. The SEA plans to collect this information as part of our comprehensive data system improvement in the 2003-04 school year. When this system is in place, we will collect records for every student, including the number of referrals.

3. Total number of students **identified** as LEP on state-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on state-selected ELP assessment(s)).

STATE RESPONSE

A total of 73,150 students identified as ELL were served in Washington's ELL programs in the 2002-03 school year. However, while the SEA has maintained aggregate statewide numbers of ELLs, we have not collected data annually. Beginning with the 2003-04 school year, this information will be collected in the statewide ELL data system. Students are identified as needing services if their initial test shows low speaking and listening skills. As stated above, the SEA began collecting information on oral tests this year but only for those students who are receiving services. Beginning in Fall 2003, the comprehensive system plan calls for collecting the following information through a Home Language Survey from each student:

- Is the student from a home where a language other than English is spoken?
- Was the student referred for testing?
- If referred, did test results show eligibility for bilingual service?
- If yes, did the family refuse service?

Timeline for Collecting Annual Data:

Fall 2003

- Meet with Information Technology (IT) staff at the SEA to assure that data elements are present in state data collection system.
- Let districts know that this requirement is forthcoming.
- Distribute information to:
 - ◊ Bilingual Coordinators/Directors
 - ◊ Assistant Coordinators
 - ◊ Information Technology Coordinators

Fall 2003-Spring 2004

- Begin collection of initial identification of eligible ELLs.

Summer 2004

- Submit language survey results on students newly registered in the 2003-04 school year.

C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- **The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments**
- **A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English.**

STATE RESPONSE

Because the SEA has not yet engaged in a formal standard setting study to specify the scores delineating proficiency levels, we are using a set of provisional criteria for student progress and a set of provisional Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) for LEAs and the state. Thus, for the interim, Washington will use the cut scores provided by the respective test makers for the reading, writing, and listening/speaking assessments.

The SEA has specific administrative rules (WAC Chapter 392-160) that govern student program eligibility and exit. Students scoring below proficiency on the LAS-O or the LPTS-O are eligible to receive services from the state-funded transitional bilingual instructional program. Once enrolled in the program, students are served until they pass criteria for exiting out of the program.

A student is deemed ready to exit the program if the student meets one of the following criteria:

1. Scores at Level 3 or 4 on the WLPT-Writing and at Level IV on the WLPT-Reading, or
2. Scores at the 35th percentile on a nationally-normed reading and language arts test.

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

- **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments**
- **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)**
- **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next**

STATE RESPONSE

Because the SEA has not yet engaged in a formal standard setting study to specify the scores delineating proficiency levels, we are using a set of provisional criteria for student progress and a set of provisional AMAO for districts and the state. Thus, for the interim, the SEA will use the cut scores provided by the respective test makers for the reading, writing, listening/speaking assessments.

WLPT-Reading – 4 levels (beginning, intermediate, advanced, proficient)
WLPT-Writing – 4 levels (beginning, intermediate, proficient, proficient)
LAS-O - 5 levels (beginning, intermediate, advanced, proficient, proficient)
LPTS-O – 2 levels (limited, proficient)

Current AMAO Criteria:

AMAO #1: Criteria students must meet to indicate progress towards English proficiency.

Reading/Writing: A student in grades K-8 has made progress in English reading proficiency if the student has shown a gain of 18 scale score points since the previous year's WLPT reading test (15 points for students in Grades 9-12) or has made a score point gain of 2 points on the WLPT writing test.

Listening/Speaking: A student in K-12 has made progress in English listening and speaking proficiency if the student has shown a 20 percent increase in scale score points since the previous year's OLPT test.

AMAO #2: Criteria students must meet to indicate attainment of English proficiency.

WLPT reading score of IV and writing score of III or better within the "specified" number of years established upon initial bilingual program enrollment in a school. For the description of the "specified" years, see the state's definition of cohort(s) below.

In the table that follows, please provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English.
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency.

Performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives are projections for increases in the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and who will attain English language proficiency.

A table has been provided to accommodate States' varying approaches for establishing their performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives. Some States may establish the same performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for all grade levels in the State. Other States may establish separate performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for elementary, middle, and high school, for example. If a State establishes different performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for different grade levels/grade spans/cohorts, the State should complete a separate table for each grade level/grade span/cohort and indicate next to the "unit of analysis/cohort" the grade level/grade span/cohort to which the performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives apply.

