

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

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

WASHINGTON



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (*NCLB*) 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*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- 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 *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

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.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction	
Address: P O Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Christine Finkle	
Telephone: 360-725-6229	
Fax: 360-586-4536	
e-mail: christine.finkle@k12.wa.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Cathy Davidson	
_____ Signature	_____ Thursday, March 6, 2008, 2:57:39 PM Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* 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

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reading/Language Arts: No revisions or changes to the reading content standards were taken or planned.

During the 2007 Legislative session the Washington State Legislature required several actions related to review and revision of the state's academic content standards for mathematics and science (SSHB 1906). SSHB 1906 requires the State Board of Education (SBE) to conduct an independent review of the mathematics and science standards and then for OSPI to respond to the recommendations generated from the independent review by revising the K-12 standards.

Mathematics: The first content area the SBE reviewed was mathematics. The Review and Recommendations report was submitted to OSPI in September 2007 with the legislated requirement that OSPI would manage a revision process that will result in revised standards being presented to the Legislature by January 31 2008. OSPI is expected to adopt the revised K-12 mathematics standards in Spring 2008.

OSPI selected an external contractor (the Charles A Dana Center for Mathematics and Science Education affiliated with the University of Texas - Austin) to manage and facilitate the revision process. The Dana Center was selected following a competitive bidding process in September 2007. Revision committee meetings began the first week of October 2007. Standards Revision Teams (content and writing) have met several times during the fall. A preliminary draft of the revised K-12 standards was posted for public input and comment in December 2007.

Science: The SBE is currently conducting the independent review of the science content standards. The results of the review and subsequent recommendations will be presented to OSPI in June 2008. OSPI will then manage a revision process similar to that of mathematics in summer/fall 2008 with the legislated requirement that the revised standards are presented to the Legislature in December 2008.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (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*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments made or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Subsequent to changes to the mathematics content standards, the state will review and revise as necessary test and item specifications for mathematics once new content standards have been adopted. New items will be field tested in the spring 2009 assessment, with a new assessment being administered in 2010; results on the new assessment will be relative to scales established in a standard-setting process approved by the State Board of Education (SBE).

The state's assessment against alternate achievement standards is a portfolio-based measure, where a student's "targeted skills" are derived from extensions of Grade-Level Expectations. These GLE Extensions will be revised using the new mathematics content standards during the 2008-09 school year, with implementation of the revised portfolio assessment becoming operational in 2010, after the SBE has considered the recommendations of a standard -setting panel and has adopted new performance standards.

A similar timeline will be followed for the science assessment, with piloting of new items in 2011, and standards being set by the SBE. Science alternate assessments will use GLE Extensions that are revised in 2009-10, resulting in a new assessment in 2011.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions are planned, beyond those described in 1.1.2, above.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (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*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Washington has administered a Science assessment in grades 8 and 10 since 2003, and in grade 5 since 2004. An alternate standard based on alternate achievement standards has been in place in those grades since the original assessment years.
--

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Academic achievement standards for science were established for grades 8 and 10 in 2003, and for grade 5 in 2004. These standards were set by the state's Academic Achievement and Accountability Commission, which was legislatively authorized to establish performance standards on the state's assessments.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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 *NCLB* 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 were tested in mathematics. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	538382	516280	95.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	13605	13164	96.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	43889	43353	98.8
Black, non-Hispanic	29890	29075	97.3
Hispanic	74516	73135	98.2
White, non-Hispanic	354317	347805	98.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	60208	57849	96.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31254	30714	98.3
Economically disadvantaged students	200913	196758	97.9
Migratory students	10849	10640	98.1
Male	269279	263587	97.9
Female	257060	252693	98.3
Comments: The total number of students served by ethnicity will not match the total N of students as we have students who report either multi-ethnic or no response.			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for 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 were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	25846	42.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	17925	29.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	4397	7.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	13016	21.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	61184	
Comments: There are no students to report in the 'Alternate Assessment Based on Alt. Achievement Standards'.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	538287	514044	95.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	13519	13133	97.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	43667	43129	98.8
Black, non-Hispanic	29676	28851	97.2
Hispanic	74287	72934	98.2
White, non-Hispanic	352439	346279	98.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	60085	57703	96.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31254	30565	97.8
Economically disadvantaged students	200071	196065	98.0
Migratory students	10817	10608	98.1
Male	268195	262687	98.0
Female	255495	251357	98.4

Comments: The total number of students served by ethnicity will not match the total N of students as we have students who report either multi-ethnic or no response.

