

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
Parts I and II**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on  
School Year 2011-12**

**WASHINGTON**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **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.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

## **PART II**

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2011-12 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).



**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.		
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.		
State has revised or changed			
Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.			
	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	7/2011	7/2011	2009-10

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Washington State formally adopted the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and mathematics in July 2011 as it's new state K-12 learning standards in these subjects. The CCSS-M and CCSS-ELA replace the state's 2008 K-12 Mathematics Learning Standards, and the 2005 K-10 Reading and Writing Grade Level Expectations. The state will phase-in implementation of the CCSS with full implementation through the state assessment system occurring in the 2014-15 year.

The state revised it's K-10 Science Grade Level Expectations in 2008 and adopted a new set of K-12 Science Learning Standards in 2009. The new standards were fully implemented through the state assessment system in 2011. Washington became a lead state in the development of the Next Generation Science Standards in 2011. Once the NGSS are completed, OSPI will consider adoption that would not likely occur until 2014.

**1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

<p><u>State has revised or changed</u></p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	NA	NA	NA
Regular Assessments in High School	NA	NA	2011-12
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	NA	NA	NA
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	NA	NA	NA
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	NA	NA	NA

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The Science change is the End of Course Biology Assessment.



**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	NA
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	2011-12
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	NA	NA	NA
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	NA	NA	NA
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	NA

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Reading/Language Arts & Mathematics:  
 In July 2011 Washington State formally adopted the Common Core Standards for English Language arts as new state learning standards for the K-12 English Language arts. These standards will be assessed starting in the 2014-15 year. In July 2011 Washington State formally adopted the Common Core Standards for mathematics as new state learning standards for K-12 mathematics. These standards will be assessed starting in the 2014-15 year.

Science:  
 No significant changes were made to the state's K-12 Science Learning Standards that were adopted in 2009 following an extensive revision process. The state is currently participating in as a lead state to provide input in the development of the NGSS. The 2009 revised science standards were assessed beginning in 2011 in grades 5 and 8, and implemented a new Biology End of Course assessment in spring 2012.

### 1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

#### 1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	20.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	80.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

#### 1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>No</u>
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>No</u>
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	552,252	533,935	96.68
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,720	8,239	94.48
Asian	39,915	39,006	97.72
Black or African American	25,539	24,294	95.13
Hispanic or Latino	108,170	104,355	96.47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5,050	4,809	95.23
White	330,965	320,454	96.82
Two or more races	33,335	32,388	97.16
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	70,942	66,891	94.29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	38,923	36,801	94.55
Economically disadvantaged students	257,989	249,008	96.52
Migratory students	9,783	9,406	96.15
Male	283,444	273,380	96.45
Female	268,808	260,555	96.93
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data is correct as reported, even though three sub-groups have lower than 95% participation rate.			

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	44,969	67.23
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	17,365	25.96
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,557	6.81
Total	66,891	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

### 1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	552,241	535,433	96.96
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,720	8,324	95.46
Asian	39,915	38,774	97.14
Black or African American	25,538	24,517	96.00
Hispanic or Latino	108,169	104,932	97.01
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5,049	4,837	95.80
White	330,957	321,102	97.02
Two or more races	33,335	32,510	97.53
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	70,938	67,806	95.58
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	38,922	36,620	94.09
Economically disadvantaged students	257,985	249,976	96.90
Migratory students	9,783	9,487	96.97
Male	283,438	274,431	96.82
Female	268,803	261,002	97.10
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data is correct as reported, even though one sub-group has less than 95% participation rate.			

#### 1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	
--	--

### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	58,465	86.22
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,767	7.03
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,574	6.75
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	67,806	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	238,671	223,055	93.46
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,811	3,420	89.74
Asian	17,406	16,631	95.55
Black or African American	11,229	10,124	90.16
Hispanic or Latino	44,851	41,371	92.24
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,080	1,850	88.94
White	145,339	136,677	94.04
Two or more races	13,651	12,825	93.95
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	28,821	26,007	90.24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,331	11,923	89.44
Economically disadvantaged students	106,705	98,836	92.63
Migratory students	4,224	3,864	91.48
Male	122,719	114,154	93.02
Female	115,952	108,901	93.92
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data is accurate as reported, even though most sub-groups have less than 95% participation.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	18,473	71.03
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,777	22.21
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,757	6.76
Total	26,007	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.



**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,581	50,370	65.77
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,143	510	44.62
Asian	5,664	4,626	81.67
Black or African American	3,377	1,621	48.00
Hispanic or Latino	16,220	7,898	48.69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	739	371	50.20
White	44,348	31,930	72.00
Two or more races	5,020	3,371	67.15
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,735	3,800	35.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,076	2,661	32.95
Economically disadvantaged students	37,835	20,037	52.96
Migratory students	1,372	539	39.29
Male	39,108	25,552	65.34
Female	37,473	24,818	66.23
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,545	52,658	68.79
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,141	591	51.80
Asian	5,635	4,459	79.13
Black or African American	3,376	1,838	54.44
Hispanic or Latino	16,214	8,364	51.59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	736	392	53.26
White	44,355	33,405	75.31
Two or more races	5,018	3,574	71.22
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,740	3,760	35.01
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,016	2,247	28.03
Economically disadvantaged students	37,810	21,159	55.96
Migratory students	1,374	531	38.65
Male	39,106	25,079	64.13
Female	37,439	27,579	73.66
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The science assessment is only given in grades 5, 8 and high school.			

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	75,666	45,453	60.07
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,124	414	36.83
Asian	5,559	4,296	77.28
Black or African American	3,393	1,353	39.88
Hispanic or Latino	15,759	6,610	41.94
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	727	297	40.85
White	44,230	29,548	66.81
Two or more races	4,814	2,907	60.39
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,666	3,020	28.31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,134	1,605	22.50
Economically disadvantaged students	37,407	16,888	45.15
Migratory students	1,375	452	32.87
Male	38,672	23,350	60.38
Female	36,994	22,103	59.75
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	75,654	53,661	70.93
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,128	592	52.48
Asian	5,533	4,473	80.84
Black or African American	3,393	1,859	54.79
Hispanic or Latino	15,760	8,650	54.89
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	728	405	55.63
White	44,233	34,154	77.21
Two or more races	4,819	3,488	72.38
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,661	3,720	34.89
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,086	2,054	28.99
Economically disadvantaged students	37,412	21,756	58.15
Migratory students	1,376	573	41.64
Male	38,653	26,060	67.42
Female	37,001	27,601	74.60
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The science assessment is only given in grades 5, 8 and high school.			