Please provide the state's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

The cohort for the percent of students making progress in learning English and who will attain English language proficiency is the set of students enrolled in bilingual programs and tested in the current school year and the previous school year.

The SEA will assign each newly identified ELL a "specified" number of years for the student to attain English proficiency. This target year will be determined by the level of English language proficiency of the student at the time of identification and enrollment into a school's bilingual program via an Oral Language Proficiency Test (OLPT). The following matrix indicates the exact number of years in which the ELL is expected to have become English proficient:

- Beginning Level of Oral language English Proficiency – 5 years
- Intermediate Level of Oral language English Proficiency – 3 years
- Advanced Level of Oral language English Proficiency – 2 years

Example: In September 2003, a new student scores a level "2" on an OLPT assessment. This score makes the student eligible to enter a school's bilingual program. Furthermore, with an OLPT score of "2" (intermediate level), the student is assigned the year 2006 (3 years) as the year in which he/she must attain English proficiency in order to be counted towards meeting AMAO #2 goal.

English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

STATE RESPONSE

AMAO #1 – Percent of students making progress learning English in bilingual programs.

AMAO #2 – Percent of students transitioning from bilingual programs.

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort for AMAO #1:**

Students Enrolled in Grades 1 through 12 bilingual programs for two successive years.

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort for AMAO #2:**

Students in Grades K through 12 that “exit” bilingual programs within “specified” number of years.

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	62%	25%
2004-2005 School Year	64%	30%
2005-2006 School Year	66%	35%
2006-2007 School Year	68%	40%
2007-2008 School Year	70%	45%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc>

A. In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high-poverty schools in the State in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

STATE RESPONSE

Data for the following table (percentage of classes taught by high qualified teachers - state aggregate and percentage of classes taught by high qualified teachers - high-poverty schools) are based on reporting by 83 percent of LEAs as of August 26, 2003. The SEA will continue to collect LEA data to reach 100 percent participation. The SEA will provide its final baseline data to the USDOE no later than January 15, 2004, following its collection and verification process. At that time, the SEA may also revise its annual targets.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	83%	88%
2003-2004 Target	85%	90%
2004-2005 Target	89%	94%
2005-2006 Target	100%	100%

B. To best understand the data provided by States, please provide the State’s definition of a highly qualified teacher below.

NOTE: Key terms related to the state’s definition of a highly qualified teacher follows criteria (A) and (B) below.

STATE RESPONSE

A. Criteria for Current Teachers to be Considered Highly Qualified

All Washington teachers must meet requirements of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) pertaining to teacher certification. However, based upon the time when their certificate was issued or the type of certificate, different criteria will apply as described below:

1. Endorsed Certificate Holders

Teachers with endorsed certificates, assigned the primary responsibility to teach a core academic subject, shall be deemed as highly qualified if they have an endorsement in the core academic subject or the assignment is “endorsement related” as defined by the State Board of Education. Teachers assigned primary responsibility to teach a core academic subject for which they are not endorsed, and that is not an “endorsement related assignment,” will follow all procedures described in WAC 180-82-110.

Teachers with K-8 elementary education endorsements are highly qualified to teach core academic subjects in those grades. Teachers with special education, ESL, and bilingual endorsements are highly qualified to teach core academic subjects to students eligible for participation in these special programs.

References: SBE Endorsement Related Assignment Chart (www.sbe.wa.gov/)
 Endorsement Competencies
 (www.k12.wa.us/cert/profed/competency/default.asp)
 WAC 180-82A (<http://slc.leg.wa.gov/>)
 WAC 180-82-110

2. **Career and Technical Education Certificate Holders**

Teachers with career and technical education certificates may teach career and technical education classes at the secondary level that are cross listed with a core academic subject. For example, a student enrolled in an auto mechanics class may also earn an applied science credit. In cases like this, where teachers are assigned the primary responsibility for this type of class, they meet the highly qualified requirements if they have:

- A baccalaureate degree or higher, and
- Full career and technical education certification, and
- A degree in the core academic subject, or
- A major in the core academic subject, or
- The equivalent of a major in the core academic subject, or
- Passed the PRAXIS II in the core academic subject, or
- (HOUSSE) Been evaluated as satisfactory in the core academic subject based on criteria identified in RCW 28A.405.100 and WAC 392-191-010 and the process described in WAC 392-191, or
- Follow all procedures described in WAC 180-82-110.