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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 *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	27736	45.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15452	25.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	4493	7.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	13524	22.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	61205	
Comments: There are no students to report in the 'Alternate Assessment Based on Alt. Achievement Standards'.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* 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 were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74560	52679	70.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1999	1087	54.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	6338	4962	78.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4288	2296	53.5
Hispanic	11766	5887	50.0
White, non-Hispanic	48604	37365	76.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9887	4456	45.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6675	2199	32.9
Economically disadvantaged students	31493	17870	56.7
Migratory students	1676	749	44.7
Male	38190	26589	69.6
Female	36291	26039	71.8

Comments: We have reviewed all reported data and the data have been verified and stand as reported.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74481	53672	72.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1993	1149	57.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	6116	4709	77.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4281	2501	58.4
Hispanic	11733	5882	50.1
White, non-Hispanic	48529	38148	78.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9398	4443	47.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6631	1839	27.7
Economically disadvantaged students	31456	18146	57.7
Migratory students	1677	697	41.6
Male	38128	26154	68.6
Female	36275	27464	75.7

Comments: We have reviewed all reported data and the data have been verified and stand as reported.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74332	43942	59.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1927	815	42.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	6435	4372	67.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4297	1558	36.3
Hispanic	11513	4184	36.3
White, non-Hispanic	48685	32168	66.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10001	3222	32.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5676	1034	18.2
Economically disadvantaged students	30908	12937	41.9
Migratory students	1716	515	30.0
Male	38140	22081	57.9
Female	36145	21838	60.4
Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74377	57775	77.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1930	1266	65.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	6209	5196	83.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4296	2835	66.0
Hispanic	11517	7079	61.5
White, non-Hispanic	48696	40074	82.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9084	5176	57.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5661	2160	38.2
Economically disadvantaged students	30936	20345	65.8
Migratory students	1718	942	54.8
Male	38159	28137	73.7
Female	36171	29606	81.9
Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73832	44656	60.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1975	831	42.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	6264	4387	70.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4226	1658	39.2
Hispanic	10841	4053	37.4
White, non-Hispanic	49101	32888	67.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9374	2755	29.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4435	601	13.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29780	12827	43.1
Migratory students	1588	451	28.4
Male	37815	22654	59.9
Female	35958	21970	61.1
Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	73874	53869	72.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1976	1160	58.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	6053	4861	80.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4221	2502	59.3
Hispanic	10841	5781	53.3
White, non-Hispanic	49111	38384	78.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8613	3955	45.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4426	1000	22.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29795	17436	58.5
Migratory students	1585	661	41.7
Male	37847	26216	69.3
Female	35972	27623	76.8
Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75184	38054	50.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1917	630	32.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6248	3671	58.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4261	1168	27.4
Hispanic	10878	2829	26.0
White, non-Hispanic	50449	29049	57.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8710	1623	18.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3782	255	6.7
Economically disadvantaged students	29297	9323	31.8
Migratory students	1523	276	18.1
Male	38441	19242	50.1
Female	36673	18776	51.2
Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.8 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75193	51899	69.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1909	1042	54.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	6037	4528	75.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4255	2298	54.0
Hispanic	10869	5631	51.8
White, non-Hispanic	50455	37275	73.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7965	3087	38.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3765	821	21.8
Economically disadvantaged students	29289	16071	54.9
Migratory students	1517	654	43.1
Male	38436	24512	63.8
Female	36690	27344	74.5
Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75452	42011	55.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1898	716	37.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	6286	4119	65.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4391	1371	31.2
Hispanic	10718	3517	32.8
White, non-Hispanic	50710	31507	62.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8450	1560	18.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3855	400	10.4
Economically disadvantaged students	28849	10710	37.1
Migratory students	1568	392	25.0
Male	38482	21124	54.9
Female	36900	20865	56.5
Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.10 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	75390	52748	70.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1889	1031	54.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	6091	4656	76.4
Black, non-Hispanic	4386	2447	55.8
Hispanic	10693	5589	52.3
White, non-Hispanic	50642	37892	74.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7803	2772	35.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3831	787	20.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28791	15852	55.1
Migratory students	1557	664	42.6
Male	38426	24956	64.9
Female	36888	27755	75.2
Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77379	39575	51.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1958	606	30.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	6351	3792	59.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4302	1126	26.2
Hispanic	10187	2875	28.2
White, non-Hispanic	53222	30522	57.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8241	1327	16.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3580	355	9.9
Economically disadvantaged students	28002	9050	32.3
Migratory students	1545	357	23.1
Male	39728	20007	50.4
Female	37533	19523	52.0

Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.12 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77394	51530	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1969	995	50.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	6152	4562	74.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4306	2156	50.1
Hispanic	10166	5213	51.3
White, non-Hispanic	53185	37607	70.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7704	2358	30.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3567	841	23.6
Economically disadvantaged students	28005	14648	52.3
Migratory students	1553	705	45.4
Male	39734	24117	60.7
Female	37545	27358	72.9

Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	66774	34973	52.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1563	561	35.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	5444	3305	60.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3397	827	24.3
Hispanic	7576	2096	27.7
White, non-Hispanic	47886	27764	58.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6521	1282	19.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2795	328	11.7
Economically disadvantaged students	19853	6589	33.2
Migratory students	1042	200	19.2
Male	33971	18296	53.9
Female	32735	16637	50.8

Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.14 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	67049	56578	84.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1600	1195	74.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	5299	4669	88.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3394	2382	70.2
Hispanic	7656	5427	70.9
White, non-Hispanic	48042	42046	87.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5696	3563	62.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2786	1176	42.2
Economically disadvantaged students	19999	14604	73.0
Migratory students	1056	669	63.4
Male	34161	27691	81.1
Female	32838	28849	87.9

Comments: The data have been verified and stand as reported.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	2117	1383	65.3
Districts	297	148	49.8
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

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 the SY 2006-07 school year. 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 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	951	636	66.9
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	544	314	57.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	407	322	79.1
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

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 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
286	137	47.9
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2001 School Improvement Assistance Program (SIAP) was initiated and funded with the mission to help build capacity for schools and districts to improve student achievement through the use of a continuous school improvement model.

By state law the Superintendent of Public Instruction cannot intervene in districts without legislative approval. The voluntary nature of school improvement in Washington evolved from these policies. Although a variety of assistance and intervention programs were underway when NCLB began Federal law provided the criteria to identify schools. Currently the only state interventions available through NCLB are deferring program or reducing administrative funding and authorizing students to transfer from a school not meeting AYP to another high performing school. There is no state authority available for any other interventions provided through NCLB.

Washington State uses a system of external facilitators who are contracted by the state to provide direct services to school systems. School Improvement Assistance (SIA) and District Improvement Assistance (DIA) hires primarily central office administrators and principals as external part-time school and district facilitators. SIA partners with the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) to provide leadership training and direct feedback to the leadership in schools in improvement. DIA partners with Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA) to provide leadership training and feedback for superintendents and district leadership teams.

Along with on-site support through school embedded facilitators a Performance Agreement is completed with participating SIA schools that identifies how the school school district and the State Department will support the successful implementation of the school's improvement plan. Prior to the development of a plan for improvement the district school staff and the State department consider ways in which the district can support the school and staff during the planning process.

In addition resource guides are produced to assist the external facilitators and local staff. The Nine Characteristics of High Performing Schools (May 2007 Second Edition) is a research-based framework for school improvement in Washington. Each of the studies that served as the basis for this guide was analyzed to determine which characteristics were found most often among high performing schools. Performance was usually measured in terms of high or dramatically improving scores on standardized tests often in spite of difficult circumstances such as high levels of poverty. In every case there was no single factor that accounted for the success or improvement. Instead the research found that high performing schools tend to have a combination of common characteristics.

One key lesson learned in the early stages of educational reform was the critical role of the superintendent central office and local school board. With the primary emphasis being the school as the unit of change there has been significant improvement over the three plus years of the program in several areas as measured by the Nine Characteristics of Effective Schools. However mobility of staff principals and central office leadership can negatively impact the sustainability of gains over time as successful strategies and research-based practices may not be continued and reinforced as new staff and leaders embark on different initiatives or are not knowledgeable about the school's work in the School Improvement Assistance Program. It has become increasingly clear that building the capacity of the school district to oversee support and lead improvement in district schools within a systemic framework is essential to sustained improvement.

Currently a total of 83 schools in various steps of improvement are engaged in the state School Improvement Assistance Program. Of these 83 schools 9 Cohort IV schools are in their 4th year (transition) from SIAP and receive funding for continued professional development and training activities. 22 Cohort V schools are in their third year (sustainability) continuing with a full complement of SIAP support. 7 of these Cohort V schools are non-Title I receiving the full complement of SIAP support through state general funds. The focus of this year is to create strategies and linkages to sustain their efforts without direct state level school improvement financial assistance. A total of 25 schools make up Cohort VI in their second year (implementation) of SIAP. 11 of these Cohort VI schools are non Title I supported through state general funds. The focus of this year is to fully implement and refine their school improvement plan. Cohort VII is made up of 16 schools 9 of which are supported through state general funds. Their focus in year 1 of SIAP is to create/update their school improvement plan with special attention given to an on-site third party School Performance Review/Report that helps set the stage for their data driven decision making process that supports their action plan. As stated above the Performance Agreement is also an outcome in this first year of SIAP. Finally all 11 schools identified in Step 5 of improvement are receiving fiscal support (1003a funds) with direct services being provided through their individual districts focusing on implementing their restructuring plan.

SIAP is a subset of all schools identified as being in Steps 1 through 5 of our Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) timeline for schools

(277 total). Based on 06-07 assessment data a total of 77 schools (43 Title I) have been identified as Step 1 improvement. Of these 77 schools 10 have volunteered for SIAP (7-current SIAP; 3-past SIAP). A total of 96 schools (34 Title I) have been identified as Step 2 of which 31 schools have volunteered for SIAP (22-current SIAP; 9-past SIAP). Another 39 schools (17 Title I) have been identified for Step 3. Of these 39 21 have volunteered for SIAP (12-current SIAP; 9-past SIAP). 54 schools have been identified in Step 4 of improvement. 21 of these are Title I. Of these 32 have volunteered for SIAP (19 current SIAP; 13-past SIAP). 11 schools have been identified in Step 5 of improvement. All are Title I schools and all have volunteered for SIAP (11-past/current SIAP).