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,566	49,951	64.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,207	508	42.09
Asian	5,597	4,567	81.60
Black or African American	3,483	1,549	44.47
Hispanic or Latino	16,023	7,576	47.28
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	725	393	54.21
White	45,633	32,118	70.38
Two or more races	4,856	3,212	66.14
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,576	2,648	25.04
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,224	1,527	24.53
Economically disadvantaged students	37,790	19,084	50.50
Migratory students	1,496	562	37.57
Male	39,802	25,055	62.95
Female	37,764	24,896	65.93
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,562	55,085	71.02
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,211	609	50.29
Asian	5,552	4,579	82.47
Black or African American	3,487	1,868	53.57
Hispanic or Latino	16,037	8,734	54.46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	726	431	59.37
White	45,652	35,284	77.29
Two or more races	4,856	3,551	73.13
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,593	3,294	31.10
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,173	1,562	25.30
Economically disadvantaged students	37,801	22,016	58.24
Migratory students	1,500	662	44.13
Male	39,796	27,113	68.13
Female	37,766	27,972	74.07
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,440	51,017	65.88
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,208	484	40.07
Asian	5,563	4,240	76.22
Black or African American	3,480	1,472	42.30
Hispanic or Latino	16,008	7,029	43.91
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	725	304	41.93
White	45,570	34,168	74.98
Two or more races	4,845	3,291	67.93
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,550	2,861	27.12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,190	1,117	18.05
Economically disadvantaged students	37,730	19,078	50.56
Migratory students	1,495	489	32.71
Male	39,726	25,802	64.95
Female	37,714	25,215	66.86
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,534	48,145	62.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,237	488	39.45
Asian	5,494	4,440	80.82
Black or African American	3,533	1,377	38.98
Hispanic or Latino	15,168	6,749	44.49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	773	332	42.95
White	46,419	31,616	68.11
Two or more races	4,858	3,115	64.12
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,928	2,144	21.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,193	1,118	21.53
Economically disadvantaged students	36,785	17,410	47.33
Migratory students	1,384	484	34.97
Male	39,619	24,287	61.30
Female	37,915	23,858	62.92

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data is accurate as reported even though there was a large increase in the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander category.

**1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,493	54,680	70.56
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,241	622	50.12
Asian	5,434	4,478	82.41
Black or African American	3,528	1,909	54.11
Hispanic or Latino	15,174	8,425	55.52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	771	413	53.57
White	46,436	35,282	75.98
Two or more races	4,857	3,516	72.39
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,936	2,659	26.76
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,123	1,147	22.39
Economically disadvantaged students	36,755	21,199	57.68
Migratory students	1,385	597	43.10
Male	39,596	25,794	65.14
Female	37,897	28,886	76.22

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data is accurate as reported even though there was a large increase in the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander category.

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The science assessment is only given in grades 5, 8 and high school.			



**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,966	46,132	59.94
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,265	435	34.39
Asian	5,353	4,185	78.18
Black or African American	3,615	1,414	39.11
Hispanic or Latino	14,937	6,487	43.43
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	643	276	42.92
White	46,441	30,407	65.47
Two or more races	4,656	2,898	62.24
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,414	1,678	17.82
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,161	760	18.26
Economically disadvantaged students	36,159	16,455	45.51
Migratory students	1,315	480	36.50
Male	39,638	23,063	58.18
Female	37,328	23,069	61.80
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,952	54,793	71.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,265	643	50.83
Asian	5,314	4,213	79.28
Black or African American	3,620	1,943	53.67
Hispanic or Latino	14,944	8,096	54.18
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	638	334	52.35
White	46,449	36,122	77.77
Two or more races	4,667	3,413	73.13
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,431	2,456	26.04
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,105	654	15.93
Economically disadvantaged students	36,129	20,922	57.91
Migratory students	1,319	553	41.93
Male	39,645	26,248	66.21
Female	37,307	28,545	76.51
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The science assessment is only given in grades 5, 8 and high school.			

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,703	43,313	56.47
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,260	408	32.38
Asian	5,600	4,220	75.36
Black or African American	3,553	1,182	33.27
Hispanic or Latino	14,188	5,559	39.18
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	630	235	37.30
White	47,097	29,183	61.96
Two or more races	4,321	2,493	57.69
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,682	1,427	16.44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,414	570	16.70
Economically disadvantaged students	34,346	14,245	41.47
Migratory students	1,352	401	29.66
Male	39,439	21,931	55.61
Female	37,264	21,382	57.38
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,715	52,129	67.95
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,263	589	46.63
Asian	5,571	4,424	79.41
Black or African American	3,559	1,815	51.00
Hispanic or Latino	14,203	7,391	52.04
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	627	284	45.30
White	47,115	34,588	73.41
Two or more races	4,323	3,001	69.42
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,698	1,972	22.67
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,366	399	11.85
Economically disadvantaged students	34,359	18,577	54.07
Migratory students	1,356	526	38.79
Male	39,433	24,830	62.97
Female	37,282	27,299	73.22
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,496	50,686	66.26
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,260	540	42.86
Asian	5,577	4,348	77.96
Black or African American	3,545	1,530	43.16
Hispanic or Latino	14,113	6,358	45.05
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	630	257	40.79
White	46,996	34,693	73.82
Two or more races	4,317	2,921	67.66
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,642	1,662	19.23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,369	426	12.64
Economically disadvantaged students	34,209	17,260	50.45
Migratory students	1,331	378	28.40
Male	39,337	25,530	64.90
Female	37,159	25,156	67.70
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	72,919	55,036	75.48
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,003	592	59.02
Asian	5,739	4,939	86.06
Black or African American	3,340	1,818	54.43
Hispanic or Latino	12,060	7,178	59.52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	572	318	55.59
White	46,286	37,237	80.45
Two or more races	3,863	2,930	75.85
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,890	1,873	27.18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,599	830	31.94
Economically disadvantaged students	28,686	17,731	61.81
Migratory students	1,112	561	50.45
Male	37,102	27,776	74.86
Female	35,817	27,260	76.11
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	74,512	61,691	82.79
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,075	690	64.19
Asian	5,735	4,903	85.49
Black or African American	3,554	2,393	67.33
Hispanic or Latino	12,600	8,856	70.29
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	611	370	60.56
White	46,862	41,105	87.71
Two or more races	3,970	3,307	83.30
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,747	3,086	39.83
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,751	579	21.05
Economically disadvantaged students	29,710	21,250	71.52
Migratory students	1,177	681	57.86
Male	38,202	30,684	80.32
Female	36,310	31,007	85.40
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	69,119	44,505	64.39
American Indian or Alaska Native	952	425	44.64
Asian	5,491	3,899	71.01
Black or African American	3,099	1,250	40.34
Hispanic or Latino	11,250	4,922	43.75
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	495	178	35.96
White	44,111	31,398	71.18
Two or more races	3,663	2,408	65.74
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,815	1,362	19.99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,364	236	9.98
Economically disadvantaged students	26,897	12,900	47.96
Migratory students	1,038	311	29.96
Male	35,091	22,483	64.07
Female	34,028	22,022	64.72
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	2,359		
Districts	316		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to Washington State's ESEA Flexibility, Washington is not required to submit Data Group 32 in SY11-12 ED Facts files.			