References: WAC 180-77 (<http://slc.leg.wa.gov/>)
WAC 180-77A
RCW 28A.405.100
WAC 392-191
WAC 180-82-110

3. **Standard or Continuing Certificate Holders**

Teachers with these certificates who are assigned the primary responsibility to teach a core academic subject meet the highly qualified requirements in one of the following ways:

- A degree in the core academic subject, or
- A major in the core academic subject, or
- The equivalent of a major in the core academic subject, or
- National Board of Certification in the core academic subject, or
- Pass the PRAXIS II in the core academic subject, or
- (HOUSSE) Evaluated as satisfactory in each core academic subject based on criteria identified in RCW 28A.405.100 and WAC 392-191-010 and the process described in WAC 392-191.

References: RCW28A.405.100 (<http://slc.leg.wa.gov/>)
WAC 392-191

4. **Conditional or Emergency Certificate Holders**

Teachers with conditional or emergency certificates who are assigned the primary responsibility to teach core academic subjects meet the highly qualified requirements if they are enrolled in a residency teacher preparation program, including alternative route programs, and will complete the program and earn a residency certificate within one year for emergency certificate holders and within three years for conditional certificate holders.

Reference: WAC 180-79A-231 (<http://slc.leg.wa.gov/>)

B. Criteria for New Teachers to be Considered Highly Qualified Beginning September 1, 2005

All Washington teachers must meet requirements of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) pertaining to teacher certification. As of September 1, 2005, passing the PRAXIS II test will be required to obtain a residency teaching certificate and endorsements. As of September 1, 2002, all teachers were required to pass the WEST-B to earn a residency certificate. As of September 1, 2003, PRAXIS II tests will be available. Higher education institutions may elect to require passing a specific subject matter PRAXIS II test for admission to a “certification only” or master’s level teacher preparation program.

Based upon the type of certificate, different criteria will apply as described below:

1. **Residency Certificate Holders**

All individuals who apply for a residency certificate on or after September 1, 2005, will be required to pass the WEST-B as well as the PRAXIS II to earn this certificate. A baccalaureate degree is required. All residency certificates identify the endorsement area(s) in which the teacher completed a State Board of Education approved program.

The following endorsements will be required appropriate to specific grade levels for teachers assigned the primary responsibility to teach core academic subjects:

Elementary - Elementary Education, Special Education, Early Childhood Education, Early Childhood Special Education, English as a Second Language (ESL) and/or Bilingual Education.

Middle Level - Elementary Education (Grades 7-8), Middle Level, Middle Level – Math/Science, Middle Level – Humanities, Special Education, ESL, Bilingual Education and/or specific subject matter endorsements.

Secondary Level - Special Education, ESL, Bilingual Education and/or specific subject matter endorsements.

References: WAC 180-79A (<http://slc.leg.wa.gov/>)
WAC 180-82A

2. **Career and Technical Education Certificate Holders**

Teachers with career and technical education certificates who are assigned the primary responsibility to teach a career and technical education class for which core academic subject credit is earned meet the highly qualified requirements if they have:

- A baccalaureate degree or higher, and
- Passed the PRAXIS II in the core academic subject, and
- Completed a state approved career and technical education college/university teacher preparation program or a state approved preparation program based on business and industry work experience.

References: WAC 180-77 (<http://slc.leg.wa.gov/>)
WAC 180-77A

3. **Conditional or Emergency Certificate Holders**

Teachers with conditional or emergency certificates who are assigned the primary responsibility to teach core academic subjects meet the highly qualified requirements if they are enrolled in a residency teacher preparation program, including alternative routes programs, and will complete the program and earn a residency certificate within one year for emergency certificate holders and within three years for conditional certificate holders.

Reference: WAC 180-79A-231 (<http://slc.leg.wa.gov/>)

Key Terms for Highly Qualified Teachers Definition

Arts – music, theatre, visual arts, and dance

Career and Technical Education Certificate – certificates issued to individuals who have completed a State Board of Education college/university preparation program or preparation program based on business and industry work experience to provide instruction for students in career and technical education programs (WAC 180-77 and WAC 180-77A) (<http://slc.leg.wa.gov/>).