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	17
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: There are a total of 39 schools identified in Step 3 Corrective Action. Of these 39 schools 17 are Title I. All but one school are in the past or current SIAP process. All schools have been identified above in the "restructuring the internal organization of the school" category as a catch all until we collect specific data from each that speaks to the other corrective action categories listed.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	11
Comments: These are schools in Step 5 of improvement. There are 11 identified. All are listed in the "other major restructuring of the school governance" category as the available/preferred option at this time. More data will be available next year to respond more specifically to other categories above. All 11 schools have been in the SIAP and are currently receiving T/A from the SEA and direct services through their LEA.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

² The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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

In the space below, 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.

A total of 29 out of 30 districts identified for improvement (out of 295 total) are currently engaged with OSPI in District Improvement Assistance (DIA). Similar to schools participating in SIA these districts represent the geographical size and demographic diversity across Washington State. Participating districts receive funding and professional development annually.

DIA hires primarily central office administrators and principals as external part-time school and district facilitators. DIA partners with Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA) to provide leadership training and feedback for superintendents and district leadership teams.

Resource guides are produced to assist the external facilitators and local staff. The Nine Characteristics of High Performing Schools is a research-based framework for school improvement in Washington. Each of the studies that served as the basis for this guide was analyzed to determine which characteristics were found most often among high performing schools. Performance was usually measured in terms of high or dramatically improving scores on standardized tests often in spite of difficult circumstances such as high levels of poverty. In every case there was no single factor that accounted for the success or improvement. Instead the research found that high performing schools tend to have a combination of common characteristics.

Another resource is the document Characteristics of Improved School Districts (October 2004). This report focuses on improved school districts and their characteristics and actions. Because school districts are complex systems within the contexts of states and communities the Washington staff points out that the strategies discussed in their studies may not be applicable in other settings. Therefore they should not be considered prescriptions to follow but rather ideas to consider. An analysis of the studies identified 13 common themes which have been clustered into four broad categories: Effective Leadership Quality Teaching and Learning Support for Systemwide Improvement and Clear and Collaborative Relationships.

The School Improvement Planning Process Guide (January 2005) is written as a planning process that leads the principal and school community through a cycle of continuous improvement. The guide provides a variety of processes resources and graphic tools to engage all stakeholders in the process and to develop deeper sustainable second order change in each school. OSPI in partnership with WASA has produced a companion guide for districts called the School System Improvement Resource Guide (SSIRG) to assist districts with their improvement efforts.

Washington enters into a two-year Performance Agreement contract with participating SIA schools that identifies how the school district and the State Department will support the successful implementation of the school's improvement plan. However prior to the development of a plan for improvement the district school staff and the State Department consider ways in which the district can support the school and staff during the planning process. Together they complete the Performance Agreement and submit it to the State with their School Improvement Plan at the end of the first year of the program. High schools participating in school improvement must submit the Initial Performance Agreement to the State by October 31st. The initial high school agreement is reviewed throughout the year and builds the foundation for the District Performance agreement to be completed the following spring.

The agreement is organized around a template of 30 district commitments and 8 State commitments with the option of additional actions to be requested by the district. The template serves as a guide to dialogue between the district and the state. Any of the parties may edit delete or add items to maximize district support to the school's plan. Participants do consider types of evidence that would demonstrate support for each of the agreed-upon commitments. Examples of the District's written commitments include:

- The district will designate a district level administrator with decision-making authority to provide direct support to the school as a member of the School Improvement Leadership Team.
- The district will ensure that all programs policies and practices are continually assessed on the basis of their impact on student learning at this school.
- The district agrees to provide data to the school to guide instructional decisions to monitor results provide for equity accountability and for consideration in the allocation of resources.
- The district agrees to increase the assignment of reading and/or math specialist time to the school.
- The district agrees to provide supplemental funding for specific professional development activities for instructional staff or for time

for staff collaboration and planning based upon strategies identified in the School Improvement Plan.

Among examples of the State Department commitments are:

- OSPI (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction) will provide a part-time School Improvement Facilitator who will work with the school district school and the School Improvement Leadership Team to develop implement and monitor a School Improvement Plan consistent with guidelines established for schools participating in SIA.

- OSPI will provide funding to support the identified objectives of the School Improvement Plan that may include the payment of stipends for the School Improvement Leadership Team members staff planning professional development and other allowable school improvement activities.

Fidelity to creating a sense of accountability â€” one key is improvement efforts are school-based but district supported. The State requires a minimum commitment of three years for a school to receive state support.