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	924		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	656		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	268		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to Washington State's ESEA Flexibility, Washington is not required to submit Data Group 32 in SY11-12 ED Facts files.			

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
286		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to Washington State's ESEA Flexibility, Washington is not required to submit Data Group 32 in SY11-12 ED Facts files.		

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	112
Extension of the school year or school day	34
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	16
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	6
Replacement of the principal	22
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	26
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	48
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	5
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	91
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Reopening as a public charter school, entering into a contract with a private entity, and takeover the school by the State were not options in Washington state for the 2011-12 sy.	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Aberdeen: The school developed a comprehensive restructuring plan that changes the delivery of instruction and revised how support services are received by students.
Battle Ground: Restructuring of the school to merge with the middle school to become one small school serving students in grades K-8 with all new administrators.
Bellevue: Implemented extended school day & year. Restructured the internal organization of the school, Implemented teacher assignment changes to include 6th grade teachers instructing LA/SS and math blocks. Professional development focused on differentiation and how to use data to inform instruction. Developed family connections center program to improve parent involvement.
Bethel: Created restructuring plans for buildings in Step 4. Two buildings focused on special education subgroup. One building focused on Reading and Math. All three buildings will have a new principal for the 2012-13 school year.
Bremerton: MVMS, step 5 went through a restructuring. They significantly increase the time in Language Arts and in Math, they added additional support classes in Language Arts, and in Math they redid the entire school schedule. BHS, step 4 spent the year planning for restructuring.



Brewster: District Improvement Facilitator was hired to guide the school improvement efforts and help to create a stronger focus on research-based instructional strategies. The school is part of a WIIN grant, which has provided strong professional development for all staff in the areas of instruction, assessment (MBAs, RBAs) as well as classroom walkthroughs and ELD training. The supt. is only in his 2nd year as is the elementary principal and the secondary principal is in her fourth year.

Burlington-Edison: The principal and staff significant to the failure of students achieving proficiency were replaced. The staff developed a restructuring plan for implementation beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. The school is moving from a Title I targeted assistance model to a school-wide model. The schedule is being modified with no less than 30 minutes for intervention and enrichment. Core curricular minutes have been increased and directly aligned with standards. The school is also implementing a comprehensive family and community involvement plan.

Everett: Implementation of outside expert to advise the school & new instructional program.

Grandview: Grandview Middle School was in Year 2 of the SIG transformation model.

Highline: New curriculum. Decrease in management authority at school level.

Kennewick: Bilingual program redesign, ERI program redesign and training working in Amistad.

Mukilteo: Consultants identified specific instructional skills that were particularly aligned to individual students skill-set needs. GLAD facilitators within those buildings supporting teachers. Title 1 Data Facilitator helps facilitate meetings.

North Mason: adopted a new reading and math curriculum for both schools. Replaced administrators in both schools and added math coaches

Pasco: math alignment, MBAs, Classroom Walk Through, Special Education and English Learner focus

Quincy: District improvement facilitator (WIIN Grant)

Renton: Each school receives differentiated support from the Chief Academic Officer and the Title I Director to execute the action plans and determine impact on student achievement.

Rochester: Replaced the Principal, complete restructuring of the school schedule to allow for longer blocked teaching periods and intervention times for each grade level. Implementation will be 12-13 school year. Addition of a math intervention block, Content Vocabulary & addition of Summer School

Royal: This school implements RTI strategies, SIOP strategies, PLC's and Step Up to Writing curriculum. Also, the building has Walk to Math and new intervention curriculums in math and reading.

Seattle: SPS has 5 schools in Step 4 and 4 Schools in Step 5. Those schools in Step 5 of improvement have been at Step 5 for 2 or more years. Those schools in Step 4 have spent the school year working with the district, building leadership team and parents to develop a restructuring plan for the building. Step 4 schools will replace staff through retirements, voluntary transfers and displacement due to reduction in hours. Step 4 schools have had leadership changes in the past two years.

Sedro Woolley: 11-12 was this building's Step 4 - Restructure Planning Year. This building will implement its' restructure plan in 12-13.

Snohomish: Emerson staff members have substantially restructured their practices. Parent involvement in school and academic support activities has increased. We will have all components of restructuring in place, as required by Step 5 of School Improvement in place by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.

Toppenish: Elementary is replacing the principal, extending school day/year, working with external support, additional professional development, etc.

Vancouver: New Principal, Turn Around School Model, new curriculum, and outside consultant.

Wapato: Replaced 2 building principals, implemented STEM, provided consultants for these buildings.

Warden: WIIN Center.

Yakima: content enhancement, learning strategies, KU, language for thinking and learning, AVID, full day K, early learning, extended learning opportunities, K-2 alignment, READ 180"

### 1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All districts receiving Title I funds and identified for a step of improvement are provided an opportunity to participate in the District Improvement Assistance program. Under the Washington Accountability System and the No Child Left Behind law, school districts are expected to meet the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) performance targets. A district is identified as "needing improvement" when it has not made AYP consistent with NCLB Guidelines for two consecutive years. If that happens the following actions are required.

#### District Improvement Assistance

Districts in Step One of improvement (not making Adequate Yearly Progress for two consecutive years) are required to develop or revise a district improvement plan and implement within 90 days from the date of AYP notification. The development of the plan must involve parents, school staff, and others.

The district improvement plan must:

- \*Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs of the district's school(s), especially the needs of the low-achieving students;
- \* Define specific measurable achievement goals and targets for each student subgroup;
- \*Incorporate appropriate student learning activities before school, after school, during the summer, and during any extension of the school year;
- Provide for high-quality professional development for instructional staff that focuses on improved instruction;
- \*Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the district's schools;
- \* Include a determination of why the district's previous plan did not bring about the required increase in student academic achievement.