Conditional Certificate – Conditional certificates are issued upon application by the local school district where the applicant is highly qualified and experienced in the subject matter to be taught and no person with regular certification in the endorsement area is available. Reference WAC 180-79A-231(1) (<http://slc.wa.gov/>).

Emergency Certificate – Emergency certificates are issued upon recommendation of a

school district to persons who hold the appropriate degree and have substantially completed a teacher preparation program where a qualified person who holds regular certification is not available or where the position is essential and circumstances warrant issuance of the certificate. Reference WAC 180-79A-231(3) (<http://slc.wa.gov/>).

Endorsement – Endorsements identify the subject area in which the teacher has completed a State Board of Education approved college/university program. The requirements for endorsements are specified in terms of competencies and are aligned with the state’s learning goals and essential academic learning requirements. Teaching assignments are based upon the endorsements on the teacher’s certificate. The SBE adopted endorsement competencies in January 2002. Reference WAC 180-82A (<http://slc.wa.gov/>).

Equivalent of a Major – Minimum of 45 quarter (30 semester) credits in the core academic subject.

Full Certification – Teaching certificates issued by the state of Washington, excluding limited certificates (conditional, substitute, emergency, emergency substitute, nonimmigrant alien exchange, intern substitute, and transitional) as defined by WAC 180-79A-231, and conditional and probationary career and technical education certificates.

High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) – Satisfactory evaluation in the core academic subject based on criteria identified in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 28A.405.100.

Washington state statute requires that all certificated teachers be evaluated on an annual basis using uniform state criteria. The SEA has the statutory authority to establish minimum criteria for the evaluation of teachers. Every LEA board of directors must establish evaluative criteria that contain all of the criteria established by the SEA and must certify that evaluative criteria have been prepared. The high objective uniform state criteria, as designated in Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 392-191-010, for evaluating certificated teachers are:

1. **Instructional skill.** The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates, in his or her performance, a competent level of knowledge and skill in designing and conducting an instructional experience.
2. **Classroom management.** The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates, in his or her performance, a competent level of knowledge and skill in organizing the physical and human elements in the educational setting.
3. **Professional preparation and scholarship.** The certificated classroom teacher exhibits, in his or her performance, evidence of having a theoretical background and knowledge of the principles and methods of teaching, and a commitment to education as a profession.
4. **Effort toward improvement when needed.** The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates an awareness of his or her limitations and strengths, and demonstrates continued professional growth.
5. **The handling of student discipline and attendant problems.** The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates the ability to manage the non-instructional, human dynamics in the educational setting.
6. **Interest in teaching pupils.** The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates an understanding of and commitment to each pupil, taking into account each individual's unique

background and characteristics. The certificated classroom teacher demonstrates enthusiasm for or enjoyment in working with pupils.

7. Knowledge of subject matter. The teacher demonstrates a depth and breadth of knowledge of theory and content in general education and subject matter specialization(s) appropriate to the elementary and/or secondary level(s).

Procedural standards, described in WAC sections 392-191-030, -035, -040, and -045 standardize the process by which teachers are evaluated across all school districts. All evaluations will reference the State Board of Education-adopted endorsement competencies, which are aligned with the state academic content standards (i.e., Essential Academic Learning Requirements).

PRAXIS II – A commercially available test that assesses subject matter knowledge specific to each endorsement. During the state test selection process, this test was called the WEST-E. At the time that ETS was selected as the vendor, the test name transitioned to PRAXIS II.

Primary responsibility – The requirements for consideration as highly qualified are linked to the teacher’s assignment and whether s/he has “primary responsibility” for providing content instruction. For the purposes of determining highly qualified status, “primary responsibility” is defined as being the sole teacher or the instructor of record.

Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) – A nineteen member board, (appointed by the governor) that serves as an advisory body to the SEA and as the sole advisory body to the State Board of Education. The board has rule making authority for the assessment of basic skills and subject knowledge of teachers. Reference RCW 28A.410.200 – 240 (<http://slc.wa.gov/>).

Residency Certificate – The State Board of Education adopted rules to establish a performance-based certification system that was fully implemented September 1, 2000. The performance-based system includes the issuance of a residency certificate as the first level certificate for all Washington teacher preparation program completers and out-of-state teachers.