Schools and school districts are expected to ensure that existing funds are used effectively and to dedicate school district resources as identified in the jointly developed Performance Agreement. This agreement also includes a timeline for meeting implementation benchmarks and student improvement goals.

The rubrics provide consistency for both district staff and State providers of technical assistance to more clearly define each district's evolving strengths and weaknesses over time. Within each of these 9 characteristics there are sections ranging from 4 in Effective Leadership to 9 in Focused Professional Development. Each of these sections has descriptions of stages of development or sophistication according to four descriptors: Initial Stages Development Partial Implementation and System-wide Coherence.

An important adjunct to these rubrics in the SSRIG is a list of guiding questions to assist district staff as they gather the data necessary to complete the rubrics. . More in-depth rubrics have been developed and will be field tested during the 2007-08 school year in the schools and districts participating in the State Improvement Assistance Programs. These rubrics will be the foundation of the performance reviews (educational audits) but will be made available in the future for all schools and districts to use in their improvement efforts.

These documents underscore that districts should have clear and consistent expectations for instruction and for improved outcomes for students. Districts should focus intensive attention to classroom practices and provide guidance and oversight for teaching and improvement of learning for all students. Central office staff have the responsibility for defining goals and standards. Schools have latitude in the use of resources and influence over issues important to school staff in the support of high standards and expectations for all students.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	18
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	
Comments: A total of 18 districts are identified in Step 2 of District Improvement. The information requested is not currently collected at the SEA. All corrective action districts are placed in the "restructured the district" cell and will be redistributed throughout the matrix when more detailed information is available.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	11/19/07	11/19/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	08/24/07	08/24/07
Comments: Districts had password security access to their OSPI Report Card site with preliminary school AYP data on August 3, 2007.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	31	12
Schools	97	48
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	11/16/07
---	----------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the State of Washington involvement in the School Improvement Assistance Program (SIAP) is based on a voluntary model focused on schools/districts identified in improvement status.

The 1003a funds make up approximately 60% of the annual funds available for a broad base of technical assistance and direct support for schools/districts identified and volunteering for improvement. Of this \$7.3m in 1003a funds provided annually 95% is allocated for school/district support. The LEA allows the state to hold back some of this funding to support identified similar/general needs of schools/districts. The remaining 5% of these funds are used to support state administrative activities that help create the foundation for sustainable improvement efforts.

Through a statewide grants system called iGrants once identified for improvement 1003a funds are disseminated in the form of individual school/district grants to assist them in impcating the individual improvement needs. Eligible schools/districts that volunteer for improvement make application for a grant electronically idenfying their willingness to participate and develop a budget. Through a multi-step approval process school and district based awards are made. Awards range from \$80K to \$120K annually for a three-year period. A small amount of building based funds is provided for a 4th year (transition) if a school is still in improvement status. Size of school numbers of areas not making AYP % of poverty and number of students below proficiency are all factors in the selection and funding process.

For schools in SIAP funding priorities include training and professional development activities hiring consultants additional paid staff time for improvement activities substitute pay travel/lodging supplies and materials.

The SEA as approved by the LEAs involved hold back funds to provide each district/school with an on-site facilitator (contractor) embedded with the school and the leadership team 2-3 days per week. Each school receives a School Performance Review (contractor supported) with public forum to share a report/recommendations for improvement. Data resources to help develop a living school improvement plan supported by evidence based decision making (contracted). Evaluation of impact both formative and summative (contracted). Regional support through Educational Services Districts (ESDs) for training and professional development needs. Specific improvement tool development (School Improvement Planning and Process Guide State Systemic Improvement Resource Guide (SSIRG); School Improvement Planning Tool etc.) Contracted support with professional organizations/education partners for leadership (Association of Washington School Principals) and district/systemic development (Washington Association of School Administrators) along with contractor training and contractor related support services.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	24
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	19
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	30816
Who applied to transfer	238
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	221

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$
Comments: This data was not collected in 2006-07. We will initiate the tools to collect this data for 2007-08.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level 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.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	
Comments: This data was not collected in 2006-07. We will initiate the tools to collect this data for 2007-08.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a 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.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

³ 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.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	46
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" 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.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	30340
Who applied for supplemental educational services	505
Who received supplemental educational services	348
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$
Comments: This data was not collected in 2006-07. We will initiate the tools to collect this data for 2007-08.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the *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 each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) 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. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	131406	129079	98.2	2327	1.8
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	6354	6304	99.2	50	0.8
Low-poverty schools	5499	5484	99.7	15	0.3
All elementary schools	24837	24719	99.5	118	0.5
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	23719	22816	96.2	903	3.8
Low-poverty schools	23421	23049	98.4	372	1.6
All secondary schools	106569	104360	97.9	2209	2.1
Comments:					

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:

--

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.