In Step 2 of District Improvement, districts are required to take corrective action as defined by the state. The state must continue to ensure the district is provided with technical assistance and must take at least one of the following corrective actions, as consistent with state law:

- \*Defer program funds or reduce administrative funds;or
- \*Institute and fully implement a new curriculum based on state and local content and academic achievement standards that include scientifically research based professional development for all relevant staff.

#### OSPI Technical Support for District Improvement

For 2011-12 a total of 113 districts were identified as in improvement. Districts were identified in two district improvement grouping: (1) Districts in Step 1, a total of 34 districts and (2) Districts in Step 2, a total of 79 districts. The technical assistance provided to districts in improvement status varies to meet the needs of districts either as they are developing their own improvement plans or in various stages of implementation of their plans.

Among the most common supports are:

- A. Providing a School System Resource Guide (SSIRG): OSPI and WASA collaborated in developing a resource planning guide to that supports districts as they analyze existing systems, structures, data, research findings, and more as they develop/revise their district improvement plan. A revision of the SSIRG was completed in 2008-09.
- B. Providing a Part-time External District Improvement Facilitator: District Improvement Facilitators are experienced educators who have been successful in improving student performance and receive continuous training through a partnership with the Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA) throughout the year. The selection of the facilitator is a collaborative effort between OSPI and each district. The facilitator works to help build the district's capacity to support high quality, data driven, research based district improvement efforts.
- C. Providing or Arranging for Professional Development: Additional resources for professional development to expand capacity of district and school personnel to sustain continuous improvement focused on improvement of instruction may be provided to meet the needs of the districts.
- D. Provide a District Educational On-Site Review: Districts can request an Educational On-Site Review which would be completed by a team of peer educators and experts. The district's strengths and challenges are identified and recommendations for improvement are developed and provided to the district.
- E. Providing Identified Expertise: Additional resources and expertise OSPI could provide is determined on a case-by-case basis for each district, but could include such support as expertise to implement research-based practices and programs, and funding for team collaboration.
- F. Providing limited grant money. Districts may apply for two levels of grant support to assist in implementing one or more of the technical assistance opportunities listed in A-E above.

The district focused support model will be incorporated in the menu of WIIN related services for the ensuing biennium. The

legacy for the initiative, strengthened partnerships with districts along with a variety of stakeholder groups, will continue to provide benefits in our system of support for the persistently lowest-achieving schools.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	26
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	3
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	1
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	7
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	3
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The following corrective actions are not allowed in Washington State:            *Removal of one of more schools from the jurisdiction of the district            *Appointing a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district            *Abolishing the district</p>	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Washington State's ESEA Flexibility Waiver enables Washington to use an AMO process rather than AYP. Given the guidance from Partner Support zeros are entered in the 1.4.7 boxes.</p>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	0
---	---

**1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. District and School Improvement and Accountability are allowed to use the maximum set-aside to provide school improvement services on a statewide basis.

**1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools**

For SY 2011-12 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

### 1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2010-11/2011-12.

In 2011-12, the SEA received support through the 5% available for administration to assist selected districts with the pre-implementation/implementation of the SIG initiative along with the continued development through contracts with private providers focused on a statewide system of support.

#### Purpose and Background

In the 2011-12 school year, three primary things continues to influence the use of 1003(g) funds in support of the new Federal School Improvement Grant initiative. First, the major shift in Federal policy focusing on the bottom 5% of Title I and Title I eligible schools identified through a composite score on reading and math achievement measured by the state assessment over the past three consecutive years and graduation rate of less than 60%. This continues to be the focus of our School Improvement Grant assistance. Second, the provision of the Federal 1003(g) Regular funding source continues to be delayed until the second half of the 2010-2012 biennium, with the intended support of the new SIG initiative in 2011-12, along with the prospect of SIG pre-implementation activities occurring prior to the end of the 2010-11 school year. Third, for the 2011-12 Federal SIG initiative, additional 2010-11 SIG funds were provided to continue SIG implementation through an additional cohort of newly identified schools, enhancing the state's ability to initiate a new cohort of SIG schools.

Our current work is based on an approved State application for SIG funding and subsequent funding waiver request (a composite of 1003(g) Regular and SIG ARRA), for three years (through September 2013) for Cohort I, SIG. Of the 18 schools selected in Cohort I, 17 have continued as SIG schools for the 2011-12 school year. One school had chosen the Closure model and is no longer supported through this grant. Beginning 2011-12 (inclusive of a pre-implementation phase initiated in April 2010) a new set of Districts with schools identified in the bottom 5% on the PLA list were afforded the opportunity to compete for SIG funds through Cohort II. As with SIG Cohort I, based on our learnings from Cohort I, this competitive application process required, eligible districts/schools to identify their level of readiness and need, selecting one of four Federal models along with their agreement to implement required elements within these models for each applicant school. Additionally, these SIG Cohort II schools/districts selected through this competitive process were required to individually present their SIG plans based on their recognition and implementation of the required actions specific to the model chosen. An additional 10 districts with a total of ten (10) new schools were selected to participate.

In addition, the Washington Statewide System of Support, continued to support a variety of services to identified districts. These services included but not limited to need assessments, contextual survey data and data dashboard support, classroom walkthrough training/PD and improvement planning support and monitoring/tracking for accountability purposes.

#### Evaluation and Technical Assistance

The SEA continues to provide Evaluation and Technical Assistance support through agency FTEs that are funded through the SIG 5% administrative reserve. During this time period, approximately 3-4 FTE provided coordination efforts for baseline evaluation involving the original 9 districts and 17 schools selected to continue for their second year for SIG Cohort I. The majority of the SIG evaluation component continues to be accomplished through a third party contractor who also provides evaluation services for other state-level improvement initiatives (e.g. Summit and WIIN services). Data from the evaluation of SIG is assisting the SEA in continued funding decisions and provide evidence for rapid-retry and other supportive initiatives to help sustain these improvement efforts once the grant funding is no longer available.

Continued Technical Assistance from Staff and contractors is in alignment with the research-based characteristics of improving districts (Characteristics of Improved School Districts: Themes from Research, Shannon, G.S. & Bylsma, P. October 2004), helps target specific outcomes within the themes of:

- Effective Leadership
- Quality Teaching and Learning
- Support for System wide Improvement
- Clear and Collaborative Relationships

For the 2011-12 school year, SEA support through the provision of Foundational Professional Development Support for enabling effective classroom instruction continues to be centered around engaging teachers and educational leaders in ongoing reflection around instructional practice and next-steps implementation for improved student learning. Foundational professional development for instructional leaders in year one and year 2 focuses on high-yield instructional strategies (See Marzano's Classroom Instruction that Works) and the application of a Classroom Walkthrough Process. These areas of study continue to be advanced through face-to-face training in the district setting, coaching at the school level, and the availability of online support tools. Online resources include expert commentary, classroom video examples, teacher commentary, student work samples, and planning templates available in an online professional development library.