Standard and Continuing K-12 Certificates – These certificates were issued prior to 1987 and do not have endorsements nor may endorsements be added. Based upon State Board of Education certification policies in effect at that time, teachers with either of these certificates may be assigned to teach any subject at any grade level. The majority of teachers with these certificates will retire by 2007.

State Board of Education (SBE) – A board comprised of one member from each congressional district of the state (elected by members of the boards of directors of school districts thereof), the state Superintendent of Public Instruction as an ex officio member, and one member elected at large by the members of boards of directors of approved private schools in the state. This board holds primary rule-making authority for all matters related to teacher preparation, excepting those allocated to the PESB. Reference RCW 28A.305.130 and all sections of WAC 180 (<http://slc.wa.gov/>).

WEST – B – A basic skills test that addresses reading, mathematics, and writing. As of September 1, 2002, all applicants to teacher preparation programs and all out-of-state teachers must pass this test to earn a residency teaching certificate.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34).)

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIguidance2002.doc>

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development” in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive “high-quality professional development” through the 2005-2006 school year. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

STATE RESPONSE

Data for the following table (percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development) are based on the 2002-03 school year Title II data on the number of teachers participating in high quality professional development. The quality of this professional development has been monitored by SEA Title II staff through both the application process and in on-site monitoring. These data are due from the districts on October 1, 2003. The SEA will provide its final baseline data to the USDOE no later than January 15, 2004, following its collection and verification process. At that time, the SEA may also revise its annual targets. For interim purposes of this report, the SEA is reporting interim baseline data based on a sampling of districts, large and small, urban and remote.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	46%
2003-2004 Target	48%
2004-2005 Target	50%
2005-2006 Target	60%*

* 60% represents 100% of Title I and Title II funds used for professional development

In July 2003, the SEA released its guidelines for schools and LEAs in planning and executing effective, high quality, and research-based professional development. These guidelines clearly describe the components of such professional development; including research based effective

practices in professional development. A copy of this plan can be accessed at <http://www.k12.wa.us/ProfDev/>.

As part of this professional development, the SEA will provide and authorize professional development to teachers, principals and paraprofessionals based on the Guidelines and Research-based Effective Practices identified in the Washington State Professional Development Planning Guide and aimed specifically at assisting and assuring teachers, principals and paraprofessionals to meet the requirements of No Child Left Behind.

Data collection on the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development beginning with the 2003-04 school year will require that the LEA either use the guidelines provided in the Washington State Professional Development Planning Guide or other research-based effective practices, such as those included in the National Staff Development Council Standards.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SASA/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

STATE RESPONSE

Data for the following table (percentage of qualified Title I paraprofessionals) are based on reporting by 89 percent of LEAs as of August 26, 2003. The SEA will continue to collect LEA data to reach 100 percent participation. The SEA will provide its final baseline data to the USDOE no later than October 1, 2003 following its collection and verification process. At that time, the SEA may also revise its annual targets.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	39%
2003-2004 Target	44%
2004-2005 Target	50%
2005-2006 Target	100%

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>.

For baseline data, please provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

STATE RESPONSE

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	0
2004-2005 Target	0
2005-2006 Target	0
2006-2007 Target	0
2007-2008 Target	0
2008-2009 Target	0
2009-2010 Target	0
2010-2011 Target	0
2011-2012 Target	0
2012-2013 Target	0
2013-2014 Target	0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: “The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.” However, section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State’s academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

The Secretary approved each State’s definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State’s accountability plan. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, we ask that the information you submit in this September 1, 2003, consolidated State application reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State’s accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the State graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE

STATE RESPONSE

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	79.0
African American/Black	64.0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	61.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	81.7
Hispanic	65.2
White	81.5
Other	63.6
Students with Disabilities	57.8
Students without Disabilities	80.8
Limited English Proficient	Not available
Economically Disadvantaged	67.2
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	80.5
Migrant	Not available
Male	75.6
Female	82.6

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: GRADUATION RATE

STATE RESPONSE

High School Graduates	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
African American/Black	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
Hispanic	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
White	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
Other	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
Students with Disabilities	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
Students without Disabilities	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
Limited English Proficient	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
Economically Disadvantaged	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
Migrant	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
Male	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0
Female	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0	85.0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