The State counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 percent 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. 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 were 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 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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

In the table 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	56.0
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	35.4
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain)	8.6
Total	100.0

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	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)	53.3
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	29.5
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain)	17.2
Total	100.0
Comments: Other (Elem): Alternative Ed 3.3% Bilingual Ed 5.3%	
Other (Sec): Altnative Ed 11.9% Bilingual Ed 2.9% Juvenile Institutions 2.4%	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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	58.4	20.3
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	50.0	17.4
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.
- b. *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.

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

- # Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
- Type of Program** = Type 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/expert/glossary.html>.
- Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
- % Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
- OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
20	Dual language	Spanish	50.0	50.0
1	Two-way immersion	Spanish	20.0	80.0
39	Transitional bilingual	Spanish	20.0	80.0
0	Developmental bilingual	NA	0.0	0.0
0	Heritage language	NA	0.0	0.0
0	Sheltered English instruction			
0	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
86	Content-based ESL			
90	Pull-out ESL			
0	Other (explain)			

Comments: Revious data submitted reflected actual numbers of students by program model. The revised numbers reflect program models by district. Some districts may implement more than one program model.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the 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.	81113
Comments: Database entries by districts were incomplete.	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group 648, category set A.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	55769
Russian	4707
Vietnamese	3119
Ukranian	2746
Korean	1753

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	80517
Not tested/State annual ELP	3142
Subtotal	83659
LEP/One Data Point	41202
Comments: The students in "Not tested//state annual ELP" are students who were given the test but were unable to complete or respond to the test items. These students are reported as not tested.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	77899
Not tested/State annual ELP	3214
Subtotal	81113
LEP/One Data Point	39778
Comments: The numbers of students reported in this section reflect the number of students who were identified as Title III funded. The students in "Not tested//state annual ELP are students who were given the test but were unable to complete or respond to the test items. These students are reported as not tested.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
Comments: The state applies the AMAOs measurement for accountability purpose to all district but does not apply the sanction to non-Title III districts.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	68.0	29979	72.0	Y
No progress		11225		
ELP attainment	40.0	10788	55.0	Y

Comments: Numbers reported are based on the AMAO Cohort Targets submitted by the State in their Consolidated State Plan.

AMAO 1- Progress is calculated based on match student data. K students and new to program students have only one data point. Students that leave the state also fall within that category.

AMAO 2 - Attainment is calculated based on the number of students who are to exit the program by the determined exit year.

Therefore, although all students are tested, the data reported reflect the results of the numbers in the student cohorts.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress				Y
No progress				
ELP attainment				Y
Comments: The state responded yes to section 1.6.3.2.1, row 2 and therefore this section is non-applicable.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	19856
MFLEP/AYP grades	15476
Comments: The 19,856 reflect the number of monitored students for the two previous reporting periods and the 15,476 are those scheduled to be included in the calculations for AYP.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

- LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.
- LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).
- LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	33288
LEP HS/Non-AYP	6372
LEP other grades	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: The State does not provide native language assessments.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments: NA	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments: NA	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: NA		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: NA		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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
13708	6141	19849
<p>Comments: Year one students reflect the number of ELL who exited the program in 2005-06 and are in the first year of monitoring in school year 2006-07.</p> <p>Year two students reflect the number of students who exited the program in 2004-05 and are now in their second year of monitoring in school year 2006-07. These numbers exclude 11th and 12th grade students who are no longer in the school system.</p> <p>Both figures include students in AYP and non-AYP grades</p>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
15476	5572	36.0	9904

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: The number tested and the number of students at or above proficient include monitored students in both year 1 and year 2 of monitoring.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
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.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
15476	8896	57.5	6580

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: The number tested and the number of students at or above proficient include monitored students in both year 1 and year 2 of monitoring.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). 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. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) reserved funds 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	107
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	28
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	54
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	40
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	9
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	5
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	19
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	8
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	3
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	8
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	6
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	6
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	14
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	8
Comments: Revised data reflect district's AMAO performance without duplicate counts.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: The State met AMAO 1 and 2, and did not AMAO 3 - AYP.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

- Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301 (6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
- 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 receive services in Title III LIEPs under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) ONLY.
- 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 LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) that have immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
16371	4331	31

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

Comments: The number of Immigrant students enrolled in the state is reflected in the count of students submitted by districts for a total of 16371 immigrant student. Not all districts that submitted immigrant student counts met the significant increase in immigrant student required to submit an application for funding. The number of grants reflect the number of districts that qualified.

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No Response</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>Yes</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments: Competitive grants target district that normally have experience with immigrant population, the formula grants serve to provide immediate support for district that are new in providing services to immigrant populations.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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 and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1229
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	699
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	8750

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

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* 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 (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Types of Professional Development Activity** = Subgrantee activities for professional development 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 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in PD activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	99	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	85	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	57	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	58	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	79	4557
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	67	1668
PD provided to principals	57	393
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	55	224
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	49	826
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	59	826
Total		8494
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 in the format MM/DD/YY.