#### Enhanced Technical Assistance Efforts

The implementation of effective instruction, assessment and intervention systems in reading and mathematics is essential to enabling all students to achieve at high levels. Within the context of district action plans, OSPI staff are providing technical assistance in the content areas of reading and mathematics and in meeting the needs of English Language Learners. Specific areas of continued focus will depend on district context relative to implementation of state standards, aligned instructional materials, assessment and intervention systems.

Ongoing training for key district staff in accessing, using, and analyzing data continues to supplement content-specific activities. District and school-based technical assistance contractors have been assigned to Summit districts. These experienced, exemplary educators work in an ongoing capacity with district personnel, supporting the effective implementation of Initiative strategies in leadership, instruction, data analysis, assessment, intervention, and the alignment of district and school improvement plans. Our ability to maintain this level of technical assistance will be critical to sustain the ongoing efforts to the existing districts and schools.



**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2011-12 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Due to the continued decline of state revenue and the loss of other non-Title I resources supporting improvement efforts, no state funding was made available for additional school improvement activities tied to current models. We continue to explore private foundation funding but have been unsuccessful, further impacting our efforts and diminishing our capacity to provide services at the current level of need.

## 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

#### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	209,364
Applied to transfer	1,825
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,538
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,930,578

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	102

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	134,311
Applied for supplemental educational services	38,134
Received supplemental educational services	16,972
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 18,217,882
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	229,244	223,670	97.57	5,574	2.43
All elementary classes	35,393	34,315	96.95	1,078	3.05
All secondary classes	193,851	189,355	97.68	4,496	2.32

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2011, the Title II, Part A office implemented a new HQT Data Collection Tool. This tool pulls data from multiple sources. Using data from the S-275 and Comprehensive Education Data and Research System (CEDARS), we can report more thorough and more accurate data in the CSPR and EDEN Report. Through CEDARS reporting, we are now able to collect and report more accurate information on teachers and courses in juvenile detention facilities, and bilingual programs. In addition, we are now collecting data on long-term substitutes and contracted teachers in online programs.

The numbers above include summer school courses. However, the Highly Qualified Teacher numbers for Summer School teachers is not indicated. In the past, we have counted the core academic classes, but have not required the districts to report the Highly Quality Teachers of Summer school teachers. We will collect and include this information in future CSPR/EDEN reports.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Washington State counts Elementary classes as a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.
---

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

### 1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note:** Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	56.00
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	35.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	9.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2011-12 SY, Washington State initiated a new comprehensive HQT data Collection tool that collects information from the S-275 and Washington State's Comprehensive Education Data and Research Systems (CEDARS). By pulling data from multiple sources, we are able to provide a more accurate data picture.

Due to this new system, we expected and received, different numbers than previously reported. Districts now have access to a system that double-checks data entry to find errors when reporting the highly qualified/non-highly qualified status of teachers.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	48.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	27.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	25.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2011-12 SY, Washington State initiated a new HQT data Collection tool that collects information from the S-275 and Washington State's Comprehensive Education Data and Research Systems (CEDARS). By pulling data from multiple sources, we are able to provide a more accurate data picture.

Using this new tool, we did see an increase of teachers in the "other" category. The areas that are effected in this category include our juvenile detention centers and bilingual studies. Teachers in juvenile centers, are reporting non-highly qualified teachers in science, mathematics, reading, English/language arts, history, and geography.

The reason for the higher totals are due to inconsistent counting by district's in previous years. For the last few years, we have relied on data input by our districts and believed them to be accurate. Now that we have an electronic reporting system in place that pulls from multiple sources, we trust the numbers submitted this year to be more accurate.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

**NOTE:** No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	8,823	8,691	98.50
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	8,886	8,198	92.26
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	38,932	37,997	97.60
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	62,611	61,277	97.87

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	65.70	30.40
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate	
Secondary schools	65.70	30.40
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate	



**FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty**

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish, Russian, Chinese
<u>No</u>	Two-way immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish, Russian
<u>No</u>	Heritage language	
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>No</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>No</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>No</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>No</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	97,397
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	96,437
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	64,886
Russian	4,178
Vietnamese	3,776
Somali	2,572
Chinese	2,077

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Ukrainian - 1,874 Korean - 1,386 Taglog - 1,324 Arabic - 1,245
---

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121 (a)(2).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	89,933
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,611
Total	92,544
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 97,397 ELIs were enrolled at some point during the academic year. Of these students, 92,544 were enrolled during the February/March testing window of which 89,933 were tested. This translates into the state meeting the 95% participation rate on the annual English language proficiency assessment.	

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	10,416
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	11.44
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

### 1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	89,154
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,457
Total	91,611
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 96,437 Title III ELIs were enrolled at some point during the academic year. Of these students, 91,611 were enrolled during the February/March testing window of which 89,154 were tested. This translates into the state meeting the 95% participation rate on the annual English language proficiency assessment.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	23,674

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

#### Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	47,722	72.88	43,395	67.20
Attained proficiency	10,315	11.57	6,313	7.10
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
N A
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
NA
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
NA
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
18,347	11,044	29,391
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**1.6.3.6.2** In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
18,438	11,407	61.87	7,031
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			



**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
18,453	12,797	69.35	5,656
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP(MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,154	2,819	54.70	2,335
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

#### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

**Note:** Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	157
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	42
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	135
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	132
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	58
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	5
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	38
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	20
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	20

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

**Note:** Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

#### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

**Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.**

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who only receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
19,587	724	2

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note:** Section 3301(8) - The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course - (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,174
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,632

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

### 1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

#### Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	135	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	94	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	1	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	75	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	40	
Other (Explain in comment box)	29	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	132	21,502
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	108	6,130
PD provided to principals	84	900
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	83	811
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	74	1,574
PD provided to community based organization personnel	16	155
Total	497	31,072

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Professional Development that should have been entered in the database as Instructional strategies for LEP students and was enter under the "Other" category

-ELL Vocab Strategies  
 -English language development training targeting middle school staff. Topics covered were: cultural awareness; language acquisition  
 -ELL Vocab Strategies  
 -ELL Strategies with A Cultural Focus  
 -ELL Instructional Support/Observation/Modeling  
 -Enrichment/Intervention Strategies-SIOP; GLAD; AVID; HYELL  
 -Instructional Support/Modeling  
 -Differentiated Teaching for ELL Students

**1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities**

This section collects data on State grant activities.