BASELINE DATA: DROPOUT RATE

STATE RESPONSE

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	7.7
African American/Black	17.1
American Indian/Native Alaskan	15.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	6.8
Hispanic	12.5
White	6.3
Other	8.4
Students with Disabilities	9.6
Students without Disabilities	7.5
Limited English Proficient	Not available
Economically Disadvantaged	7.6
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	7.7
Migrant	Not available
Male	8.6
Female	6.8

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: DROPOUT RATE

STATE RESPONSE

The SEA will use the definition of the graduation rate as indicated in Performance Measure 5.1 above, the percentage of students who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma in four years ("the standard number of years"), as the additional indicator for high schools for accountability purposes. The SEA will also measure a cohort dropout rate as well as report to NCES the annual dropout rates as indicated in the definition above. Given that accountability is based on the on-time graduation rates, the SEA does not plan to set targets for the annual dropout rates.

Student Dropouts	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
African American/Black	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
American Indian/Native Alaskan	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Asian/Pacific Islander	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Hispanic	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
White	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Other	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Students with Disabilities	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Students without Disabilities	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Limited English Proficient	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Economically Disadvantaged	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Migrant	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Male	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Female	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**

APPENDICES

Appendix A: FIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY LEVELS

Listening and Speaking:

“Beginning”

A student at the beginning level utilizes words, gestures and actions to communicate basic needs and practices repetitive social greetings. The beginner employs words and phrases to join in discussions and activities, including asking and answering questions using rudimentary grammatical forms. The student responds to simple academic content and directions with words, gestures and drawings. The student begins to correct speech in group activities.

“Advanced Beginning”

A student at the advanced beginning level participates in academic discussions with phrases and simple sentences using content-related vocabulary. The student has command of social greetings and can participate in social discussions on familiar topics. Although the older (grades 6-12) student begins to self-correct speech independently, use of correct grammatical forms at this level is inconsistent. The advanced beginner tells and retells simple stories and, in grades 3-12, can be expected to identify the main points of a simple story.

“Intermediate”

A student at the intermediate level uses simple sentences to inform, explain and entertain the listener, and to participate in social discussions on unfamiliar topics. Idioms and figurative language appear in his/her speech and the student is capable of being more analytical about language. Younger students (K-5) self-correct speech independently and use of correct grammar becomes consistent. In grades 3-12, the intermediate student uses descriptive sentences, learns to be persuasive and begins to use separate word parts to determine meaning.

“Advanced”

A student at the advanced level uses descriptive sentences as well as figurative and idiomatic language in discussions of academic content and ideas. Increasing ability to analyze language and to self-correct independently enables the student to produce correct grammatical forms with only occasional, random grammatical errors. Students are expected to follow multi-step directions. In grades 3-12, the advanced student is able to identify story elements, give an oral presentation and initiate social conversations.

“Transitional”

A student at the transitional level uses standard grammatical English with native-like proficiency, successfully negotiating social conversations on both familiar and unfamiliar topics. The student applies content-related vocabulary in response to academic content. At the transitional level, all students (K-12) are expected to give oral presentations and to persuade an audience. In grades 3-12, the transitional student is expected to understand and use specialized vocabulary in many content areas.

Reading:

“Beginning”

A student at the beginning level typically expresses him or herself with words, drawings, gestures and appropriate actions. K-5 students are aware of familiar sounds, while older 6-12 students

hear both familiar and unfamiliar sounds. At all levels students read sight words. Vocabulary is simple in K-2, but by grades 3-12 a student includes content-area vocabulary and concepts.

A beginning K-12 student answers literal questions about text, makes simple predictions and understands story sequence. A student in grades 3-12 follows simple directions and identifies features of the text. This older student recognizes and explains main idea, cause and effect, and compare and contrast, and distinguishes between different genres. Additionally, a student in grades 9-12 follows multi-step directions.

“Advanced Beginning”

A student at the advanced beginning level typically expresses him or herself with simple sentences. All students now hear both familiar and unfamiliar phonemes and employ word meaning strategies. The student increases both sight word and content area vocabulary and the 3-12 student identifies roots and affixes.