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 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/26/06	9/13/06	60
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

To shorten the process for distributing Title III funds, the State has made the following change:

1) Because the application approval process is contingent on districts having their annual reports submitted, the state has changed the timeline for reporting ELL student level data from the end of the school year to coincide with the Core State Reporting System which requires monthly student reporting.

2) To facilitate the application approval process, the State has scheduled statewide trainings to provide additional technical assistance on application content, timelines, and allowable activities.

Assisting districts in these two areas will shorten the process for distributing Title III funding.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	70.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	48.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	76.5
Black, non-Hispanic	53.6
Hispanic	57.5
White, non-Hispanic	74.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	54.3
Limited English proficient	55.5
Economically disadvantaged	58.0
Migratory students	
Male	67.1
Female	73.9
Comments: Data is not available for migrant students in the 2005-06 school year. Tools are in place and data is being collected for the 2006-07 school year.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	10.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.2
Black, non-Hispanic	10.1
Hispanic	8.6
White, non-Hispanic	4.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6.4
Limited English proficient	8.2
Economically disadvantaged	7.7
Migratory students	
Male	5.9
Female	4.8
Comments: Data is not available for migrant students in the 2005-06 school year. Tools are in place and data is being collected for the 2006-07 school year.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

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	272	272
LEAs with subgrants	23	23
Total	295	295
Comments: Of the 295 districts in Washington State we had a 100% return rate on our data collection. Some of the grantee districts reported above were members of multi-district consortia and not the lead grantee district.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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)	225	204
K	753	460
1	857	552
2	899	525
3	783	532
4	807	499
5	739	466
6	707	428
7	641	441
8	719	475
9	799	566
10	679	443
11	765	423
12	888	578
Ungraded	0	0
Total	10261	6592
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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	2694	2438
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6072	3422
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	649	347
Hotels/Motels	846	385
Total	10261	6592
Comments: Preschool numbers were included in our count. Washington State LEAs completed their data collection before USDE finalized the changes in data collection questions.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	214
K	437
1	521
2	498
3	499
4	471
5	443
6	395
7	433
8	477
9	560
10	443
11	420
12	581
Ungraded	0
Total	6392
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations 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 youth	825
Migratory children/youth	259
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	877
Limit English proficient students	508
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	15
2. Expedited evaluations	8
3. Staff professional development and awareness	22
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	20
5. Transportation	19
6. Early childhood programs	12
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	20
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	12
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	16
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	17
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	19
12. Counseling	10
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	13
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	20
15. School supplies	21
16. Referral to other programs and services	20
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	14
18. Other (optional)	4
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments: Response to "other": "Some 'services' involved our HEC opening up opportunities for students to receive existing services through advocacy and referral work."	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	6
2. School Selection	3
3. Transportation	13
4. School records	6
5. Immunizations	5
6. Other medical records	0
7. Other Barriers	9
Comments: Responses to "other" include: "Quick identification of homeless students" "early identification" "attendance; parent involvement" "prompt identification of homeless students" "early identification" "lack of homeless shelters in district" "the escalating costs or transportation continues to result in a reduction in services to all students" "early identification" "small children not getting to school due to parents not trusting transportation services or not waking up/waking up their children so they could take a bus or cab we sent to a location to transport children."	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *NCLB* 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 *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	0	0
4	453	243
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	353	137
8	0	0
High School	422	202

Comments: Washington State provides assessments (WASL) at grades 4 7 & 10. Grades 3 5 6 and 8 are not included in the WASL so the districts did not report numbers for those grades. (I marked grades 3 5 6 and 8 with a zero on this form as assessments do not occur at those grades.)

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	0	0
4	451	137
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	353	84
8	0	0
High School	400	82

Comments: The Washington State assessment (WASL) is administered at grades 4 7 & 10. I reported zeros for grades 3 5 6 and 8 as the WASL is not administered at those grades.

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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 in Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

Please note that 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:

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.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1267
K	2258
1	2349
2	2305
3	2201
4	2280
5	2108
6	2170
7	2177
8	2055
9	2452
10	1980
11	1592
12	1469
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	8710
Total	
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	63
K	247
1	253
2	248
3	245
4	228
5	196
6	165
7	153
8	91
9	162
10	154
11	180
12	80
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	2465
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There is a 24.85% decrease from the last report. There were more funded sources available for summer schools than in previous years. The districts used PAS for High School and preparation for many elementary students and for which Migrant Students have a right of access to. Therefore fewer Migrant staff and resources had to be used to serve migrant students. More migrant students have access to summer school but not with Migrant Education Program dollars.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

The Migrant Student Information System (MSIS) is operated under contract for the Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Title I Migrant Education Program (MEP) maintains a database for the explicit collection of data for students served by Washington State's Migrant Education Program. Records clerks at the school district enter information directly into the MSIS via the Internet or by sending their documentation to the Migrant Student Data and Recruitment (MSDR) office for entry into the MSIS. MSDR staff identify and enroll eligible migrant students in non-project districts (districts where migrant student reside but do not receive program funds) while local school personnel identify and enroll eligible migrant students in project school district. The MSIS also generated these same child counts for the previous reporting period.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Staff at each project LEA are required to report student enrollment and movement information into MSIS once their attendance has been verified. Additionally most project LEAs report immunization assessment and credit accrual information. For those students attending non-project districts staff at the MSDR office enter their mobility and enrollment information system into MSIS after their attendance has been verified. All LEAs have Internet access to the MSIS allowing for immediate data collection once students are identified as qualifying for the MEP.