**1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process**

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/12	7/1/12	45
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The timeline begins on the date the districts has submitted a request for review. The final approval is contingent on the district submitting additional information to their "needs more work request. To ensure districts can obligate fund beginning July 1st, the state has in place a subtantually approve status process.		

**1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees**

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Establish timelines and due dates for grant applications.</li> <li>-Make program applications, training, and preliminary allocation available by May 1st to ensure that districts have available the information needed to assist in the application process.</li> <li>-Prepopulate sections of the application that may not require change.</li> <li>-Implement a substantially approved process to allow districts to beginning incurring cost as of July 1st.</li> <li>-Review the status of applications submitted on a weekly basis.</li> </ul>
--

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	255	255
LEAs with subgrants	40	40
Total	295	295
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		



**1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)**

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	351	290
K	1,310	931
1	1,398	865
2	1,265	795
3	1,297	787
4	1,251	739
5	1,191	704
6	1,151	723
7	1,112	696
8	1,136	679
9	1,256	747
10	1,136	708
11	1,153	723
12	1,768	1,228
Ungraded	0	0
Total	16,775	10,615
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	4,233	2,291
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	11,017	7,315
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	744	461
Hotels/Motels	781	548
Total	16,775	10,615
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	606
K	1,004
1	979
2	898
3	890
4	839
5	769
6	787
7	776
8	745
9	825
10	771
11	787
12	1,291
Ungraded	0
Total	11,967

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Age birth through 2 was not collected.

### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,660
Migratory children/youth	714
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,459
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,579

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

### 1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

#### 1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths who were tested on the State *ESEA* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,522	700
4	1,482	695
5	1,410	633
6	1,364	635
7	1,270	649
8	1,273	561
High School	1,102	709

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,533	631
4	1,475	484
5	1,405	505
6	1,362	459
7	1,265	428
8	1,271	382
High School	1,002	515

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	1,402	573
6		
7		
8	1,266	508
High School	899	374

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science assessment was not administered at all grades.

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

**Note:** In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

### FAQs on Child Count:

*a. How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

*b. How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	801
K	1,918
1	1,954
2	1,939
3	1,813
4	1,831
5	2,016
6	1,864
7	1,743
8	1,795
9	1,905
10	1,729
11	1,634
12	1,807
Ungraded	2
Out-of-school	8,696
Total	33,447
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Difference is less than 10 percent.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	129
K	246
1	242
2	246
3	225
4	220
5	151
6	127
7	115
8	76
9	210
10	215
11	220
12	103
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,525</b>
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Student enrollment in summer programs decreased in most grade levels during the 2011-12 school year either due to the local educational agency providing a summer program for all students - including migrant students, or a decrease in the hours of operation.



### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Q: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period?

A: The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program contracts with the Migrant Student Data and Recruitment (MSDR) office to maintain the Migrant Student Information System (MSIS). The MSIS is used for the exclusive collection of data for migrant students identified by Washington State's MEP recruitment staff. The MSIS database is accessed via a web application created with Coldfusion and the database itself resided in a SQL Server. This system is used to generate counts for both Category 1 and Category 2.

Q: Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)?

A: Yes.

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Q: How was child count data collected?

A: Staff at each project LEA are required to identify migrant students according to MEP eligibility requirements and record such eligibility determinations on the State COE. The State COE incorporates all required data elements and sections of the National COE. Student enrollment and movement information is reported into MSIS once their attendance has been verified for those students attending non-project districts, staff at the MSDR office enter their mobility and enrollment information into MSIS after their residency has been verified. All LEAs have secured Internet access to the MSIS allowing for immediate data collection once students are identified as qualifying for the MEP. In addition, program staff conduct on-going (active) Identification and Recruitment to locate eligible families throughout the enrollment period (September 1 - August 31).

Q: What data were collected?

A: If the student is newly identified as being eligible for the MEP, a Certificate of Eligibility is completed through a face to face interview. The certificate contains student data, parent data, qualifying move data and school enrollment information, all of which is entered into MSIS. The student data includes the names of eligible children, gender, birth data, birth verification, multiple birth information, and birth place (city, state, country). The parent data includes Father/Guardian, Mother/Guardian, street address, city, state, zip, and phone number. The qualifying move data includes whether the child moved with or to join a parent/guardian or moved on his/her own, the relationship of the student/s to the qualifying worker, the name of the qualifying worker, from (city, municipality, state, country), to city and state, qualifying activity and crop, whether the move was agricultural or fishing related, and the qualifying arrival date. The school enrollment information includes the name of the school district, building, enrollment date, grade level, academic and assessment information (where applicable), and health information. If the student was not new to the MSIS or to the LEA and had an eligible qualifying move within the previous 36 months, then an enrollment is processed for the student. This enrollment is not processed until enrollment, residency and eligibility have been confirmed through contacting the family. The enrollment contained the student unique ID number, student name, district ID, building ID, enrollment date, and grade level.

Q: What activities are conducted to collect the data?

A: At the beginning of every school year, LEA records clerks are asked to enroll their returning students whose residency has been confirmed by LEA staff by completing a preprinted form in MSIS containing a list of the previous year's students. Students are only included on this form if they have made a qualifying move within the last three years and if they are eligible to receive MEP funded services. The form is preprinted by the MSDR office and only MEP eligible students under the 36-month eligibility criteria will appear on this form. All students whose 36-month eligibility has ended are automatically terminated in the MSIS and will not appear on this enrollment form. Identification and Recruitment state and local staff are also interviewing and enrolling eligible migrant students on an on-going basis throughout the enrollment period (September 1-August 31). The state's migrant student database system allows authorized program managers and staff an opportunity to review enrollment efforts on a continuous basis. At the end of the Category 1 and Category 2 enrollment periods, a final report is provided to the state for reporting and analyzing purposes. Records clerks in Washington State enroll migrant students in the MSIS via the Internet after receiving confirmation from the home visitor/recruiter that the student was physically residing within their district boundaries. For every new student a COE is completed and the student is enrolled in the MSIS. For other eligible students that are still eligible under the 36-month eligibility period, an enrollment is processed using the existing COE data. If these students make a more recent qualifying move, then a new COE is completed and the qualifying arrival date is updated in the MSIS database. All COEs completed by LEA staff are reviewed by MSDR staff for accuracy. If a student is incorrectly enrolled, LEA staff notifies MSDR support staff and request a deletion of the incorrect enrollment. That enrollment record is then completely deleted from the MSIS.