In addition, the advanced beginning students in grades 3-12 uses comprehension strategies and can distinguish between genres. The student identifies simple literary devices and supporting details in a text. In grades, 9-12 the advanced-beginner can also draw conclusions.

“Intermediate”

A student at the intermediate level in grades K-2 uses simple sentences and can now produce unfamiliar sounds. The student can decode word patterns and begin to read unfamiliar text fluently. The intermediate student reads sight words and increases vocabulary through reading. The student now uses text features to gain meaning and monitors comprehension.

The grade 3-12 intermediate level student uses descriptive sentences and can accomplish all of the tasks of the K-2 student at this level. In addition, the older intermediate student uses word meaning strategies and reads words and concepts across content areas. The intermediate student visualizes and describes images from text and connects text to prior knowledge. In addition to distinguishing between fact and opinion and fantasy and reality, the intermediate student infers and makes generalizations based on text.

The grade 9-12 intermediate student decodes multi-syllabic words and uses comprehension repair strategies. The scope of reading materials is greater, including functional documents and career interests.

“Advanced”

A student at the advanced level in K-2 uses simple sentences, a 3-5 student uses descriptive sentences and a 6-12 student uses expanded descriptive sentences. At all grade levels, phonemic awareness extends to multi-syllabic and patterned words, and the student uses parts of words to determine meanings. While all students read with increasing fluency, the advanced reading student in grades 6-12 adjusts his or her reading rate as needed. This student now identifies multiple meaning words across content areas.

The comprehension skills of the advanced student include independently confirming word meanings and identifying the theme. This student recognizes literary and persuasive devices and uses a variety of strategies to monitor for meaning while reading. In addition, the advanced

student compares, contrasts, and makes generalizations between texts, and uses a variety of resources for research.

“Transitional”

A student at the transitional level uses descriptive sentences and the reading material includes functional documents. Students at all grade levels adjust reading rate as needed. A fluency goal for grades 3-8 might be unpracticed text at 110-120 wpm. A K-2 student uses specialized vocabulary in reading and a 3-12 student applies multiple-meaning words.

A transitional student at all levels identifies the main idea and supporting details, predicts, infers, analyzes, and applies literary elements. The student follows increasingly complex directions. A transitional student in grades 3-12 uses comprehension and questioning strategies, summarizes text, and analyzes and applies persuasive devices. The 3-12 transitional student examines and explains characteristics of genres and develops research skills. This includes paraphrasing and note-taking. Finally, at the transitional level, the 6-12 student is expected to state cause and effect with evidence from the text.

Writing:

“Beginning”

The student functioning at the beginning level can draw, label, as well as copy familiar words and patterned phrases. The student in grades 3-12 can write familiar words and sight words, while a student in grades 9-12 can also write unfamiliar words. The beginning student writes to name and describe, to complete a list, journal, or write a song or poem based on a model. A writer in grades 6-12 records and gives directions and in grades 9-12 is expected to write journals, songs and poems without a model. The beginning writer uses invented spelling, capital letters and participates in group editing. The audience may be self, teacher or a known person. The student may sequence pictures to assist with organization and in grades 3-12 writes about main ideas and details. The beginner participates in group writing for all steps of the writing process.

“Advanced Beginning”

The student functioning at the advanced beginning level in grades K-2 can write sight words and phrases, in 3-12 can write unfamiliar words and simple sentences, and in 6-12 can write paragraphs. The purposes for writing expand to include book reports and friendly letters for K-12, and in 6-12 to thank, inform, reflect, question, record information and for self-expression. The advanced beginning writer demonstrates inconsistent use of capitals, punctuation, and correct spelling, and at grades 9-12, edits work independently. The audience for grades 6-12 now includes unknown persons. In grades 9-12, the advanced beginning writer organizes paragraphs using a topic sentence and supporting details. For the advanced beginner, the writing process includes group brainstorming and writing a rough draft. K-2 revise as a group, while 3-5 revise individually. A student writer in grades 6-12 offers feedback on other’s writing.