If the student is newly identified as being eligible for the MEP a Certificate of Eligibility is completed. 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 race and birth place (city state country). The parent data includes Father/Guardian Mother/Guardian birth mother's maiden name street address mailing address (if different) city state zip phone number and home language. 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 municipio 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 and grade level.

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. The enrollment contained the student unique ID number student name district ID building ID enrollment date and grade level. All newly- identified migrant children and/or their parent/guardian are interviewed face-to-face by a home visitor/recruiter before the child is deemed eligible for the MEP and before the child is enrolled in the MSDR database.

At the beginning of every school year LEA records clerks are asked to enroll their returning students by completing a preprinted form in MSIS containing a list of the previous year's students.

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. 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. 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.

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.

The Category 2 count is collected using the same system and procedures as the Category 1 count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Records clerks at the local level process enrollments directly into the MSIS SQL database through on line MSDR web pages. If a school district does not have Internet capabilities the data is mailed to the MSDR office where Support Staff enter the data into the MSIS database.

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.

Each student has 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.

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.

The Category 2 count is collected using the same system and procedures as the Category 1 count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 enrollment date birth date and qualifying arrival date fields ensure only those students enrolled and eligible for this reporting period are counted.

* 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 our out-of-school students. Once their presence in a school district was verified an out-of-school enrollment was processed for this reporting period.

* When a child who has been enrolled as a two-year-old turns 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.

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

If the local school district 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 school districts receive monthly building lists or view via the Internet for the purpose of reviewing their 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 intersession term; and

All children enrolled in summer/intersession 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 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 student-count 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 all students having more than one 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 are 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.

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 year including summer school but are not counted in the Category 2 count. Secondary students who are being served through credit accrual only 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 Federal Performance Report.
- * 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.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 trained by state MSDR staff 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 the migrant families and COE completion. In addition to the new home visitor training training is available at our state MEP conference and at our 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 and other agency staff complete and submit all COEs to the MSDR office. State MEP staff review the COEs 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 through the MSIS. Each year a random sampling is done of all students enrolled in the MSIS including those families identified by MSDR staff. This listing of families is then reviewed by a third party consultant who has been trained on MEP eligibility criteria. The third party consultant reviews the COEs for these families and reports their findings to the staff MEP state staff.

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) 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 insure accuracy. Incomplete or otherwise questionable ones are returned to the home visitor/recruiter for correction further explanation documentation and/or verification.
- * The SEA provides recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g. a handbook).
- * SEA staff reviews student attendance enrollment days present and withdrawal date at summer/inter-session projects.
- * 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 the 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 childcount purposes.
- * State level recruiters each have randomly selected COEs reviewed for accuracy and validity.
- * Randomly selected COEs are further examined by a third party consultant and the families re-interviewed to certify valid identification and eligibility standards are met.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 reporting period each home visitor or recruiter who completed a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) had at least one and

possibly two COEs reviewed by a third party consultant through an on-site family interview.

Utilizing a random COE selection feature on MSIS COEs are randomly selected by school district to obtain the COEs to be reviewed. Approximately 125 home visitors/recruiters had their COEs reviewed.

Of the approximately 7900 COEs completed during the reporting period 242 COEs were selected for review through a third party consultant with 239 COEs being found eligible. All COE data and associated enrollments for the three families found to be in-eligible were deleted from the MSIS.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

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. All members of the MSDR staff who undertake this activity collectively have over 35 years of MSIS data consolidating experience. 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 completely independent from other valid records.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Each year MEP state staff review one-fourth of the school districts receiving MEP funds. During this review staff asks for local school district documentation of migrant student enrollments and compare that to the MSDR produced enrollment lists. This activity is carried out to ensure enrollments are correctly processed. In addition state staff also compare current school district grant applications to MSDR produced End-of-Year reports. State office staff will 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.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

During this school year the MSDR plans to continue with the third party consultant review practice and will strongly encourage home visitors/recruiters to accompany the reviewer on such reviews. In addition MSDR will incorporate additional interviewing scenarios into the home visitor/recruiter training activities to assist recruitment staff in with eligibility determinations.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

We are very secure in the accuracy of the reported child counts this year and the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.