Q: When were data collected for use in the student information system?

A: Throughout the year, if new students are identified or if students leave and subsequently return to the LEA, records clerks process these enrollments as they occur. Student identification and enrollment data is collected throughout the school year by LEA records clerks, if students are identified as residing within their school district boundaries. School districts operating a summer migrant program process (during their summer program) an enrollment in the MSIS for those students attending summer school.

Data for Category 2 counts is collected and maintained utilizing the same procedures as Category 1.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information

system for child count purposes at the State level.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data is inputted into the Migrant Student Information System for child count purposes by the local educational agency's records clerk who processes yearly enrollments directly into the MSIS SQL database, after student residency has been confirmed through family contact. School district staff may update enrollments by accessing and updating the specific record directly through the Internet or by mailing data to the MSDR Office. Updates occur when a migrant student is new to the local district, has made a more-recent qualifying move, or has changes to the data collection components listed in Part 1 of this Section. Data is organized by designating a unique student identification number. When an enrollment is processed, it is tied to the student ID number, thus making it possible to query the MSIS database for a specific number of students who had an enrollment during a specified time frame. Data may be sorted for state reporting and management purposes utilizing the unique student ID number and the various data elements collected.

If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data for Category 2 counts is collected and maintained utilizing the same procedures as Category 1.

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- Children who were between age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Q: How is each child count calculated for ...

\*Children who were between age 3 and 21;

\*Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);

Category 1:

The Category 1 count is an amalgamation of two student datasets. The first dataset is comprised of students between the ages of 3 and 21 who have a qualifying move within 36 months of their school enrollment date. Calculations based on the unique student ID number, maximum enrollment date, birth date, and qualifying arrival date fields ensure only those students enrolled and eligible for this reporting period are counted. Utilizing this process, students with multiple enrollment dates are only counted once in the reporting period.

The second dataset is comprised of students between the ages of 3 and 21 who were identified by LEA or MSDR staff as having made a qualifying move into and resided within the State during the child count reporting period, but were not enrolled by any LEA during the same period. These are considered out-of-school students and are counted as Out of School Youth for this reporting period..

When a child who has been enrolled as a two-year-old turns three (3) and becomes eligible, she/he will appear on a "Students Turning Three" report available to LEAs through the Migrant Student Information System. LEAs then verify that the students on the list are still residing within their district, and after the verification process is complete, an enrollment is processed for each resident three year old child. At no time is a two-year-old automatically enrolled as a three-year-old. When a student graduates from school, their LEA will process a withdrawal for that student in MSIS as well as enter a termination code indicating that the child has been terminated due to graduation.

Category 2 The only summer services for which a child is counted are those that are funded in whole or part with MEP during the summer term. All student graduates of the regular school year are terminated upon graduation from high school and are no longer eligible for MEP service. Since these students are terminated from the database, they are not counted for the summer Category 2 report.

All students that end their eligibility and are still attending school and being served with MEP funds are withdrawn from eligible status and enrolled in an end-of-eligibility (EOE) status and are eligible for services until the end of the term, including summer school, but are not counted in the Category 2 count. Secondary students who are being served through credit accrual only and are in the EOE status and may be served, but are not included in the Category 2 count. The EOE status is only used to count those students that receive services under the "Continuation of Services" provision and are included in the Consolidated State Performance Report Part II. The query used to extract students for Category 2 purposes uses a birth date factor of 3-21 year olds only - when a child turns three years of age, an enrollment is processed in the MSDR after verifying that the child is still residing within the district.

Students whose eligibility has expired during the regular school year are not included in Category 2 counts. These students can only be enrolled in the MSDR using the EOE status and are excluded from the Category 2 count.

\*Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);

If the local educational agency processed an enrollment for a student during the reporting period, and the student made a qualifying move within 36 months of the reporting period, the student was counted. Using an out-of-school ID, LEAs enroll in the MSIS all students residing in their districts who are MEP eligible and not attending school. (It should be noted that local educational agencies receive monthly building lists or may view via the Internet student enrollments to ensure only students

who were residing in their school district are actually enrolled. In addition, in order for a student move to be a qualifying move, the student must have resided in the destination at which qualifying employment was sought for at least 48 hours.)

\*Children who, in the case of Category 2, received a MEP funded service during the summer or inter-session term;

All children enrolled in summer/intercession programs that received a MEP funded service were counted. Only those students that are enrolled in a migrant summer school (funded in whole or in part with MEP funds) are counted in the Category 2 count. Records clerks are required to enroll migrant students in a summer building ID and report which migrant students are receiving migrant funded services into the MSIS. All our MEP summer schools start after the end of the spring term and end before the start of the fall term. End-of-Year Summer Reports of migrant students served in summer programs are reviewed by MEP staff. State staff reviews the report to ensure they are within the size and scope of the approved application submitted and that the information on student services was reported to MSIS. On-site reviews of summer projects by MEP staff specifically include verifying eligibility of migrant students.

\*Children once per age/grade level for each child count category:

Using the unique student ID number, a computer-generated program allows MSDR staff to prepare a statewide studentcount report which contains the statewide student total of all eligible migrant students identified and enrolled in the MSDR during the eligible period. A manual quality control process is also in place to ensure that students who may have more than one ID number are merged into one record. A query is run to extract a list of students that have possible matches of the following information: student's first name, last name, parent information, birth date, birth city, state and country. If the student has enough matching information, a manual review of the student list is done and the data is merged into one record with the other records being deleted. All staff that is involved in creating and updating these records is contacted to ensure that the record kept is the one to be used for all future reporting of data. By using a unique student ID for each migrant student, the system ensures that a student is counted only once, regardless of the number of enrollments the student may have generated throughout the year.