“Intermediate”

The student functioning at the intermediate level in grades K-2 uses simple sentences, and in grades 3-12 is expected to use compound sentences. In grades 6-12, an intermediate writer is expected to use descriptive sentences and in 9-12, to write paragraphs. Grades 3-12 writers use figurative and idiomatic language in their writing. All students are expected to show appropriate word choice. The purposes for writing in K-2 now include thanking and

entertaining. In 3-12, students write explanations, reports, memos, engage in questioning, and write without a model. In grades 6-12, intermediate writers use dialogue in narratives, express opinions, direct, create and imagine, while in 9-12, students write career related papers, such as business letters. Students at the intermediate proficiency level distinguish and are capable of writing to different audiences.

The intermediate writer in grades 3-12 uses basic transitions, and in grades 6-12, the student chooses and maintains a focus, utilizing a topic sentence supported by details. The intermediate writer in grades 9-12 uses reference tools to self-edit conventions and is expected to use correct word order and subject/verb agreement. The student may write independently or as a group process.

“Advanced”

The student functioning at the advanced level is expected to use descriptive sentences at all levels. In grades 6-12, the advanced writer develops a topic using multiple paragraphs. The purpose for writing continues to expand. A grade 3-5 advanced writer uses dialogue and in 3-12 persuades. In grades 6-8, the advanced writer writes newspaper articles and brochures, while in grades 9-12, the writer is expected to produce skits, advertisements, and critiques. All advanced writers use standard conventions. Advanced writers in grades 3-12 develop their own voice and use a topic sentence supported by details. In grades 6-12, advanced writers distinguish between relevant and irrelevant details. The advanced writers in grades K-2 independently follow the five-step writing process.

“Transitional”

The student functioning at the transitional level uses specialized vocabulary across content areas. The K-12 student independently writes notes and friendly letters. The transitional writer in grades 3-5 creates brochures. In grades 6-8, writers produce skits and critiques, and in 3-12, writers present information in tables and graphs. At the transitional level, all writers use standard grammar and conventions, and independently follow the five-step writing process.

Appendix B: WRITING EALRs

EALR 1) The student writes clearly and effectively.

1.1 develop concept and design

develop a topic or theme; organize written thoughts with a clear beginning, middle, and end; use transitional sentences and phrases to connect related ideas; write coherently and effectively

1.2 use style appropriate to the audience and purpose

use voice, word choice, and sentence fluency for intended style and audience

1.3 apply writing conventions

know and apply correct spelling, grammar, sentence structure, punctuation, and capitalization

EALR 2) The student writes in a variety of forms for different audiences and purposes.

2.1 write for different audiences

2.2 write for different purposes

such as telling stories, presenting analytical responses to literature, persuading, conveying technical information, completing a team project, explaining concepts and procedures

2.3 write in a variety of forms

including narratives, journals, poems, essays, stories, research reports, and technical writing

2.4 write for career applications

EALR 3) The student understands and uses the steps of the writing process.

3.1 prewrite

generate ideas and gather information

3.2 draft

elaborate on a topic and supporting ideas

3.3 revise

collect input and enhance text and style

3.4 edit

use resources to correct spelling, punctuation, grammar, and usage

3.5 publish

select a publishing form and produce a completed writing project to share with chosen audience

Appendix C: READING EALRs

EALR 1) The student understands and uses different skills and strategies to read.

1.1 use word recognition and word meaning skills to read and comprehend text *such as phonics, context clues, picture clues, and word origins; roots, prefixes, and suffixes of words*

1.2 build vocabulary through reading

1.3 read fluently, adjusting reading for purpose and material

1.4 understand elements of literature -- fiction *such as story elements, use of humor, exaggeration, and figures of speech*

1.5 use features of non-fiction text and computer software *such as titles, headings, pictures, maps, and charts to find and understand specific information*

EALR 2) The student understands the meaning of what is read.

2.1 comprehend important ideas and details

2.2 expand comprehension by analyzing, interpreting, and synthesizing information and ideas

2.3 think critically and analyze authors' use of language, style, purpose, and perspective

EALR 3) The student reads different materials for a variety of purposes.

3.1 read to learn new information *such as reading science and mathematics texts, technical documents, and for personal interest*

3.2 read to perform a task *such as using schedules, following directions, filling out job applications, and solving problems*

3.3 read for literary experience in a variety of forms *such as novels, short stories, poems, plays, and essays to understand self and others*

3.4 read for career applications

EALR 4) The student sets goals and evaluates progress to improve reading.

4.1 assess strengths and need for improvement

4.2 seek and offer feedback to improve reading

4.3 develop interests and share reading experiences