If your State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state used the same system to generate Category 2 counts as was used to generate Category 1.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All educational staff responsible for making eligibility determinations are required to attend annual MSDR trainings at which staff are trained to make eligibility determinations of migrant students and how to accurately complete COEs. All new home visitors are trained by MSDR staff on eligibility criteria, eligibility rulings, finding migrant families, and COE completion. In addition to the new home visitor training, training is available at our annual state MEP conference and at our annual regional network meetings, and additional one-to-one basis depending on need. In addition, technical assistance is provided over the phone or via email throughout the year as needed. LEA staff complete and submit all COEs to the MSDR office. State MEP staff review COEs as submitted to their office for accuracy and verify students meet MEP eligibility criteria. State MSDR staff complete COEs in many areas of the state. Their COEs are reviewed by other MSDR staff for accuracy and to verify students meet MEP eligibility criteria. Only those students whose names have been included on the COE may be enrolled in MSIS. In addition, the following are practices that our state uses to ensure the proper identification or verification of the eligibility of each child included in the child count:

\*The SEA has a standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form and process that is used statewide.

\*Student eligibility is based on a personal face-to-face interview with a parent, guardian or other responsible adult.

\*All COEs are reviewed by MSDR staff to ensure accuracy following the MSDR COE Review Process. This process includes at least 2 MSDR members reviewing the COE prior to data entry.

Questionable COES are held until the local educational agency home visitor/recruiter returns calls for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification to MSDR. A listing of commonly found errors and guidance for reducing the errors is created by MSDR and distributed to local school districts to provide additional assistance. These commonly found errors are also highlighted in the MSDR newsletter and used as examples in statewide trainings.

\*The SEA provides recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook) that is updated periodically based on eligibility clarifications or additional guidance from the Office of Migrant Education as well as the federal register (nonregulatory guidance).

\*SEA staff reviews student attendance, enrollment, days enrolled, days present and withdrawal date at summer/intersession projects through summer end of year monitoring activities.

\*The SEA has both local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions.

\*The SEA periodically evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revises the procedures.

\*Written procedures are provided to summer/inter-session personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data.

\*Records/data entry personnel are provided training at least annually on how to review summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes.

\*State level recruiters each have randomly selected COEs reviewed for accuracy and validity.

\*Randomly selected COEs are further examined by the Quality Assurance Coordinator, and the families are re-interviewed to certify valid identification and eligibility standards are met.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the 2011-2012 school-year the MSDR Office had the responsibility of re-interviewing migrant families for approximately one-half of the state's migrant funded school districts and MSDR recruiters who completed a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) for the Migrant Education Program. In addition, all new recruiters hired during the school year and any recruiter who was found to have inaccurately completed a COE during the 2010-2011 school year were also reviewed. The following are the results of our re-interviewing activities:

Number of Families Reviewed 112

Families Found Eligible 91

Families Found Eligible w/Changes 21

Families found Not Eligible 0

Definitions of COE results terminology is as follows:

Eligible -- indicates the eligibility determination was correct and accurately documented.

Eligible with Changes -- indicates the eligibility determination was correct; however, the reviewer found errors with some of the data documented on the COE.

Not Eligible -- indicates the family was incorrectly identified as eligible for MEP services.

In instances where the reviewer found Eligible with Changes due errors on qualifying COEs:

5 COEs incorrectly recorded student name or birth date information;

7 COEs incorrectly recorded the Qualifying Arrival Date or Qualifying Activity;

7 COEs incorrectly recorded the qualifying From or To City; and

2 COEs incorrectly recorded the Parent or Qualifying Worker name.

These errors were corrected on the COEs and the student database system.

Apart from re-interviewing the families, eligibility technical assistance is provided to school district staff during school district visitation and family re-interviews, and results of the re-interviews are used to develop recruitment training activities for the 2012-13 school year.

School district staff were notified in writing of the re-interview results.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

MSDR staff conduct quarterly monitoring of LEA staff data entry activities. This includes monitoring enrollment and education data updates. As the MSIS database provides LEA staff with instant access to student/district data, LEA staff have the ability to view their enrollments through the MSIS building list report. This allows them to verify enrollments (by building and by student) are processed correctly and to compare MSIS data with LEA data. Additionally, users have the ability to view the Enrollment Summary Comparison Report on a daily basis. Not only can LEA staff use this report to verify MSIS enrollment counts, but it also gives them an opportunity to compare this year's counts to those of last year. Student record merges are conducted only by staff within the MSDR office. As all data collected via the MSIS is student focused, staff ensures students have only one record by running a Merge Report which queries the system pulling out students

whose data is very similar. Any student records that need to be combined are then merged into one record and the second record is archived and isolated to be completely independent from other valid records.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the months of January, February, and May, state staff contact LEAs receiving migrant funds to review reporting practices and confirm accuracy of submitted data. Any students who were incorrectly identified as being eligible for services are deleted from the Migrant Student Information System. A hard copy of the COE found to be ineligible is filed with supporting notations. In addition, per the ED approved consolidated federal program four-year monitoring cycle, the State Educational Agency conducts a consolidated program review of the required compliance items for the Migrant Education Program and reviews a sampling of Certificates of Eligibility to ensure they are completed accurately and that local school district listings of migrant students served matches those listed in the MSIS database. This activity is carried out to ensure enrollments are correctly processed. In addition, state staff compare the approved school district grant application to MSIS produced End-of-Year reports to ensure the district is implementing and serving migrant students within the size and scope of the approved application. State office staff also compare reported numbers with previous reported numbers, and rectify counts or ensure reasons for the changes. If any discrepancies occur, state staff follow-up with the LEA.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MSDR has implemented a third party review practice as part of its Standard Operating Procedures and strongly encourages the local district home visitors/recruiters to accompany the reviewer on such reviews as a way to ensure accuracy and consistency in the interview and eligibility process. As a result of the prospectus re-interviewing, material has been developed and disseminated to staff to assist with those moves requiring additional comments, weekly eligibility emails are sent to all staff completing COEs, and commonly occurring errors are highlighted via a quarterly newsletter or at regional/statewide trainings conducted in the fall and spring.

This additional quality control is part of the annual state initiated quality control process and as such, the number of revalidations conducted are included in the overall count for reinterviews.

The reinterview process is completed by a state level recruiter who samples Certificates of Eligibility completed by newly employed Local Educational Agency Identification and Recruitment staff to verify program eligibility and correct any errors.

The state level recruiter has over 20 years in Identification and Recruitment of migrant families in Washington State and is nationally recognized for his interview techniques. He annually attends national I/R trainings and also participates in state Identification and Recruitment trainings.

The state has a written process for quality control which identifies the method for selecting Local Educational Agencies where reinterviews will occur (based on newly employed I/R staff); notification to LEA informing them of the activity to take place; process for random selection of COE's completed by new staff member; process for reinterviewing family; procedures for COE verification or corrections to COE; process for entering updated information into the state student database system; and procedures for notifying LEA of results of verification process.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Washington State does not have any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child count.